

10.0 CONSULTATION

10.1 CONSULTATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Chapter 10 documents the public, agency, First Nations and Métis consultation activities that took place as part of the LWC Project EA. Consultation for the LWC Project EA was coordinated according to the MOE Code of Practice: Consultation in Ontario's Environmental Assessment Process (MOE, 2007).

LWC Project consultation that took place in the Feasibility Study and Terms of Reference (ToR) stages of the LWC Project is detailed in the Record of Consultation that was submitted with the ToR in July of 2012 (Appendix A). This Record of Consultation provides details of consultation that took place between August 16, 2011 and December 12, 2013.

10.2 OBJECTIVES AND GENERAL METHODOLOGY

Throughout the LWC Project EA, the LWC Project team strove to provide appropriate, flexible and convenient opportunities for consultation and clear documentation of all consultation activities. CVC and the Region of Peel facilitated various and diverse opportunities for the public and interest groups to provide input into the LWC Project EA. Consultation initiatives brought stakeholders and community members together in a way that channeled community energy and fostered support for the LWC Project. Many interested parties were invited to and participated in the consultation activities outlined in this chapter.

The objectives of the LWC Project consultation program were to:

- Inform all interested members of the public and interest groups about the LWC Project and Alternative LWC Project Configurations in a user-friendly format;
- Consult with stakeholders and obtain feedback before decisions were made on the Alternative LWC Project Configurations, Evaluation Criteria and the selection of the Preferred Alternative;
- Involve the public and stakeholders directly to ensure concerns and ideas about the LWC Project were understood, including being responsive to comments and providing written responses to key issues; and
- Empower the public and stakeholders to inform and influence decision making throughout the LWC Project.

10.3 CONSULTATION MECHANISMS

10.3.1 Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications

10.3.1.1 Notice of Commencement and PIC #1

The Notice of Commencement (NoC), announcing the initiation of the LWC Project EA, was released January 2, 2013. This notice included LWC Project information and necessary EA process information. This notice also included information for the first Public Information Centre (PIC) for the EA, held January 22, 2013 (see Section 10.4.2 for further information), including a brief agenda, location and contact information. The NoC and PIC#1 notice were posted January 3, 4, 10, and 11 in three newspaper publications (Table 10.1), as well as released to the press via news release (Table 10.2). The NoC and PIC #1 notice also went out via email or mail to the LWC Project Contact List (Table 10.3). In addition, PIC #1 was posted on the City of Mississauga's home page (with a link to the CVC news release). Two City of Mississauga electronic readerboards, on Lakeshore Rd at the Pt. Credit Library, and at the access road to Lakefront Promenade Park, were also used to promote PIC #1. An event notice was also sent to the Inspiration Lakeview mailing list and publicized through Councillor Grimes' eNewsletter. The NoC/PIC #1 newspaper advertisement, flyer, news release and press pick up are included in Appendix E-1.

10.3.1.2 Notice of PIC #2

Notices for PIC #2, held April 3, 2013 (see Section 10.4.2 for further information), were posted on March 13 and 14, 2013 in three newspaper publications (Table 10.1). This notice included LWC Project information and necessary EA process information, a brief agenda, location and contact information. Notice of PIC #2 was also released to the press via news release on March 15, 2013 (Table 10.2). The PIC #2 notice went out via email or mail to the LWC Project Contact List (Table 10.3) on March 18, 19, and 20, 2013. PIC #2 was posted on the City of Mississauga's home page (with a link to the CVC news release). Two City of Mississauga electronic readerboards, on Lakeshore Rd at the Pt. Credit Library and at the access road to Lakefront Promenade Park, were also used to promote the event. An event notice was also sent to the Inspiration Lakeview mailing list and publicized through Councillor Grimes' eNewsletter. Appendix E-2 provides copies of the PIC #2 newspaper advertisement, flyer, news release and press pick up.

10.3.1.3 Notice of PIC #3

Notices of PIC #3, held November 20, 2013 (see Section 10.3 for further information), were posted in the Mississauga News (October 30, 2013), Mississauga News This Week (October 31, 2013) and the Etobicoke Guardian (October 31, 2013) (Table 10.1). In addition, 17,754 PIC #3

notice flyers were delivered to apartment and condo residents in the Longbranch community via Canada Post unaddressed admail. This notice included LWC Project information and necessary EA process information, a brief agenda, location and contact information. Notice of PIC #3 was also released to the press via news release on November 6, 2013 (Table 10.2). The PIC #3 notice went out via email or mail to the LWC Project Contact List (Table 10.3) on November 4, 2013. An event notice was also sent to the Inspiration Lakeview mailing list and publicized on Councillor Grimes' website on November 8, 2013. Appendix E-2 provides copies of the PIC #3 newspaper advertisement, flyer, news release and press pick up.

10.3.1.4 Notice of Submission of Draft EA

A Notice of Submission (NoS) for the Draft EA was posted on the LWC Project website on December 12, 2013, emailed/mailed to the LWC Project contact list (Table 10.3) on December 12, 2013, published in local newspapers (Table 10.1) on December 11 and 12, 2013, and publicized with a news release (Table 10.2) on December 12, 2013. In addition, approximately 17,754 NoS flyers were delivered to apartment and condo residents in the Longbranch community via Canada Post unaddressed admail. The Notice described the LWC Project and directed the public to locations where the draft EA could be reviewed. It included the dates of the review period, and the details of where comments could be sent. The NoS is included in Appendix E-1.

10.3.1.5 Notice of Submission of Final EA

A Notice of Submission (NoS) for the Final EA was posted on the LWC Project website on May 2, 2014, emailed/mailed to the LWC Project contact list (Table 10.3) on May 2, 2014, published in local newspapers (Table 10.1) on May 1, 2014 and publicized with a news release (Table 10.2) on May 2, 2014. In addition, approximately 17,754 NoS flyers were delivered to apartment and condo residents in the Longbranch community via Canada Post unaddressed admail. The Notice described the LWC Project and directed the public to locations where the final EA could be reviewed. It included the dates of the review period, and the details of where comments could be sent. The NoS is included in Appendix E-1.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.1 Mandatory Notice Publication Information

Notice	Media Outlet	Dates
Notice of Commencement and PIC #1	Mississauga News	January 4 & January 11, 2013
	Mississauga News This Week	January 3 & January 10, 2013
	Etobicoke Guardian	January 4 & January 11, 2013
PIC #2	Mississauga News	March 13, 2013
	Mississauga News This Week	March 14, 2013
	Etobicoke Guardian	March 14, 2013
PIC #3	Mississauga News	October 30, 2013
	Mississauga News This Week	October 31, 2013
	Etobicoke Guardian	October 31, 2013
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	Mississauga News	December 11, 2013
	Mississauga News This Week	December 12, 2013
	Etobicoke Guardian	December 12, 2013
Notice of Submission of Final EA	Mississauga News This Week	May 1, 2014
	Mississauga News	May 2, 2014
	Etobicoke Guardian	May 1, 2014

Table 10.2 News Releases, News Articles, and Other Media Items

News Releases & Radio Spot	Date	Media Responses	Date
News Release: Notice of Commencement and PIC #1	January 3, 2013 (Appendix E-1)	Article written by Mississauga News	January 3, 2013 (Appendix E-1)
Radio spot: Kate Hayes and Councillor Jim Tovey on The Haze FM	January 19, 2013 < http://www.thehazefm.ca/Podcast-page.html >	Article written by Mississauga News	January 23, 2013 (Appendix E-2)
News Release: PIC #2	March 15, 2013 (Appendix E-2)	Article written by Mississauga News	March 15, 2013 (Appendix E-1)
News Release: PIC #3	November 6, 2013 (Appendix E-2)	Article written by Mississauga News	April 4, 2013 (Appendix E-2)
News Release: Notice of Submission of Final EA	May 2, 2014 (Appendix E-1)	Article written by Mississauga Business Times	May 12, 2013 (Appendix E-2)
		Article written by Mississauga News	May 29, 2013 (Appendix E-2)
		Article by SNAP Etobicoke	Date unknown (Appendix E-2)
Article in Mississauga Life	January 2014 (Appendix E-2)	Article written by Mississauga News	November 6, 2013 (Appendix E-1)

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.3 Notice Email / Mail Notifications

Notice	Contact (number of individuals on list/method of contact)	Date
Notice of Commencement and PIC #1	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail)	December 28, 2012
	Agency Contacts and Technical Advisory Committee (58) (email)	January 2, 2013
	Local Businesses (57) (mail and email) and Landowners (4) (email)	Mail: December 28, 2012 Email: January 2, 2013
	Utility Companies (4) (email)	January 2, 2013
	Ministry of Environment (email)	January 2, 2013
	Community Liaison Committee (CLC) (21) (email)	January 2, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (83) (email)	January 2, 2013
PIC #2	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail and email)	Mail: March 19, 2013 Email: March 18, 2013
	Agency Contacts and Technical Advisory Committee (53) (email)	March 20, 2013
	Local Businesses (56) (mail and email) and Landowners (4) (email)	Mail: March 20, 2012 Email: March 20, 2013
	Utility Companies (4) (email)	March 20, 2013
	Ministry of Environment (email)	March 20, 2013
	CLC (23) (email)	March 20, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (115) (email)	March 20, 2013
Notice #1 of Direct Community Engagement Sessions and Release of Supplementary Newsletter	CLC(23) (email)	July 25, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (202) (email)	July 26 and 29, 2013
Notice #2 of Direct Community Engagement Sessions and Release of Supplementary Newsletter	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail and email)	August 6, 2013
	CLC(23) (email)	August 12, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (228) (email)	August 12, 2013

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.3 Notice Email / Mail Notifications (Cont'd)

Notice	Contact (number of individuals on list/method of contact)	Date
PIC#3	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail and email)	October 30, 2013
	Agency Contacts and Technical Advisory Committee (59) (email)	November 4, 2013
	Local Businesses (56) (mail and email) and Landowners (8) (mail and email)	October 31, 2013 and November 1, 2013
	Utility Companies (4) (email)	October 31, 2013
	Ministry of Environment (email)	November 4, 2013
	CLC(24) (email)	November 4, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (347) (email)	November 4, 2013
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail and email)	December 12, 2013
	Agency Contacts and Technical Advisory Committee (59) (email)	December 12, 2013
	Local Businesses (56) (mail and email) and Landowners (8) (mail and email)	December 12, 2013
	Utility Companies (4) (email)	December 12, 2013
	Ministry of Environment (email)	December 12, 2013
	CLC(24) (email)	December 12, 2013
	Interested Members of the Public (384) (email)	December 12, 2013
Notice of Submission of Final EA	First Nations and Métis Communities (21) (mail and email)	May 2, 2014
	Agency Contacts and Technical Advisory Committee (59) (email)	May 2, 2014
	Local Businesses (56) (mail and email) and Landowners (8) (mail and email)	May 2, 2014
	Utility Companies (4) (email)	May 2, 2014
	Ministry of Environment (email)	May 2, 2014
	CLC(24) (email)	May 2, 2014
	Interested Members of the Public (393) (email)	May 2, 2014

10.3.2 Website

A website for the LWC Project was developed at the beginning of the ToR stage. All information released to the public regarding the LWC Project has been posted on the LWC Project website (www.creditvalleyca.ca/lwc). This website contains a detailed description of the LWC Project, information on the EA process, as well as a number of document links.

Documents for public comment were posted on the LWC Project website in order to solicit input from community members not able to attend the PICs. Please see Appendix E-3 for website screenshots and statistics.

Documents available for download from the LWC Project website include:

- LWC Feasibility Study;
- Notice of Commencement;
- Notices of public meetings;
- PIC presentations;
- PIC agendas and workbooks with questions;
- Newsletters;
- Poster displays;
- Notes from public meetings;
- Final EA Terms of Reference including the Comment Disposition Table, Errata and Notice of Approval;
- Notice of Submission of Draft EA; and
- Notice of Submission of Final EA.

The website was provided in every media release, advertisement, official correspondence, and presentation given to the public regarding the LWC Project.

From the Notice of Commencement of the LWC Project EA on January 3, 2013, until November 25, 2013, the LWC Project website received 3,606 page views (Appendix E-3).

10.3.3 Newsletter

Newsletters were prepared ahead of each of the PICs in order to summarize LWC Project developments, convey key LWC Project information in written form, and provide the opportunity for attendees to distribute the newsletters to members of their community not able to attend PICs. Four newsletters were printed during the LWC Project EA. Newsletters were made available at the PICs, at various meetings and events in the Lakeview area, during direct

community outreach sessions and on the LWC Project website. Newsletters were also made available at various events attended by CVC's LOISS Project team. The newsletters are included in Appendix E-2.

10.4 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

10.4.1 Contact List

The public component of the LWC Project contact list consists of contacts acquired through the LWC Project public event and outreach sign-in sheets, as well as individuals who have contacted the LWC Project Consultation Coordinator directly via email or phone. The public list includes City of Toronto Ward 6 Councillor Mark Grimes, who represents part of the LWC Project Study Area, as well as Charles Souza, MPP for Mississauga South. Stella Ambler, MP for Mississauga South and Councillor Jim Tovey (City of Mississauga and Region of Peel) are on the LWC Project CLC.

The public contact list was used to provide direct email notices of pertinent LWC Project information, including consultation and outreach initiatives. At the time of submission there were 393 persons on the LWC Project contact list.

10.4.2 Public Information Centres

The primary method of providing information, collecting input, and collaborating with the public throughout the LWC Project EA, was through PICs. Three PICs were held during the LWC Project EA, with PIC notices sent to the LWC Project contact list and publicized in local papers at least two weeks ahead of each event (see section 10.3.1). PIC notice information, meeting notes, presentation materials, and workbooks are provided in E2. Table 10.4 provides an overview of the PICs for the LWC Project EA. Section 10.6 summarizes all comments received during the EA, including those from the PICs.

As participants arrived for PICs they were asked to sign-in and were provided with an agenda, workbook / comment sheet, newsletter, and PIC-specific information (Appendix E-2). PIC participants were invited to view information boards (Appendix E-2) and speak with the Proponents and the LWC Project team. Each PIC featured a presentation, with opportunities for members of the public to ask questions, make comments, and receive responses from the LWC Project team. PICs #1 and #2 featured facilitated discussion in which workbooks were filled out by small groups and individuals. The workbooks posed specific questions, providing a further opportunity for PIC participants to express their opinions and questions on the EA process and the LWC Project. At PICs #1 and #2, groups, and individuals, shared the ideas and comments generated during their discussions with the wider group. Individuals were invited to fill in their

own workbooks and hand them in to the LWC Project team, if they preferred. Information boards, newsletters, presentations, workbooks, and meeting notes were available for download from the LWC Project website for people who were not able to attend. Workbooks could be filled in and sent to the LWC Project Consultation Coordinator after each PIC.

PIC #1

PIC #1 was held at the Mississauga Senior’s Centre at 1389 Cawthra Road in Mississauga, Ontario on January 22, 2013. PIC #1 focused on presenting, and receiving feedback on, the Alternative LWC Project Configurations and the Proposed Evaluation Criteria and Indicators.

PIC #2

PIC #2 was held at the Mississauga Senior’s Centre on April 3, 2013. PIC #2 focused on presenting, and receiving feedback on, the evaluation of Alternative LWC Project Configurations.

PIC #3

PIC #3 was held at the Oasis Convention Centre at 1036 Lakeshore Road East, in Mississauga, Ontario on November 20, 2013. PIC #3 focused on presenting, and receiving feedback on, the refinements to the Preferred Alternative and the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative.

Table 10.4 Overview of PICs

Event	Date	Objectives	Attendance
PIC#1	January 22, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing EA status update. • Communicating how Alternative LWC Project Configurations were developed. • Discussing approach to comparative evaluation • Receiving public input and feedback on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternative LWC Project Configurations; - Objective based evaluation approach; - Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; and - Project and process to date. 	83 members of the public
PIC#2	April 3, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing EA status update. • Communicating the results of the evaluation of Alternative LWC Project Configurations and presenting the Preferred Alternative. • Discussing elements of the Preferred Alternative that will be refined further. • Getting public input and feedback on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results of the evaluation of Alternative LWC Project Configurations; - The components that should be considered as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative; and - LWC Project and process to date. 	87 members of the public

Table 10.4 Overview of PICs (Cont'd)

Event	Date	Objectives	Attendance
PIC#3	November 20, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing EA status update. • Presenting the Preferred Alternative, as it was presented at PIC#2. • Communicating comments received following PIC #2 as well as expanded community consultation initiatives since PIC#2. • Presenting the Refined Preferred Alternative. • Discussing construction access routes, construction phasing and the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Naturalization effects; - Access effects; - Compatibility effects; - Coordination effects; and - Fiscal viability effects. • Discussing the EA approval process. 	131 members of the public

10.4.3 Community Liaison Committee

As part of the LWC Project consultation process, a CLC was established. The purpose of the CLC was to assist in reaching out to, and maintaining contact with, representative community residents, groups, associations, and organizations, and to provide community input and advice throughout the ToR and EA processes of the LWC Project. A key role of the CLC was 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:

- City of Mississauga Councillor – Ward 1;
- Credit River Anglers Association;
- Lakeview Estates Ratepayers' Association;
- Mississauga Bassmasters;
- Mississauga Canoe Club;
- Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee;
- Mississauga Residents' Associations Network;
- Mississauga South Historical Association;
- MP – Mississauga South;
- Ontario Cycling Association
- Port Credit Business Improvement Area;
- Port Credit Salmon and Trout Association;

- Port Credit Village Residents Association;
- Port Credit Yacht Club;
- Rattray Marsh Protection Association;
- Sierra Club of Ontario, Peel Region;
- South Peel Naturalist Club;
- The City of Mississauga; and
- Town of Port Credit Association.

One CLC Ideas Workshop (October 9, 2012) and three official CLC meetings (January 14, March 19 and October 30, 2013), and a page-turn review of the Draft EA (January 16, 2014), took place during the EA stage of the LWC Project. Overviews of the CLC Ideas Workshop and CLC meetings #1, #2, and #3 are provided in Table 10.5. Appendix E-4 documents CLC meeting summary notes, agendas, comment summaries, and presentations. Questions and comments received during CLC meetings are summarized in Section 10.6.

The October, 2012 Ideas Workshop gathered input into the design of the Alternative LWC Project Configurations for the LWC Project. An information package with a workshop agenda was provided to the members of the CLC (D1.1). The meeting began with a presentation (Appendix E-4) and moved into a workshop during which the CLC gave their input on variations of the Alternative LWC Project Configurations that had been produced to date. Large print-outs of the Alternative LWC Project Configurations and markers were provided. CLC members were invited to draw their ideas on the print-outs, and give verbal comments to note-takers positioned throughout the workshop (Appendix E-4).

Three CLC meetings were held one to two weeks ahead of each of the PICs. The purpose of these meetings was to present the information that would be presented at the upcoming PIC to ensure that the content was comprehensive and appropriate given the community context. See Appendix E-4 for CLC meeting agendas, presentations and notes. Table 10.5 provides an overview of the CLC meetings.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.5 Overview of CLC Meetings

Event	Date	Objectives	Attendance
CLC Ideas Workshop	October 9, 2012	To provide an update on the status of the LWC Project. To obtain a review and feedback from the CLC regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative LWC Project Configurations drafted by the EA technical team; • The building blocks used to create those alternatives; and • The rationale for the size, character and extent of habitat, shoreline and recreational features. 	13 CLC members
CLC Meeting #1	January 14, 2013	To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report back to the CLC on how their input was used to finalize the Alternative LWC Project Configurations; and • Discuss how the Alternative LWC Project Configurations will be evaluated. 	16 CLC members
CLC Meeting #2	March 19, 2013	To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the outcomes of the evaluation for each Alternative LWC Project Configurations; • Present the Preferred Alternative based on the evaluation; • Seek the CLC's input on the evaluation and the selection of the Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss potential refinements to the Preferred Alternative. 	9 CLC members
CLC Meeting #3	October 30, 2013	To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate comments received following PIC #2 as well as expanded community consultation initiatives since PIC#2; • Present and discuss the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Present and discuss construction access routes, construction phasing and the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Naturalization effects; - Access effects; - Compatibility effects; - Coordination effects; and - Fiscal viability effects. 	12 CLC members
Page turn review of the Draft EA	January 16, 2014	To provide the CLC with an opportunity to review the Draft EA and provide comments as a group.	5 CLC members

10.4.4 Direct Community Engagement

In addition to PICs and CLC meetings, the LWC Project team undertook a variety of additional direct community engagement initiatives. The LWC Project team attended events over the summer at Lakeview Promenade Park, Marie Curtis Park, the Small Arms Building (Doors Open Mississauga), Lakeview Library, and the Royal Canadian Legion – Branch 101. At these outreach events, the LWC Project team spoke with community members about the LWC Project, handed out LWC Project newsletters, displayed LWC Project renderings, grew the LWC Project public contact list, and received comments and answered questions about the LWC Project. LWC Project team also responded to inquiries over telephone and via email. Table 10.6 provides a summary of direct community engagement initiatives. Comments and questions raised about the LWC Project by members of the public are reflected in the comment tracking matrix and can be found in Table 10.9.

Table 10.6 Summary of Direct Community Engagement Sessions

Date / Time / Location / Staff Present	Rationale for Selecting Location / Date / Time	Summary of Session and Outcomes
<p>Date: Friday, June 14, 2013 Time: 6 – 9 p.m. Date: Saturday, June 15, 2013 Time: 10 a.m. – 9 p.m. Location: Port Credit Memorial Park Staff Present: CVC</p>	<p>The Mississauga Waterfront Festival is a multi-day outdoor festival, attracting thousands of people. CVC had a booth at the festival, promoting its conservation areas, urban environmental stewardship programs and shoreline-focused community outreach under LOISS.</p>	<p>A 10'x10' booth was set and attended to by CVC staff and volunteers. Information on shoreline-related projects, conservation areas, and urban environmental stewardship was disseminated. In addition, information about the LWC project was presented. Approximately 60 members of the public were engaged and 32 LWC Project newsletters were handed out. Most of the people welcomed the idea of creating new green space.</p>
<p>Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 Time: 1 - 4 p.m. Location: Marie Curtis Park East, north of the parking lot, near the playground. Staff Present: Alexis Wood, TRCA; Kenneth Dion, TRCA; and Tristan Knight, CVC</p>	<p>The date and time for the initial direct community engagement activity at Marie Curtis Park was selected based on a local mother's group meeting being held at the playground in the park.</p>	<p>The display was set-up adjacent to the Waterfront Trail crossing over Etobicoke Creek, at the north of the Marie Curtis Park East parking lot, near the playground. In order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members, artistic renderings of the project were on display. LWC Project team members were on hand to discuss the LWC Project. A total of 26 members of the public spoke with LWC Project team members. Positive support for the LWC Project was received from 21 people. See Section 10.6 for a summary of comments. A total of 12 members of the public requested to be added to the LWC Project's distribution list.</p>
<p>Date: Saturday, July 27, 2013 Time: 9 a.m. - 12 p.m. Location: Marie Curtis Park East, north of the parking lot, near the playground. Staff Present: Alexis Wood, TRCA and Janice Hatton, Region of Peel</p>	<p>The date and time for the second direct community engagement activity at Marie Curtis Park was selected based on a large fundraising walk ("Paws on the Shore") being held along the Waterfront Trail.</p>	<p>The display was set-up adjacent to the Waterfront Trail crossing over Etobicoke Creek in order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members. Artistic renderings of the LWC Project were on display. Two members of the LWC Project team were present to discuss the LWC Project. A total of 36 members of the public stopped by the display. Positive support for the LWC Project was received from 31 people. Of the 5 members of the public who noted concerns regarding the project, 1 member of the public had also attended and submitted concerns as part of the July 24, 2013 outreach session at Marie Curtis Park (see section 10.6 for a summary of comments). A total of 19 members of the public requested to be added to the LWC Project's distribution list to be kept informed of LWC Project updates and notices of public meetings.</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.6 Summary of Direct Community Engagement Sessions (Cont'd)

Date / Time / Location / Staff Present	Rationale for Selecting Location / Date / Time	Summary of Session and Outcomes
<p>Date: Monday, August 5, 2013 Time: 1 - 4 p.m. Location: Marie Curtis Park East, north of the parking lot, near the playground. Staff Present: Alexis Wood, TRCA; Janice Hatton, Region of Peel; and Kate Hayes, CVC</p>	<p>The date and time for the third direct community engagement activity at Marie Curtis Park was selected in order to directly engage with the large crowds expected during a long weekend holiday Monday.</p>	<p>In response to concerns noted during the second outreach session on July 27, 2013, two 2'x3' signs were installed at the entrances to both the parking lots at Marie Curtis Park East and Marie Curtis Park West. The signs included dates and times for the expanded outreach activities being held at Marie Curtis Park and Lakefront Promenade Park, as well as the aerial planform rendering of the LWC Project to provide context for those unfamiliar with the LWC Project. The signs were installed on Thursday, August 1st in advance of the direct community engagement session in order to advise the public of the expanded outreach activities.</p> <p>The display was set-up adjacent to the Waterfront Trail crossing over Etobicoke Creek in order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members. Artistic renderings of the LWC Project were on display. LWC Project team members were present to discuss the LWC Project. A total of 69 members of the public spoke with LWC Project team members. Positive support for the LWC Project was received from 65 members of the public. Of the 4 members of the public who noted concerns, 2 had also attended and submitted concerns as part of the July 27, 2013 outreach session at Marie Curtis Park (see section 10.6 for a summary of comments). A total of 24 members of the public requested to be added to the Project's distribution list to be kept informed of Project updates and notices of Public Meetings.</p>
<p>Date: Sunday, August 18, 2013 Time: 1 - 4 p.m. Location: Marie Curtis Park East, north of the parking lot, near the playground. Staff Present: Alexis Wood, TRCA and Janice Hatton, Region of Peel</p>	<p>The date and time for the fourth direct community engagement activity at Marie Curtis Park was selected in order to directly engage with the large crowds common during summer weekends.</p>	<p>In response to concerns noted during the second outreach session on July 27, 2013, two 2'x3' signs were installed at the entrances to both the parking lots at Marie Curtis Park East and Marie Curtis Park West. The signs included dates and times for the expanded outreach activities being held at Marie Curtis Park and Lakefront Promenade Park, as well as the aerial planform rendering of the Project to provide context for those unfamiliar with the Project. The signs were installed on Thursday, August 15, 2013 in advance of the direct community engagement session in order to advise the public of the expanded outreach activities.</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.6 Summary of Direct Community Engagement Sessions (Cont'd)

Date / Time / Location / Staff Present	Rationale for Selecting Location / Date / Time	Summary of Session and Outcomes
		<p>The display was set-up adjacent to the Waterfront Trail crossing over Etobicoke Creek in order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members. Artistic renderings of the Project were on display. Two members of the LWC Project team were present to discuss the LWC Project. A total of 41 members of the public stopped by the display. Positive support for the LWC Project was received from 33 members of the public. Of the 8 members of the public who noted concerns regarding the project, 1 member of the public had also attended and submitted concerns as part of the July 27, 2013 outreach session at Marie Curtis Park, and 1 member of the public had also attended and submitted concerns as part of the August 5, 2013 outreach session at Marie Curtis Park (see section 10.6 for a summary of comments). A total of 19 members of the public requested to be added to the Project's distribution list to be kept informed of Project updates and notices of Public Meetings.</p>
<p>Date: Saturday, August 24, 2013 Time: 11:30 a.m. - 3 p.m. Location: Lakefront Promenade Park Staff Present: Jon McMull, CVC</p>	<p>The date and time for the third direct community engagement activity at Lakefront Promenade Park was selected based on a large weekend crowd drawn to the splash pad. The tent displays were set-up adjacent to the splash pad in order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members. Two signs were set-up near the splash pad over a week prior advise visitors of the information display.</p>	<p>The display was set up between the parking lot and splash pad. Artistic renderings of the LWC Project were on display. One member of the LWC Project Team, as well as Councillor Jim Tovey, were present to discuss the LWC Project. A total of 16 members of the public stopped by the display. All 16 members of the public indicated their support for the LWC Project.</p>
<p>Date: Saturday September 14, 2013 Time: 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. Location: Lakeview Library Staff Present: Kate Hayes</p>	<p>Attendance at Lakeview Ratepayer's Association "community event" was suggested by a CLC member in response to the Project team's request for suggestions for outreach opportunities.</p>	<p>The display was set-up adjacent to the Lakeview Library parking lot in order to maximize visual exposure and interaction with local community members. Artistic renderings of the project were on display, as well as an aerial planform rendering of the Project. One member of the Project Team was present to discuss the Project with the local community and answer questions. Between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. approximately 50-60 members of the public demonstrated interest in the project. Comments received were overwhelmingly positive in support of the LWC Project. Some concern was expressed about recent flooding in the community and questions centered on how the LWC Project might help to mitigate stormwater, and what</p>

Table 10.6 Summary of Direct Community Engagement Sessions (Cont'd)

Date / Time / Location / Staff Present	Rationale for Selecting Location / Date / Time	Summary of Session and Outcomes
		additional measures were being taken by the City and CVC to assist with stormwater management. Comments and questions raised about the LWC Project by members of the public are reflected in the comment tracking matrix and can be found in section 10.6.
Date: September 28 Time: 12:00 - 4:00 p.m. Location: Doors Open Mississauga at the Small Arms Building Staff Present: Ken Dion	Attendance at Doors Open Mississauga at the Small Arms Building was suggested by a CLC member in response to the Project team's request for suggestions for outreach opportunities.	The LWC Project information display was set up adjacent to the Inspiration Lakeview and Hanlan Feedermain tables. Artistic renderings of the LWC Project were on display, as well as an aerial planform rendering of the LWC Project. Approximately 1200 people attended the Doors Open event. Several hundred visitors walked by the LWC Project information display. LWC Project staff spoke with approximately 30-40 people. Every individual who conversed with LWC Project staff expressed support for the LWC Project.
Date: October 17 Time: 7:00 - 9:00 p.m. Location: Royal Canadian Legion – Branch 101 Staff Present: Ken Dion, Alexis Wood, Michael Charendoff, TRCA; Kate Hayes, Scott Sampson, CVC; Janice Hatton RoP; Anneliese Grieve, Kyle Hunt, SENES; Milo Sturm, Shoreplan	Neighbouring Councillors Jim Tovey, Mississauga Ward 1, and Mark Grimes, Toronto Ward 6, co-hosted an informational open house to present the plans of the LWC Project. The Open House was held at the Royal Canadian Legion Branch 101, 3850 Lake Shore Boulevard West in Toronto, Ontario.	Approximately 60 members of the public attended the Open House. The public was invited to review information boards and discuss their comments and questions with the LWC Project team. The overwhelming majority of attendees expressed support for the LWC Project; however, some attendees expressed concern about potential impacts to the beach at Marie Curtis Park. Many of those who expressed concern had previously registered their concern at PICs, outreach initiatives, and via email.

In addition to the above-noted direct community engagement sessions, LWC Project staff met with one member of the public on-site, on July 5, to discuss their concerns and questions. The minutes from this meeting can be found in Appendix E-5. In addition, the LWC Project team, as well as staff from the City of Toronto and the office of Councillor Mark Grimes, met with nine members of the public on August 21, 2013 from 7:00 – 9:30 p.m. at the Royal Canadian Legion - Branch 101, located at 3850 Lake Shore Blvd. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the status of the LWC Project as well as options to maximize broad public input in advance of two public meetings: 1) an informational open house, hosted by Councillors Tovey and Grimes, on

September 17, 2013; and 2) PIC #3, held November 20, 2013. Complete minutes of the meeting on August 21, 2013 can be found in Appendix E-5. Notes from the informational open house on September 17, 2013, can be found in Appendix E-5.

10.5 LOCAL BUSINESSES AND LANDOWNERS

The LWC Project team consulted with the businesses and landowners located south of Lakeshore Road and east of Lakefront Promenade to Etobicoke Creek. A total of 53 businesses and 4 additional landowners were kept apprised of the LWC Project throughout the EA (see Appendix E-6).

Businesses and landowners within the LWC Project Study Area were contacted a total of five times during the EA (Table 10.7). Correspondence included an open invitation to meet with the LWC Project team to discuss the LWC Project in greater detail.

Table 10.7 LWC Project Notifications to Businesses and Landowners

Notification	Date
NoC and PIC #1	Mail: December 28, 2012 Email: January 2, 2013
Notice of PIC #2	Mail: March 20, 2013 Email: March 20, 2013
Notice of PIC #3	Mail: October 31 and November 1, 2013 Email: October 31, 2013
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	December 12, 2013
Notice of Submission of Final EA	May 2, 2014

In addition, the following utility companies have infrastructure located south of Lakeshore Road and east of Lakefront Promenade to Etobicoke Creek:

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

These utilities were provided with the same information as the local businesses and landowners (Table 10.7) and an open invitation to meet with the LWC Project team to discuss the LWC Project in greater detail. To date, only one response has been received from the utilities and local businesses and landowners (Table 10.8).

Table 10.8 Responses from Local Businesses, Landowners and Utilities

Business, Landowner or Utility	Method of Communication	Date	Summary of Key Issues
Enbridge Gas	Email	January 7, 2013	Enbridge Gas notified the LWC Project team that as of January 7, 2013, they did not have concerns or comments regarding the LWC Project. Jim Arnott of Enbridge Gas asked to be added to the mailing list. (Appendix E-6)

10.6 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following matrix provides a summary of comments and issues received during PICs, CLC meetings, and other sources. The matrix is not an exhaustive account of all comments received; rather it is a summary of those comments received during the LWC Project EA.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Accessibility	Ensure that the park is designed to be used year round.	It is our intention to introduce design elements that will allow the public to enjoy the park year-round.
	Consider access to the project land area over the next several years and during construction.	The LWC Project Study Area will be a construction site over the next several years so public access must be controlled in accordance with relevant legislation and by-laws. Access will be permitted once construction activities have been completed. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Consider accessibility to the park to ensure everyone can enjoy it.	The multi-use trail will be fully accessible. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Will the groyne separating the existing Marie Curtis West beach from new area (transition zone) be accessible for people to be able to walk out on it?	Yes
	Concern over not being able to use the park for years during construction.	It is anticipated that construction will have minimal effects on existing park use with the exception of the Waterfront Trail which will be rerouted during construction. However, the existing trail will continue to be accessible by the public when construction activities have shut down for the day during weekday evenings and at night.
	Consider providing access to the middle of the LWC Park and protecting viewscapes.	Currently the EA identifies the primary trail access. However, during the detailed design phase of the LWC Project we will look at secondary trails, including the forested area and other areas away from the shoreline. We are trying to balance the use of the park to ensure that people can have a range of experiences recognizing that it is also a natural area that should provide safe areas for birds to reproduce and for humans to co-exist with the ecology of the park.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Accessibility		With respect to views, an important element of the EA was to conduct view shed analysis to ensure important views are maintained, including the view of the City of Toronto skyline from the Ontario Power Generation piers.
	Consider making the temporary trail accessible for cycling in addition to pedestrians. Also consider increasing access to the waterfront during the construction phase.	<p>The routed Waterfront Trail during the period of construction along the south side of Lakeshore Road will be accessible to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>We are also contemplating construction viewing opportunities along the south side of the WWTF by establishing a tertiary mown trail with extensive fencing to maintain security for the construction site and WWTF. Alternative viewing areas will be contemplated at detailed design as well.</p>
Algae	Consider algae growth in the embayment area.	Algae growth and circulation has been considered during the development of Alternatives. The primary issue associated with algae growth is nutrient levels in the water column (which is high throughout Lake Ontario), and suitable hard substrates from which algae could become attached. In discussions with the ecologists, and coastal engineers, sheltered areas, such as embayments generally provide conditions suitable for the establishment of macrophyte submergent vegetation, such as milfoil. While these types of plants are known to be a nuisance for motorized watercraft, they do provide shelter for fish and generally reduce the amount of algae growth by competing against them for nutrient uptake. For the beach areas, it is likely that algae growing offshore will end up being deposited on the beach areas, similar to other beaches on Lake Ontario. The revetment while providing a surface for algae to attach to, does not provide a shoreline conducive for the build-up of detached algae, thus allowing algae to continue on around the landform.
	Consider a hybrid of the embayment and the Island Alternatives (Island Beach A, Island Beach B, Island Beach C with) a break through option to alleviate algae growth concerns.	Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a discussion of the preferred alternative.
	The new landform will create an area where there will be very little movement of water, resulting in a build-up of algae. On the west side of Etobicoke Creek, there is a breakwater which is causing the same effect. It also happens at Colonel Sam Smith Park.	Water circulation and water quality modeling was completed. The results indicate that there will be no significant changes from existing conditions. Algae is a regional issue which the LWC Project cannot address. Detailed videos of the lake bottom depict “algae forests” offshore along the Project Study Area.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Algae	The videos are not correct; the lake bottom is all sand from Etobicoke Creek to the eastern OPG pier. Currently, the area in question is wide open and the algae tends to wash out. As the algae will attach to the cobble more so than sand, this area has much less algae than Mimico or other areas in Toronto. There is concern that this Project will change that dynamic.	Our studies indicate that there will be little change to existing coastal processes.
	Does the City of Mississauga rake the algae from their jurisdiction?	CVC and the Region are currently testing equipment to rake algae, although the results indicate that they are not very effective given the regional issue of algae.
	You keep giving us assurances that the modeling indicates that the LWC Project won't exasperate the algae issue. However, there are features of this project that are categorically similar to Colonel Sam Smith Park, where the build-up of algae and organic material renders the shoreline completely unusable.	Noted. Details regarding water circulation and water quality modeling will be available as part of the EA.
	What will prevent the wetlands from becoming stinking ponds of algae?	Nutrient loads within the wetlands will be taken up by wetland vegetation. Experience with wetland restoration projects throughout the GTA suggest algae will not be an issue, provided the design maximizes aeration and water circulation in the wetland.
Beaches	Provide a more precise definition of what is meant by 'beach'.	A beach is a landform, defined as a collection of loose particles such as sand, gravel, pebbles, shingles or cobbles, that is exposed to, and reworked by, wave action and currents. In the case of the LWC Project, the easternmost beach area, overlapping with Marie Curtis Park West beach, the materials will range in size from 0.5 to 4 inches in diameter, with parts of the beach likely being covered in sand for much of the summer, as is currently experienced. For the remaining portions of the proposed beach, beach materials will be round river stone, ranging in size from 4 to 8 inches in diameter. Please see section 3.2.2.2 of the EA for a discussion of beaches.
	Disappointment was expressed by a number of PIC #2 participants about the 'beach' component of the Preferred Alternative Island C not being able to support a sandy area.	The preferred alternative, Island C, has been refined to maximize the amount of sand beach area retained. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Beaches	Is there evidence to refute a comment shared by a Long Branch resident that the beach in question may be the last remaining “Natural beach” in the Toronto Area?	There are many natural beaches on Lake Ontario and other Great Lakes that consist of rocks that are significantly larger than sand. As such, when the creation of a cobble beach in the area is proposed, these are materials that would be deemed “natural” in the context for the area – the beach at Rattray Marshes, for example. There are also several remaining sand beaches in the Toronto area. The most extensive is Woodbine Beach in Toronto which was formed through the deposition of sand eroded from the Scarborough Bluffs. Other sand beaches can be found on the Toronto Islands, Bluffers Park and at the mouth of the Rouge River. More locally, sand beaches are found along the City of Mississauga shoreline at the Suncor Energy site and Fusion Park near Oakville.
	Concerned with the loss of sand beach and not clear on the reasons behind this. Request for clarification for reasons for change and request confirmation that community concerns are being listened to.	The preferred alternative, Island C, has been refined to maximize the amount of sand beach area retained. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Can you please give me an estimate of the amount of beach that will be removed? It looks like there is about 30 feet of sand beach to the west of Applewood Creek. How much sand beach will be removed or altered on the east side of that small creek.	The preferred alternative, Island C, has been refined to maximize the amount of sand beach area retained. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	I am glad that the Lakeview neighbourhood in Mississauga will get a natural waterfront park but not at the expense of an existing sand beach on the Toronto side.	The preferred alternative, Island C, has been refined to maximize the amount of sand beach area retained. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	How much of the sand beach currently at Marie Curtis Park will be lost?	The preferred alternative, Island C, has been refined to maximize the amount of sand beach area retained. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Need to consider the remnant sand beach in front of the WWTF.	Comment noted.
	A member of the public thinks that not enough sand beach will be retained and wants the entire shoreline to be beach, or pockets of beach left behind the islands. Does not believe the coastal studies regarding the need for cobble and not sand	Noted.
	How will this affect beach conditions at Marie Curtis Park beach east?	There are no anticipated changes to Marie Curtis Park East beach east?

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Beaches	The sand beach in the area has been here for 200 years, why do we now need cobble? Would like to see the design changed to retain even more of the sand beach.	Comment noted. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a discussion of the preferred alternative.
	People lounge on cobble beaches in Nice. The cobble beach feature is not an issue.	Noted.
	Why can't the new beaches be sand instead of cobble?	The further the land base extends into the lake, the stronger the wave energy. The beach material must be appropriately sized to withstand that energy and be stable in the long-term.
	The beaches behind the headlands at Colonel Sam Smith Park are oriented in the same direction as these Alternatives; however, the cobble is much smaller.	When Colonel Sam Smith Park was created, the cobble material was the same size as proposed in the LWC Project. Over time, the wave energy has ground them down to the small size you see now. TRCA has also gone back and completed refinements to the beaches at Colonel Sam Smith Park. To provide another example, east of Rattray marsh is an area known as Brick Beach. When this beach was constructed, the beach material was large bricks. Over time, the wave energy has turned these bricks into small cobble stones.
	The LWC Project Team must understand that local residents are already concerned regarding loss of beach along Marie Curtis Park beach east. This proposed loss of beach on the west side only adds to the overall extent of beach lost.	Feedback received from the Parks Supervisor is that the existing sand beach along Marie Curtis Park east and west is not naturally maintained. The Parks Supervisor regularly places sand along the maintained sections of the east and west beaches.
	There is a risk that the public will not tolerate the loss of the beach.	Comment noted.
	We love the project and the opportunity. We still are not overly happy to see the effects on the west end of the beach at Marie Curtis Park and the remnant beach south of the Treatment Plant. And yes I am aware that I am not supposed to be there. But it is lovely, despite some of the extra-curricular activities that occur over there.	Comment noted. We have minimized the changes to the beach at Marie Curtis Park West. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Connecting the waterfront trail and getting it off the Lakeshore road is the most anticipated goal. The only concern is that the beach of M.C. Park will not be adversely affected by the proposal.	Comment noted

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Beaches	Will the hidden beach near the water plant area that is accessible by water only completely disappear?	This pocket of sand beach will be transformed into a wetland area tied to Applewood Creek. The depth of water at the new constructed open coast shoreline will be approximately 5 metres deep, thus preventing the reestablishment of shallow sandy conditions found to the south of the WWTF. This is why this area will have larger cobble stones as opposed to sand to ensure it can withstand the higher wave energy resulting from deeper water conditions.
Benefits	Concern over habitat loss.	The LWC project will create new wildlife habitat creating a net positive increase in habitat.
	How will this project help the environment?	The goal of the LWC Project is to create a new natural park that will establish ecological habitat and public linkages on the eastern Mississauga waterfront. Currently, the shoreline is approximately 80% hardened. There is poor upland habitat and very little connection along the shoreline, and past stone hooking activity has resulted in the loss of near shore fish habitat. The Preferred Alternative of the LWC Project will create terrestrial and wetland habitat, including meadow; beach; forest; wetland; treed swamp; and rocky island habitat.
	How will this project benefit City of Toronto residents?	The LWC Project provides a number of benefits to residents of Toronto, Mississauga, and beyond. The Project will ultimately provide a connection along the eastern Mississauga waterfront, from Marie Curtis Park to Lakefront Promenade Park. Ultimately, members of the public will be able to walk along the water's edge from Marie Curtis Park to Lakefront Promenade Park and use the new waterfront park for passive recreational activities such as: bird watching; nature appreciation; fishing; and hiking; as well as retain the current uses found at Marie Curtis Park. In addition, the project will provide significant indirect enhancements to the public by directly improving the quality of habitat for regional fish and wildlife populations along the shores of Lake Ontario. In particular, the feature offers a unique opportunity to create much needed habitat for migratory species including birds and butterflies by improving the amount and the quality of "stop-over" habitat as various species make their way over Lake Ontario. Habitat loss and degradation is a leading cause of declines in wildlife both in Ontario and globally, and the Lake Ontario shoreline is part of a major migratory pathway for species that breed in Canada and overwinter in the southern United States and both Central and South America.
	Will this improve fishing and fish habitat?	Yes. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Configuration of LWC Project	Based on what is being proposed, what will happen at the interface of Applewood Creek and the Lake Ontario?	Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a description of this interface.
	Consider the aesthetics of the islands.	Islands play a crucial role in maintaining beach stability in a very harsh environment. Further, we had received direction from the community that we should not create conditions that would be conducive for establishing new cormorant communities. This directive requires us to ensure that the islands remain low-lying, so that large waves can regularly overtop the structures, thus preventing the establishment of isolated trees, which are desired by cormorants for nesting purposes. The resulting rocky islands will not produce a substantial break in sight lines from the beaches given their distance from shore and low-lying nature during most lake level conditions.
	Consider opportunities for including more sand in the terrestrial area.	This statement relates to the stated desire for making the proposed cobble beaches more “people” friendly. The challenge of adding sand to these beaches is that the wave climate is too severe to maintain sand in place on the beaches. This would require expensive and frequent sand replenishment programs that are not sustainable. Alternatively, sand could be placed above the high water marks of the beaches outside of the zone of wave influence. However, without the influence of wave action to move the sand around, these sand areas will become vegetated over a couple of seasons and will simply take on the form of the surrounding meadow areas of the park.
	Will the two wetlands both be permanently open to Lake Ontario or is it the intent to have a more fluctuating situation where they open and close depending on water levels, wave action etc. like Rattray Marsh?	Wetlands may or may not be periodically closed off from direct effects from Lake Ontario due to movement of materials at the mouths of each creek. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Are the islands associated with Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives for fish habitat only, or are they needed to protect the beach?	The islands in the Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives are essential for beaches to remain in place otherwise the cobbles proposed for the beaches would be lost. The islands can be designed to have enhanced fish habitat function as well.
	Consider including more sand as part of the Preferred Alternative Island C.	Please see Chapter 6 of the EA. We have minimized the effect of the preferred alternative on the sand beach to the extent possible.
	Can a wall be constructed to keep this project in City of Mississauga jurisdiction?	The intent of this project is to facilitate public and wildlife access to the water’s edge; therefore, a wall would contradict this intent.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Configuration of LWC Project	I do not want this to end up like Colonel Sam Smith Park, with sludge build-up.	Noted.
	Consider minimizing the amount of standing water in the treed swamp.	With respect to the treed swamp (i.e. Forest), the water located in this area will be locally generated from the hills and the forested area. The design of this swamp will be such that it will likely be wet on the bottom during the spring after the snowmelt and after rain events. For the remaining parts of the year, the wetland is not likely to contain standing water. This kind of wetland is referred to as having 'ephemerally wet swamp conditions'.
	Where will the rivers go?	Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Ensure this project does not end up looking like Humber Bay Shores.	Noted.
	Ensure the beach face of the new waterfront park does not look like Colonel Sam Smith Park (i.e., protruding metal rebar).	Noted
	Will the rocky islands be submerged at times?	The islands are designed to be low-lying, which will allow waves to overtop them frequently during storms but will remain emergent under most lake level conditions.
	These islands are being built to a certain height, but Lake Ontario water levels are getting lower.	Lake Ontario water levels are regulated through control structures at each end. As such, it is not anticipated to see water levels drop significantly as is experienced in Georgian Bay.
	How far from shore will these islands be, and how deep is the water in this area? There are concerns regarding the build-up of algae between the shoreline and islands.	The islands are approximately 40-m to 50-m from the shoreline and the water is approximately 3-m to 4-m deep in this area. Water circulation and water quality modeling was completed in this area, and the results indicate that there was little anticipated change in circulation or water quality as compared to the existing conditions.
	What would prevent moving the groyne farther west and creating a thinner band of new land in front of the WWTF? Every inch of existing sand beach that can be retained is a benefit.	While there may be still some opportunity to move the groyne farther west, there is limits as to how far this can occur given the intent of the LWC Project to allow sufficient space for a wetland complex associated with Applewood Creek; create a multi-use trail; screen the WWTF; and create views to City of Toronto and back to the Inspiration Lakeview site. These are all elements which the public and agencies have indicated a desire for. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	I think most people would trade off a narrower band of land at the eastern extent of the project for more sand beach.	Comment noted.
	How was the determination of the new beach and the layout of the large promontory at the west end with the armour stone wall selected?	Please see Chapter 5 of the EA for a discussion of how the alternatives were developed.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Configuration of LWC Project	Unnatural man-made islands will be a water & boating hazard if too low, if they are too high can be offensive due to unplanned use, vegetation growth and blocked views	The islands are a required component to maintain the stability of the beach. The islands also provide opportunities for additional habitat diversity.
	The groyne will make algae problems worse.	Algae is a lake-wide issue and is not anticipated to be improved or exacerbated as a result of the Preferred Alternative.
	How far does the groyne extend into the Lake Ontario? What is the purpose of the groyne?	It extends approximately 20 to 30 m offshore. The purpose of the groyne is to prevent the larger materials (e.g., cobbles) from mixing with finer materials (e.g. sand) to the east in Marie Curtis Park.
Construction	Consider effect on roads and local area due to the transportation of the fill and other construction activities.	The effect on transportation of fill and other construction activities on local traffic and roads has been considered as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.
	Will the construction plan happen soon?	Construction of the LWC Project will start in late 2014, subject to receiving all necessary permits.
	How will construction vehicles access the site? Can construction proceed from west to east, such that it begins in Mississauga and finishes with the piece within City of Toronto jurisdiction?	At the moment, the LWC Project does not have access to enter the site from the OPG Lakeview site or the GE Booth WWTF, which would have allowed for construction to proceed from west to east. As such, construction access is contemplated through the Arsenal Lands and south to the lake, near Applewood Creek. With this access point, construction activities must proceed from east to west.
	Concern regarding removal of trees in Marie Curtis Park	The route selected through the Arsenal Lands minimizes to the extent possible, the number of trees requiring removal. The LWC Project Team will continue to explore opportunities to access the waterfront from the OPG Lands, thereby removing these effects.
	Access routes through OPG is best.	Comment noted.
	Minimize environmental pollution during construction caused by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise {including but very much not limited to truck reversing noises amplified by open water};, • Dust; • Visual {construction sites can be made less visually challenged when there is a binding vision to significantly reduce the visual challenge plus effective implementation}; and • Trucking routes within existing public parks. 	Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Construction	I am very concerned about the amount of truck traffic, as well as the duration of the Project. The impact on the City of Toronto's local roads, particularly Brown's Line, will present a serious issue which has negative impacts for both City of Mississauga and City of Toronto residents. How many trucks will access the site? What is the route which will be taken to get to the site? How will you access the site from Lakeshore?	Please see Chapters 6 and 7 of the EA for detailed information with respect to site access routes and the effects of truck traffic on local roads.
	Accessing the site through the Arsenal Lands would have implications on two major apartment buildings on Lakeshore.	Comment noted.
	Do you need to get TRCA Authority Approval to go through the Arsenal Lands? Are there affiliations with the Authority and the City of Toronto?	Yes, we will need to obtain approval from TRCA's Authority to access the site through the Arsenal Lands.
	Is access through the WWTF being considered as an option?	Yes, the WWTF was considered closely as a potential access site. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.
	Will the access route through the Arsenal Lands cross the Waterfront Trail?	Yes, a route through the Arsenal lands could cross the Waterfront Trail. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for the evaluation of access routes.
	Recognizing the significant amount of infrastructure and works along Lakeshore, the logical route for trucks to access the site would be Brown's Line. How can you ensure that trucks take the identified route?	There are measures which can be taken to encourage trucks delivering fill to the site from other projects, as part of the site authorization processes for accepting fill. If the trucks did not utilize the identified routes, they could be denied access to the site. Though, since the LWC Project is not in direct control of those other Project Contracts (where fill is being generated), there is limitations on how much direct control the Project is able to exert.
	There is an issue with the sound of trucks backing up. The beeping sound carries across the water quite a distance. Residents who live on the south side of Lake Promenade will be subjected to that noise for the duration of the project's construction. Can anything be done about the noise?	Noted. We will need to confirm the safety standards and regulations for these types of constructions sites. We will also explore options for what can be done on site to minimize the sound. On certain sites, a directional sound is utilized to minimize the distance the noise travels; while on other projects, the trucks have the ability to deposit the material without backing up. These options are site and contractor dependent, but will explore options during detailed design.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Construction	Accessing the shoreline through the Arsenal Lands will maximize, not minimizing nuisance effects on the surrounding neighbourhood and on Marie Curtis Park. Consider accessing the site through the OPG lands.	We acknowledge that the access route is not ideal. However, this is the best of the worst access alternatives we assessed. At this time, access through the OPG lands is not possible but it might be possible in the future.
	Consider allocating specific truck routes to minimize nuisances associated with truck traffic.	At this juncture we know that trucks will be coming from the QEW and/or from the 427. Because the truck contracts are not in our control, we may not be able to determine the routing of the truck traffic. Access to Lakeshore Road will likely be from Brown's Line, Dixie Road and Cawthra Road.
	250 trucks per day is a key issue and will generate nuisances such as noise, dust and contribute to traffic congestion.	Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.
	How soon will the LWC Park construction begin? Will there be overlap with the Etobicoke Creek bridge construction?	The earliest the LWC Park construction will begin is late 2014; therefore there will not be overlap.
	Why not store the fill closer to the LWC Park in order to minimize disruption due to truck traffic?	The only available space in proximity to the LWC Park is the overflow parking lot at the G.E. Booth plant, which has limited storage capacity, and the Peel's Britannia Road property. The Britannia Road location makes sense because it is located in close proximity to the northern portion of the Hanlan feedermain construction. Once a landbase is established in the area of the first containment cell for Lakeview, stockpiling will occur there.
	Consider the possibility of there not being sufficient fill to finish construction on time. Also consider that construction may be delayed due to politics and the impacts on the surrounding community.	In addition to the Hanlan Feedermain and other Peel projects, we will also be accepting fill from other projects throughout the GTA. There is a lot of fill available in the GTA and we do not anticipate there being insufficient volume. Furthermore, it is not in our interest to extend the duration of construction. The longer the construction process, the higher the cost.
	Consider opening completed components of the LWC Park during construction.	We may be considering (as part of the detailed design component of the LWC Project) a phased restoration. There are a number of options that we can consider to ensure that as construction unfolds the completed elements of the LWC Park are not affected. Site stabilization will occur as the LWC Project progresses.
	Consider other access routes to minimize impact.	Chapter 6 outlines the routes considered and the evaluation and selection process undertaken.
	How long will the trucks be active in this area during construction?	The tentative construction period will be 7 to 10 years. We understand the construction will have implications on the surrounding neighbourhood. We are exploring and doing everything we can to minimize impacts and to add some value/benefits during the construction phase.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Construction	All five project Alternatives are directly adjacent to the OPG land and the City of Toronto. Consider consulting both organizations about the proposal.	We have been in discussions with both the City of Toronto and OPG through the EA process. The City of Toronto is generally supportive of the Preferred Alternative and OPG is also generally supportive of the LWC Project.
	Are City of Toronto staff and Councillors aware of this project?	The LWC Project Team has maintained an open line of communication with City of Toronto staff and Councillors throughout the Feasibility Study, Terms of Reference phase, and EA phase of the LWC Project. City of Toronto technical staff participate in the LWC Technical Advisory Committee, providing input and direction into the Project; while Councillor Grimes was invited to attend the CLC and continues to receive project updates and notices.
	Is there a way of letting the Toronto public know what is going on?	In response to your suggestion, the Project team has installed temporary signs at Marie Curtis Park to advertise the Summer Community Engagement efforts. All project consultation events have been advertised in local Toronto newspapers to date and will continue to be.
	Is there someone who needs to give approval for a City of Toronto beach to be disturbed, re-modeled, reconstructed -or whatever the chosen term is. I understand the sand will be left -but if the water is not there it will just grow up with weeds and shrubs in a matter of years. If so-I would like to have that person or committee's contact info.	City of Toronto staff are members of the Technical Advisory Committee who review project information and provide comments. TRCA owns the park, Toronto Park maintains the park.
	How many people from Toronto are on the CLC and is there someone that can be contacted? Thanks again for the efforts that you are making reaching out to the public.	During the formulation of the CLC representatives from Toronto were not identified, however, some of the groups represented on the CLC may include members who reside in the City of Toronto. CLC members have not provided permission to be contacted by community members.
	What exactly does review mean? We can look at it?	The Draft EA will be available for the public and government agencies to read and provide comments on the information presented and the decisions made as part of the EA process undertaken to date. Any member of the public can raise comments which the LWC Project team will address in the context of all other comments received.
	Please advise me where I can access complete information as to plans, impact, meetings, etc.	All accurate LWC Project information is available on the LWC Project website at: www.creditvalleyca.ca/lwc , including the approved Terms of Reference, which lays out how the EA will be undertaken; all information presented to the public to date; and links to background studies.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Construction	Consider making the EA document available at multiple locations, including the Lakeview, Port Credit and South Etobicoke library branches.	The EA document will be available in library locations in Mississauga and Toronto. The EA document will also be available for download on the Credit Valley Conservation website.
	Have the MOE, MNR, CVC and Region of Peel all had an opportunity to review the proposed construction phasing, including the access route?	Yes.
	How does the LWC Project coordinate with the Marie Curtis Park Master Plan and the Arsenal Lands Master Plan?	The ability of the LWC project to coordinate with the Marie Curtis Park Master Plan and the Arsenal Lands Master Plan was assessed throughout the evaluation of alternative project configurations and for the detailed assessment of the preferred alternative. Please see Chapters 5 and 7 of the EA.
	Consider future connections to the east of the Project Study Area.	Comment noted
	Should parks not be considered as infrastructure? If not, what do you consider to be infrastructure? The project should ensure compatibility with activities at Marie Curtis Park.	The term infrastructure refers to hard infrastructure, which, for the purposes of this EA, are the GE Booth WWTF and the two water filtration plants. The coordination objective considers consistency with the Marie Curtis Park Master Plan and the Arsenal Lands Master Plan, as well as the Inspiration Lakeview vision for the OPG lands.
	It would be nice to see a coordinated presentation with Marie Curtis Park and the Arsenal Lands so the public is not viewing the information in isolation, but instead can understand the whole concept for the waterfront.	Planning for Arsenal Lands Master Plan has not started and Marie Curtis Park is in its implementation stage. In future planning meetings for both the Arsenal Lands and Inspiration Lakeview, we can make information on the LWC Project available.
Cost & Funding	Differences in construction costs between the five Alternatives.	Please see Chapter 5 of the EA.
	What is the total cost of the project? Who is paying for this project?	The project is being funded by the Region of Peel. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA for preliminary cost estimates.
	Is the cost of the project reduced by the cost savings incurred by reusing the fill instead of disposal at a clean fill site? That is to say, are these savings re-directed towards the cost of the Project? Will these cost savings and total approximate cost of the project be quantified as part of the LWC EA?	The sustainable reuse of the fill locally will help offset transportation costs and allow for investment in the LWC Project. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.
	Will the LWC Project have a negative cost?	We are working as close as possible to being cost neutral; however, it is likely that there will be a premium (i.e., positive cost). Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.

Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Detailed Design	Consider incorporating parking, restaurant, and washroom facilities.	Parking will not be established on the created park lands. Parking will be located at the existing parks, and likely the future Inspiration Lakeview lands. Other park amenities will be defined following the EA approvals as part of the detailed design phase.
	Without good lighting and some human activities you could have a great nature habitat but a black hole that would discourage pedestrian and cycling traffic which is the basic intent of the "connect" project.	Noted.
Ecology	Consider introducing only native (Carolinian) species in the LWC Park.	Species will be addressed in the detailed design stage. There will be a variety of native species introduced, likely primarily Carolinian species.
	Consider mosquito proliferation due to proposed wetlands.	The proliferation of mosquito-borne disease, such as West Nile Virus, is a consideration of the project. In general, the primary vector species of mosquito associated with West Nile Virus transmission is <i>Culex pipiens</i> . Four other species are also associated with West Nile Virus in the GTA. The larvae of these species of mosquito are known to use stagnant waters that do not provide fish or wildlife habitat. The wetlands being proposed will be designed to provide extensive habitats for fish and wildlife.
	Plant milkweeds for butterflies	Noted.
	How does this project allow for managing invasive species?	Invasive species will be managed through the adaptive management framework which will be outlined in the EA. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a discussion of how the design will deter invasive species and Chapter 8 for a discussion of the Adaptive Management framework.
	Are there plans to remove the bamboo in the forest behind the old parking lot?	During the construction of the Stone Overlook in Marie Curtis Park East, the Japanese Knotweed in the area of the east parking lot was initially cut back and has since grown back. Parks and TRCA are currently evaluating options to address this issue.
	Will the proposed islands become nesting habitat for cormorants?	The islands have been designed to be approximately 1.5 m above average lake water levels. This means that during large storm events waves will top over the islands and will inhibit soil from establishing and in turn any vegetation. Therefore, we are creating unsuitable conditions on the islands for cormorant nesting.
	How will they remove the fish, once the retaining wall berms have been built? And to where will they relocate them?	Fish will be removed using a variety of live capture techniques as required such as electrofishing and netting. Captured fish will be released back to the open lake.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Evaluation of Alternatives	Consider using numeric scoring as part of the evaluation of Alternatives.	Please see Chapter 5 of the EA for the evaluation of Alternatives.
	Consider an indicator to measure fiscal viability of each Alternative.	Fiscal viability has been considered throughout the process appropriate for the level of detail of each stage of the EA. The more refined, the more detailed the analysis will be generated. Please see Chapters 5 and 7 of the EA.
	Consider criteria to measure the infrastructure required to support transportation requirements.	The Project will be providing trail linkages through the park. The Primary trail will be established according to City of Mississauga trail guidelines to allow a variety of trail users and emergency vehicle access. Secondary Trails will be established according to CVC conservation trail guidelines. No other transportation infrastructure is to be provided for this Project.
	Consider criteria to measure active recreation opportunities.	The Project is not currently considering the incorporation of active recreation opportunities.
	Consider criteria to measure interpretive activity opportunities.	Interpretation opportunities are available in all Alternatives and will be incorporated during detailed design of the preferred, following EA approvals.
	Consider criteria to measure the extent to which Alternatives might prevent odours from reaching the park.	All Alternatives provide similar characteristics as it relates to separation between park users and the WWTF. Trail alignments and the placement of “natural” habitat features are consistent between options. As such, would not be defining criteria in the selection of a preferred.
	Consider criteria to measure the extent to which the Alternatives attract undesirable species (e.g. cormorants) that may degrade aesthetics.	Alternatives have been developed, in part, from a structural and ecological perspective. Islands were refined at this early stage to ensure that they were not “attractants” for undesirable species such as cormorants. During the detailed design of the Preferred Alternative, additional considerations may be made in the design to address other undesirable and invasive species, such as carp, and Canada Geese.
	Consider criteria to measure ‘universal accessibility’.	All Alternatives will have a primary trail which will meet the City’s trail development guidelines. These include accessibility requirements.
	Island Beach B and Island Beach C Alternatives are generally preferred.	Noted.
	The Revetment Alternative does not seem reasonable given the project objectives.	Noted.
	Provide the cost of constructing and maintaining the LWC Park for each Alternative being considered.	The Alternatives were not been refined to a sufficient level to develop detailed costs for construction and maintenance. In addition, it is difficult to assess the costs in absence of the funding mechanisms. Relative cost comparisons were made based on the proportion of “purchased materials” that are required. Please see Chapter 5 of the EA.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Evaluation of Alternatives	Were the criteria used to evaluate the Alternatives weighted?	No. All criteria were treated equally.
	The evaluation process and methodology is understandable and adequate.	Noted.
	Why did the Island Beach C Alternative outperform the Island Beach B Alternative in terms of access? The Island Beach B Alternative has a long peninsula that allows privacy and access to the water.	The evaluation was based on the criteria that was put forward and reviewed during CLC #1. With respect to access, we considered the following criteria: (i) potential for lookout areas; (ii) potential for public access to water's edge; and (iii) potential for effects from construction on traditional lands used by First Nations. We also considered the initial objective for access which was to create safe and accessible public linkages for access to and along the waterfront while allowing for compatible recreational, educational and cultural heritage opportunities. When taking all of these criteria into consideration, we determined that Island Beach C Alternative performed slightly better than Island Beach B Alternative.
	Will there be an opportunity to re-evaluate the Alternatives if during the refinement stage we learn new information?	In the detailed assessment phase we evaluated the Preferred Alternative. Once a Preferred Alternative is confirmed, we will not be going back to re-evaluate the Alternatives.
	Consider giving more emphasis to the preservation of existing beaches.	The evaluation criteria have not been "weighted" in the selection of the Preferred Alternative. This was a decision made early in the LWC EA process.
	How did you choose between alternatives which have both positive and negative effects, when you're criteria is only considering the positive effects? It automatically skews the outcome of the analysis.	Most of the negative effects will occur during construction. As previously discussed, it is assumed that construction will be the same for all alternatives. That is to say, the negative effects will be the same for all alternatives. In addition, as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative, the benefits, potential effects, and mitigation measures are discussed. Please see Chapters 5 and 7 of the EA.
	Based on the evaluation criteria presented, the loss of sand beach was not considered. I don't believe that there would be consensus among residents regarding the selection of the Preferred Alternative. Personally, I would prefer the revetment along the eastern extent of the landform if it meant the existing sand beach was retained.	Your comment is noted. Throughout the ToR and EA phases of the LWC Project, there have been a significant number of comments submitted. The LWC Project must look at the bigger picture. The trade-offs must be considered within this context.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Flooding	Ensure that the proposed LWC Project does not increase the occurrence of flooding up-stream in Serson Creek.	The City of Mississauga will be replacing numerous culverts in the area allowing the creek to flow more freely. The LWC Project will not result in an increase to Serson's water flows. Rather, we believe that there should be a reduction in flood levels up-stream.
	Consider flooding concerns associated with the Alternatives.	CVC is the floodplain regulator for the LWC project area, and Region of Peel has critical infrastructure in the area. In addition, TRCA is the floodplain regulator for Etobicoke Creek, with low-lying residential properties a relatively short distance to the east of the LWC Project area. All three agencies have critical roles and/or interests in ensuring that none of the options will increase the risk of flooding throughout the area.
	Will the Lakeview Project improve flood protection that was experienced throughout the Region, tied in with the new infrastructure works underway?	The LWC Project is not tied directly to the flood mitigation/avoidance work being undertaken as a result of this summer's stormy weather.
Marie Curtis Park	Why was this not done in conjunction with the recent Marie Curtis Park improvements?	The LWC project planning has been done keeping in mind the recent Marie Curtis Park improvements. Both projects could not be considered together as they have different and non-complementary approval requirements and different proponents.
	Does this project affect Toronto's Marie Curtis Park west master plan? I haven't heard of any changes to the west side. Planned improvements have not taken place other than removing parking lot. Is observation hill still being built?	The LWC project will not affect the ultimate build out of the Marie Curtis Park master plan.
Materials	For the Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives, will the fill to create the islands all come from the Hanlan project or will some of it have to be "purchased"?	Islands are almost entirely created from purchased material.
	Consider a contingency plan in the event there isn't sufficient fill generated so that the configuration/land mass of the park can be adapted.	Flexibility has been built into the LWC EA Adaptive Management Plan to accommodate change, including possible reductions in fill for the Preferred Alternative.
	Consider looking outside of the Region of Peel for fill.	We will be looking beyond the Region of Peel to ensure there is sufficient fill volume to construct the LWC Project in a timely manner.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Materials	Consider separating the fill into piles based on quality to ensure that low-quality fill is not mixed with high-quality fill.	The LWC Project will incorporate Best Management Practices in a Fill Management Plan to control fill quality. Every source of fill will undergo compliance testing before authorization to receive materials is provided. Visual inspections of every load will be undertaken with random samples being taken for additional quality compliance monitoring.
	Are you still stockpiling fill in the Arsenal Lands?	Fill is not being stockpiled at Arsenal Lands. There may be temporary stockpiles of construction rubble on site in 2014-15.
	Does any of this fill contain rebar? Concern that the new beach front will have protruding rebar, similar to Leslie Street Spit and Colonel Sam Smith Park, rendering the shoreline entirely inaccessible.	While the fill material being generated through the Region of Peel capital projects is clean, native soil and rock; there is potential for the LWC Project to use construction rubble in the creation of a containment berm (behind which fill is placed). The MOE considers rebar an inert substance (e.g., it does not break down over time) and is an approved material for use in these types of projects. Although current industry standards state that rebar must be cut down to the concrete, it will become exposed over time. TRCA has learned from past projects, and are very selective in how material containing rebar is used. Any possible rebar will be buried under metres of fill, such that it will not be exposed over time. The beach face will also be dressed with cobble / revetment.
	Are there any ISO standards for the use of material in land creation activities?	The LWC Project will meet the Ministry of Environment's standards for Confined Fill Material Criteria (<i>Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario, 2011</i>).
	The aesthetic and human use component is important in terms of getting the fill right. The current fill at Marie Curtis and Sam Smith is so ugly, unnatural, and even dangerous. It also dissuades use because of the awkward angles and spaces between the rocks.	Comment noted.
	Where is the material coming from?	This project is based on an opportunity to take advantage of clean fill being generated by the Region of Peel's infrastructure expansion plans over the next ten years. RoP estimates up to 1.5 to 2M cubic metres will be generated by their works. Standard practice currently treats this clean material (glacial tills and bedrock) as a waste, shipping this material long distances to be dumped in pits in small communities. This has significant costs and impacts on Regional and rural transportation areas.
	Cobble is difficult to walk on and to put down a chair to sit. Look at opportunities to make the cobble as small as possible.	Comment noted

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Materials	What will the size of the cobble stones be?	There will be two different sizes of cobbles. The three cells on the south-west side will contain cobbles between 4 inches and 8 inches, and the north cell will contain cobbles ranging from 0.5 inches to 4 inches.
Miscellaneous	Will the new land creation area collect debris? Will it impact debris accumulation along the sand beach of Marie Curtis Park West? Who will clean any debris which accumulates? Can debris be cleaned from the cobble beach of the new land creation area?	Debris will continue to accumulate as it does currently. The benefit of the Preferred Alternative is that it does not create a large armourstone wall on the eastern limits of the project area that would encourage enhanced accumulation of debris on the sand beach areas. As the majority of the sand beach will remain, current beach maintenance activities will continue as are currently undertaken by Toronto Parks. The larger cobble beaches will not be located within the City of Toronto jurisdiction.
	Is there a risk of contaminants entering the project site from OPG's Lakeview site?	Based on the publicly available records of soil and groundwater quality available about the OPG site, our consultants indicate that the risk of contaminants entering the project site from OPG's Lakeview site is low. The former OPG Lakeview site has undergone some remediation activities to address soil and groundwater contamination.
	Is any of the fill from Region of Peel capital projects sent to the Leslie Street Spit?	No.
	Is the increased depth of the lake near the eastern OPG pier due to previous lakefilling activities for the WWTF or past stone hooking activities?	There is a drowned river valley system in this area which results in sections which drop down in depth quite suddenly. The western portion of the land base is close to the existing shoreline for this reason.
	In Etobicoke, the lake is quite shallow for quite a distance into the Lake.	TRCA staff conducted a detailed bathymetric survey of the LWC Project Study Area in 2011. Depths within this area vary up to approximately seven metres along most of the outer edge, although there is a steep drop-off approaching 10-m in the southwestern corner, fronting the edge of OPG's Lakeview site. There is a shelf-like feature fronting the WWTF, so the nearshore bottom slopes are flatter immediately in front of the WWTF than in front of Marie Curtis Park. Depths at the tip of OPG's eastern pier are in the order of seven metres. A bathymetry map of the LWC Project Study area is available in Chapter 3 of the EA.
	Hoping that OPG lands are sold to the region for development under Lakeview inspiration and not an OPG vision.	Comment noted.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Miscellaneous	What would the shoreline have looked like prior to the shoreline stabilization and urbanization?	Likely there would have been some sand and gravel as part of the barrier beach, and as you moved west, air photos suggests that the shoreline would have been about 4-5 m high and quite vertical, consisting of glacial tills, with a narrow cobbly - gravel beach as we move west away from the influence of Etobicoke, Serson and Applewood Creeks. Similar conditions can be found along the Oshawa waterfront near Gold Point Marsh. Natural meadows and coastal forest with a coastal wetland system is found in that area as well.
	What is the current construction of the shoreline near the water treatment plant?	It is mainly comprised of armour stone rocks with a steep grade. The shoreline at this location is characterized by poor habitat conditions.
	Is there space within the Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project for managed honeybee cultivation? We would require minimal space (30 meters square) and would provide all necessary equipment for the maintenance of 2 honeybee hives.	Where native biodiversity is an objective, honeybee cultivation is not permissible on conservation lands. We instead prefer to encourage native pollinators to these areas.
	Consider that new ideas may arise in the future that can inform future park design options.	Chapter 9 of the EA is the amendment chapter which states that if new information arises, the EA does not need to be redone, but rather amended. Therefore, we have designed the EA document to have flexibility to change the design of the LWC Project without the need to redo the entire EA.
	Will the land be sold at a later time for high-rise development?	This will absolutely not occur. CVC is identified as being the agency that will own the waterfront park. CVC will manage the area as conservation lands and will protect them as a natural and recreational area in perpetuity.
	Consider that Lake Ontario's water levels may change over time. The proposed designs should be based on future lake levels, which are difficult to predict.	As part of the detailed assessment, we considered the adaptability of the design in light of changing water levels and in light of climate change. We understand that the water levels may change due to regulations and policy changes and that climate change and storm activity will also have implications on the shoreline.
	What is the current flow of water along the shore?	The current flow ranges from approximately 0.01 to 0.03 m/sec and does not change significantly as a result of the preferred alternative.
	Will the sediment accumulate against the groyne and extend into the lake?	This is known as a sediment starved area of the lake shore. These structures can cause localized sand accumulations, but it should not be significant here due to the limited supply of sand available. If issues are observed, an adaptive management strategy can be implemented.
	Who will own and maintain the LWC Park once construction is completed?	CVC would be the owners of the property. CVC would also be responsible for operating and maintaining the property. The intent is for the LWC Park to be a conservation area in perpetuity.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Miscellaneous	What will prevent the wetlands from becoming stinking ponds of algae?	Nutrient loads within the wetlands will be taken up by wetland vegetation. Experience with wetland restoration projects throughout the GTA suggest algae will not be an issue, provided the design maximizes aeration and water circulation in the wetland.
	If the final EA isn't due until next winter and the decision on the OPG lands is expected in June, could not both options for trucking be included in the draft and finalized in the final report?	The June decision will lay out the long term plans for the use of the OPG lands. It is likely that after that decision additional studies may be required and no decision has been made on the timing of construction. The LWC project needs to proceed at the present time to take advantage of available fill therefore, it is not possible to include both options in the LWC EA.
Modeling, Studies, and Analyses	Ensure that the water circulation modelling is based on current conditions and the proposed Alternatives.	The modelling was completed based on current conditions and each of the five footprints for the Alternatives evaluated. Please see Chapter 5 of the EA.
	Consider water currents associated with the Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives.	In discussions with the coastal engineer, the proposed island Alternatives (Island Beach A, Island Beach B, Island Beach C) are not conducive to producing rip-current conditions. Dangerous currents are typically associated with wide, shallow sandy beach conditions. These conditions will not be formed by the cobble beaches that will be located in deeper waters.
	Consider conducting a wave study.	All of the proposed designs are based on coastal engineering studies.
	Consider the accumulation of organic materials along the shoreline.	According to the coastal analysis conducted, there will be no change in coastal circulation.
	What lake level are the studies predicated on?	Different lake levels are considered for different variables. Base lake levels for flood modeling of the local creeks are higher than the assumed lake levels for coastal dynamic and circulation modeling. In addition, the wetland design considers the extremes in water levels to account for potential changes in lake level due to climate change.
	Have the water circulation models been back-tested? Back-testing is a critical aspect of building any model.	The water circulation and water quality model was calibrated with 2004 MOE ADCP data.
	Consider doing a historical study of what the landscape of this site looked like before the design began	As part of the LWC Project EA, we assessed historical photography and we discovered that there used to be a coastal wetland in this area that connected Etobicoke Creek, Applewood Creek and Serson Creek. We used this information to inform the design of the LWC Project and in particular, to confirm the wetlands wanted to be there.
	How will the water flows be affected by the groyne and the proposed design?	Based on the modeling results, there would be very little change in circulation between present conditions and future conditions.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Parking	Will there be new parking associated with the project?	No there will be no new parking associated with the LWC project.
	There isn't enough parking now. What happens in the future?	We are working with the City of Mississauga to look at parking as part of the overall Inspiration Lakeview Project planning and development for the former OPG lakeview site. Similarly, TRCA does own the Arsenal Lands. The Master Plan update and implementation will occur in the future in partnership with the City of Mississauga. As part of that process, we will explore opportunities for adding parking into the design of the Arsenal Lands Park.
Presentation of LWC Project Information	Consider adopting a two column format in order to improve notice readability.	Noted.
	Consider providing studies completed as part of the EA to CLC members for review.	Background technical reports will be included in the Appendices of the EA document itself. Much of the baseline data used in the LWC Project EA will be posted on the Lake Ontario Shoreline Strategy (LOISS) website ahead the EA submission and interested parties are welcome to access studies there.
	Include 3D visuals to get a better sense of what is being proposed.	3D renderings of Island Beach C Alternative will be prepared for the final EA document for visualization purposes.
	Provide the drawings of the five proposed Alternatives to the CLC for review.	The presentation to the CLC (which included drawings of each Alternative) was provided with the CLC meeting minutes.
	Beach users are unaware of this project. I think it is very important that you inform the beach-using community – ideally with a kiosk in the parking lot on summer weekends.	As a result of this recommendation, the Project Team prepared information that was presented directly to park users at Marie Curtis Park for feedback over a number of weekends throughout the summer.
	There should also be a display at Marie Curtis Park West.	Noted.
	Concern regarding being unaware of previous consultation activities	Noted.
	There should be more information on the Mississauga side.	Noted.
	Publicize the project to the City of Toronto and put project information on the City of Toronto website.	Noted.
	Put more signage on the West side of Marie Curtis Park.	Noted.
	Show an overlay of the existing vs. the proposed shorelines.	Noted.
	Put more signs up.	Noted.

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Presentation of LWC Project Information	Start the public meetings at 7:00 PM as people can't make it from work if it starts any earlier. Concern regarding public meeting accessibility.	Noted.
	Will the next public meeting be accessible by TTC? From what I saw of the proposed project is that the only public lands that are impacted by the project are Toronto lands-namely Marie Curtis west beach-and I think it only fair that the next E.A. meeting should be in Toronto.	The LWC project affects public lands both in the City of Mississauga and Toronto. In addition, the Project will provide extensive benefits for residents living in both cities as well. The importance of public transit access is understood. The project team is looking at venues for the final PIC that will be accessible by transit and closer to the project site.
	Show the municipal boundaries on the imagery.	Noted.
	Great to see the municipal boundary depicted on a map of the Project Study Area. Very clear.	Comment noted.
	There should be winter renderings.	Comment noted.
	The description of beaches is not correct. I understood rocks would be flat, rather than round.	Beach material sizing had only been explored to date. Round material has typically been used on created beaches in the Greater Toronto Area. Recent discussions with the Coastal Engineer, following questions raised by the public, has indicated that flat materials are not likely viable for the Lakeview Project.
	Show all things going on with connecting projects.	Comment noted.
	Recreation	
Ensure the proposed islands will not preclude the use of non-motorized vessels (canoe, kayak, etc.) due to high waves and strong under toe.	The open coast areas of Lake Ontario are prone for rapid changes in wind and wave and currents. It is unlikely that the proponents would encourage the use of small, non-motorized watercraft along the waterfront.	
Consider limiting the use of motor-powered vessels in the proposed wetland areas.	There is no intention to allow motorized vehicles into the wetland areas.	
Concern regarding navigation hazards introduced by the islands.	As part of the EA process, we will need to apply for appropriate permits from Transport Canada with respect to navigation. Transport Canada does not process permit applications of this nature until the EA has been completed. Through the permit system we will be providing detailed bathymetry information that can be uploaded onto GIS layers to ensure safety. Navigation markers will likely be required.	
Consider the safety of trail users in the design.	Noted.	

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Recreation	Consider public safety if allowing boat access into the embayment area.	Public safety has been considered and none of the Alternatives encourage shoreline boat access. Boating will be conducted at the operators own risk.
	Consider the public experience, including recreational opportunities in the park.	Noted.
	Consider allowing swimming in the embayment area.	Swimming will likely not be encouraged due to water conditions and will be undertaken at the participant's personal risk.
	Provide more details on public recreation opportunities. The public experience is also an important consideration in addition to the environment and ecological habitat.	More details on passive public recreation opportunities will be built into the detailed design stage. Specific parks programming will not occur until the detailed design of the Park following EA approvals. It is critical during the EA stage that the land base be provided such that opportunities for passive public recreation components can be accommodated in the design at later stages. A list of "suitable" passive recreational infrastructure (trails and lookouts) can be produced as part of the EA, with a map indicating approximate locations where these could be located.
	Consider the human element in the park in addition to naturalization.	The recreational amenities of the park as well as the final location of the multi-use trail and secondary trail system will be determined during detailed design after EA approval has been received. These types of details are not typically defined within an EA.
	Need to consider the impacts on windsurfing and kite-boarding.	Noted. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.
	The islands are a problem for windsurfers.	Noted. Please see Chapter 7 of the EA.
	I pull my kayak up on the remnant beach and won't be able to do this with a cobble beach.	Noted.
	I can't walk into the water from the sand behind the cobble.	Noted.
	Will the settling ponds be accessible to birders?	No, the WWTF is not accessible to the public
	Will skating on the wetland be permitted in Winter?	Skating in an area which CVC has not designated for such an activity would be a prohibited use. Signage will indicate that skating is prohibited.
Will there be a bike path?	Yes, the Waterfront Trail will be relocated from Lakeshore Road to the water's edge.	

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Support for LWC Project and / or Process	The new LWC Project Study Area is reasonable.	Noted.
	Happy to know that the studies are taking into consideration changing Lake Ontario water levels.	Noted. We will be building in additional variability and capacity within the final design for the wetlands and creeks in the event that long-term water levels in Lake Ontario changes, or if storms get bigger in the future.
	The five Alternatives presented are reasonable and make sense with the exception of introducing revetments.	Noted.
	The evaluation approach seems reasonable and appropriate.	Noted.
	The Alternatives reflect the CLC's and the public's input.	Noted.
	Pleased with the consultation process.	Noted.
	Evaluation approach is reasonable. It is a good an exciting process.	Noted.
	The evaluation objectives being used are good.	Noted.
	I am highly impressed with the quality of communications, on all levels, associated with the project.	Noted.
	Your response affirms my sense that the Mississauga Waterfront Connection EA Project and all other initiatives related to the redevelopment of the Lakeview Area demonstrates an exemplary communications strategy and a strong focus on ensuring that meaningful input from residents is an integral part of the planning process.	Noted.
	This is a great project – anything that helps animals is good.	Noted.
	The new beach configuration is good.	Noted.
	I am on-board with the project.	Noted.
	Nice to see something being done with the shoreline in this area.	Noted.
	Happy to see a naturalized park that will provide benefits for migratory birds.	Noted.
Let's do it! Nice project.	Noted.	

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Support for LWC Project and / or Process	It is recognized that parks of this nature require time to complete. While it's an inconvenience, it's also a great benefit. We would like to see something move forward.	If there are continued objections regarding one project element after another, this may stop the project entirely. That's not what the community would like to see happen.
	Fundamentally, extending the waterfront for connections is good.	Comment noted.
	Love the Project.	Comment noted.
	It will be nice.	Comment noted.
	Great Project.	Comment noted.
	Great to See.	Comment noted.
	We need more wetlands!	Comment noted.
	Need more natural areas like this project!	Comment noted.
	We are pleased with the project.	Comment noted.
	Preferred Alternative Island C is good! Hurry up! Make it happen in 5 years.	Comment noted.
	Get the shovels in the ground and get it done. Going to be great.	Comment noted.
	The refinements are an improvement over original plan. Overall, this will be a great.	Comment noted.
	Impressed with proposal.	Comment noted.
	A substantial improvement over the original...no need to destroy a sand beach!	Comment noted.
	Much happier, there is still room to improve. We need to save more of the naturally occurring beach. Thank you!	Comment noted.
	I am very excited at the naturalization initiatives and their positive effects on insects, birds, fish and native plants and habitats. I support taking some beach area from Marie Curtis to implement naturalization.	Comment noted.
The LWC Project is great, the plan is excellent, well-thought out, considerate of competing interests and true to the goal and objectives. I'm looking forward to exploring the park as it is developed!	Comment noted.	

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Support for LWC Project and / or Process	The Lakeview Park is a great idea and I support the initiative. Developing a man-made park which does not restore the natural features of the area works against natural forces; and will, as CVC confirms, require intervention in perpetuity. This cost should be in the proposal.	Comment noted.
	I like the option of the smaller footprint on the west beach at Marie Curtis.	Comment Noted.
	The design of the wetlands seems much improved over the sweeping floodplain presented previously.	Comment Noted.
Timeline	When will the construction for the Arsenal Lands begin?	Construction of the Arsenal lands will be delayed pending completion of the LWC Project. During detailed design it will be determined if there are aspects of the Arsenal lands that can be constructed while the LWC Project is under construction.
	Timeframe is ok.	Noted.
	What are the timelines for the implementation of Inspiration Lakeview plan? 10 to 30 years?	It will depend on the decision that is made by June 2014 regarding the future of the OPG lands.
	Do the project timelines consider the use of 2 million m ³ of fill? If it takes 20 years to generate this fill, there is concern that the project may continue indefinitely.	It is not the Region of Peel's intention for the Project to continue beyond the 10 year timeframe. Although the Project is dependent upon fill generation by the Region's capital works projects, should there be downtime, the Project is in discussions to consider fill from other municipalities and private sources. There is significant development downtown Mississauga, as well as significant development in the City of Toronto with MetroLinx works and revitalization areas. Fill quality monitoring will be conducted on every site sending material to the LWC Project to ensure the fill meets the MOE's guidelines.
	Is there any way to have legal assurances that the project will not continue beyond 10 years? Given that the Project is working towards being cost neutral, there is no incentive to not wait for the Region to generate the fill, even if it takes 20 years.	The purpose of the Project is not to dispose of the Region's fill material. The fill generation by the Region of Peel simply provides an opportunity to create the Project. It is in the best interests of the Project to complete construction as soon as possible as downtime, and the costs associated with construction and equipment time are very expensive.
	This project will take too long to build – get it done sooner.	Comment noted.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Trails	Provide more detail with respect to trail size.	The main trail size will be at least 3m in width (standard to allow emergency vehicle access) and will meet City of Mississauga trail guidelines. The size of secondary trails will be determined in the detailed design stage of the process.
	Ensure that the trails in the proposed park accommodate multiple users.	It is our intention to ensure that the trail system within the park will be able to accommodate multiple users including cyclists and pedestrians, as well as maintenance and emergency vehicles on the primary trail.
	Is it possible to create a trail in front of the WWTF without lake-filling?	No there is not sufficient space to create a multi-use trail in front of the WWTF without lake-filling.
	The trail doesn't go anywhere without the use of OPG lands.	Comment noted.
	I would like to ask you, when you get to the detailed planning stage of this project, to ensure that the trail be designed to have AMPLE SEPARATION between the walking lane area and the lane designated for bicycles, rollerblading ,skateboarding, etc. as opposed to just a painted line.	Noted. Issues pertaining to separation on trails will be considered during the detailed design stage of the EA.
	Ensure that the trail is multi-use	Noted.
	Reroute the waterfront trail along the shoreline south of the water treatment plant plus the OPG so as to connect the trail on Lake Promenade (Etobicoke) with the trail on Lake Promenade (Mississauga) before significant landfill starts to extend parkland south of the plants	Noted.
	The trail should not go along the waterfront, it should go through the Waste Water Treatment Facility north boundary.	Comment noted.
	The proposed Waterfront Connection Project will result in the closure of the bike path (Waterfront trail) through the Arsenal Lands for 7 to 10 years. I object to this closure.	The LWC Project Team has identified the existing Waterfront Trail as the preferred location for the construction access route following an evaluation of several route alternatives against criteria representing the full definition of the environment. To mitigate for the closure of the trail, the Waterfront Trail will be re-located for the duration of construction and the construction access will be opened to walkers and cyclists in the evenings and on weekends. The LWC Project Team will continue to work to further minimize these effects during detailed design. Please see Chapters 6 and 7 of the EA.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Trails	<p>This landfill site is to be wildlife habitat. I am concerned that there may be too many secondary trails. A trail that snakes up, across, then down the large hill will have tertiary trails leading straight down to the main trail. Too often, people want the shortest distance. Meandering trails are nice (normally preferred) but they take up more land, leaving less for nature.</p>	<p>Trail design will occur at detailed design and will consider these and other issues.</p>
Views	<p>Consider opportunities to maximize views into the water and into the land.</p>	<p>Viewscape analysis was built into the development of Alternatives. The evaluation of Alternatives will consider views from specific look-out areas.</p>
	<p>How high will the revetment be and will it obstruct views?</p>	<p>The revetment is approximately 4 metres above the average lake level (+/- 15 feet). The height of the revetment will be similar in height to the pier. The revetment must be this high due to the wave energy in this area.</p>
	<p>Consider not obstructing any critical views.</p>	<p>We are aware of the interest in views.</p>
	<p>In general there are no objections to the Preferred Alternative Island C, but consider views carefully.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>With the presence of the large promontories in the west and near the WWTF, what happens to the views to the City of Toronto?</p>	<p>Views have been an important driver of the project from day one. The largest hill adjacent to the WWTF was placed there to block views from the park to the WWTF. When standing on the hill itself, views will continue to be blocked to the WWTF by the proposed forest community located on the hill, once it matures. The more southwesterly hill was located in such a way that views to the City of Toronto skyline can be retained both from the end of the OPG piers and through the saddle between the two hills from the base of the pier at OPG. There will be some angles that the skyline will be hidden by the terrain, but there are many located where the views will be spectacular.</p>
	<p>Consider how to manage plant growth so as to not obstruct views.</p>	<p>There will be ongoing maintenance occurring in the LWC Park. In addition, as part of the design, the meadow areas will have harsher environmental and soil conditions which will retard (though not entirely inhibit) tree growth. The combination of vegetation management and park design will be used.</p>

Table 10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses (Cont'd)

Issue	Comments and Questions Received	Responses
Waste Water Treatment Facility	How realistic will beach area utilization be because of the odours from the wastewater treatment plant?	Woodbine Beach in Toronto is one other largest draws to the Toronto waterfront, despite being immediately downwind from Toronto's Ashbridge's Bay Treatment Plant. It is anticipated that the LWC Project will be a major public attraction for the Region.
	Consider overflow from the wastewater treatment plant into the proposed naturalized area.	There are no overflows to be accommodated in the LWC Project design associated with the G.E. Booth WWTF. All flows are discharged through their existing overflow pipes.
	Concern over unsightly WWTP and the odour that is emitted.	New trees proposed in the LWC plans will partially obscure WWTP.
	If there is one thing the City of Mississauga does not enjoy, it is the aroma from the WWTF. This Project will move the aroma east into the City of Toronto.	The Region of Peel has invested in substantial upgrades to the WWTF, greatly improving the conditions. The LWC Project will not change the movement of odour into the City of Toronto from current conditions.
	Will the project address the smell from the WWTP?	This project will not address the odour from the WWTP. However, plans call for trees to be planted in front of the WWTP, partially obscuring it from view while in the new park.
Water Quality	During storm events, the new landform will stop the pollution discharging from the mouth of Etobicoke Creek from dispersing, impacting water quality at the Marie Curtis Park beaches.	The water circulation and water quality model in use by the Regional Water Quality Monitoring Network, was applied to the north shore of Lake Ontario in the vicinity of the Ontario Power Generation intake channel (OPG) to access the effect of land creation activities on the water quality at the two closest water treatment plant intakes, as well as the Marie Curtis Park east and west beaches. These results indicate that at each of these locations, there was either no significant effect to water quality, or a marginal beneficial increase in quality.
	I am very concerned that the proposed lake fill will increase the number of days the <i>E. Coli</i> counts are too high to swim at the existing Marie Curtis East beach, where the city monitors the water daily and has lifeguards.	Water quality and water circulation modeling has been undertaken as part of the LWC EA. The modeling suggests that the project will not have a substantive effect on the swimability of the beaches at Marie Curtis Park. The modeling does however, indicate that given the deeper shoreline conditions of the Preferred Alternative, pollution plumes from Etobicoke Creek would disperse more quickly than under existing conditions, resulting in a minor increase in days that the beaches would be deemed swimmable. Given these results, there is overall little to no change in water quality condition over the existing conditions.

10.7 FIRST NATIONS AND MÉTIS CONSULTATION

10.7.1 Objectives

The objectives of First Nations and Métis consultation were to identify and address specific concerns relating to traditional territories, including heritage and archaeological resources, Aboriginal rights such as traditional hunting or fishing grounds, and / or specific treaty rights.

10.7.2 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 LWC Project Study Areas and scope (see ToR Record of Consultation, Appendix E-6) and the final list of First Nations and Métis was compiled with additional information from the various authorities. This list has been updated throughout the LWC Project EA consultation process as contacts and contact information changed.

The following communities were contacted:

- Alderville First Nation;
- Beausoleil First Nation;
- Fort William First Nation;
- Chippewas of Georgina Island;
- Chippewas of Mnjikaning/Chippewas of Rama;
- Credit River Metis Council;
- Curve Lake First Nation;
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council;
- Hiawatha First Nation;
- Huron-Wendat First Nation;
- Kawartha Nishnawabe;
- Métis Nation of Ontario;
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Mississaugas of the Scugog Island;
- Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte;
- Moose Deer Point First Nation;
- Nishnawbe Aski Nation;
- Peel Aboriginal Network;
- Six Nations of the Grand River: Elected Band Council;

- Six Nations of the Grand River: Lands and Resources; and
- Williams Treaty First Nations.

10.7.3 Letters to First Nations and Métis Communities

The LWC Project team consulted with First Nations and Métis communities according to the requirements of the Crown’s *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 EA and asked if they were interested in the LWC Project and how they wanted to be consulted. A summary of the correspondence sent to First Nations and Métis communities is outlined in Table 10.10.

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

First Nations and Métis communities were contacted a total of five times throughout the LWC Project EA process. Each letter or email was followed up with at least one phone call to confirm receipt of the notice. All letters were sent via priority mail.

Letters and attachments can be found in Appendix E-7.

Table 10.10 Summary of Correspondence to First Nations and Métis Communities

Notification	Date
Notice of Commencement and PIC #1	Mail: December 28, 2012 Email: January 2, 2013
PIC #2	Mail: March 19, 2013 Email: March 18, 2013
Project Update and Supplementary Newsletter	Mail: August 6, 2013 Email: August 6, 2013
PIC #3	Mail: October 30, 2013 Email: October 30, 2013
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	Mail: December 12, 2013 Email: December 12, 2013
Notice of Submission of Final EA	Mail: May 2, 2014 Email: May 2, 2014

10.7.4 Summary of First Nations and Métis Comments

A letter was received from the Haudenosaunee Development Institute (HDI) on October 9, 2012, near the end of the Ministry of Environment (MOE) review of the LWC EA ToR process. This correspondence referenced an earlier letter submitted during the LWC EA ToR indicating that the LWC Project would impact treaty rights and indicated that the proponents were to submit an application fee to initiate their review of the proposal. The Proponents responded that both of their correspondence had been received and that the Proponents would be pleased to meet with HDI at a time and location at their convenience. Please see Appendix E-7 for a copy of correspondence with HDI.

Responses from First Nations and Métis communities to the NoC and PIC #1 Notice were to inform of contact changes, except for two communities who requested meetings with the LWC Project team: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and Métis Nation of Ontario.

The meeting that took place on January 15, 2013 between the LWC Project team and the Mississauga's of the New Credit First Nation covered some of the ways the MNCFN could contribute to the LWC Project and possibilities for the LWC Project team to further involve the MNCFN. Appendix E-7 provides a copy of the meeting summary and presentation.

The LWC Project Team scheduled a meeting with the Metis Nation of Ontario for March 7, 2013; however, the meeting did not take place due to conflicting schedules. Although attempts were made to reschedule, a meeting did not transpire. Appendix E-7 provides a copy of correspondence between the LWC Project team and Métis Nation of Ontario.

Response to the PIC #2 Notice was limited to the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation, who requested they be kept apprised of LWC Project developments and associated public meetings. The LWC Project team did not receive written responses from communities to the Project Update and Supplementary Newsletter sent on August 6, 2013.

Response to the PIC #3 Notice was limited to Chippewas of Georgina Island, who requested to be kept informed of the Project and to be involved during the process. Beyond this letter, the LWC Project team did not receive responses from other communities to the PIC #3 Notice sent on October 30, 2013.

Table 10.11 Responses from First Nations and Métis Communities

Community	Method of Communication	Date
HDI	Mail	October 9, 2012
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation	Meeting	January 15, 2013
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	Email	April 15, 2013
Chippewas of Georgina Island	Email	November 27, 2013

To date, First Nations and Métis communities have not 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 at any point during the LWC Project. All records of communication can be found in Appendix E-7. Records of communication made with First Nations and Métis communities during the ToR stage can be found in the ToR Record of Consultation.

10.8 AGENCY CONSULTATION

10.8.1 Objectives

Throughout the development of the EA, 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 EA agency consultation were to consult with all potentially interested agencies about the EA; and ensure coordination between the LWC Project EA and the broader local and regional planning context.

10.8.2 Contact List

As part of the ToR, a contact list of regulatory and interested agencies was developed, which included 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 LWC Project and/or the LWC Project Study Area; and
- Agencies involved as part of the Feasibility Study.

Consultation with these agencies was continued as part of the EA. Any agencies that noted as part of the ToR, that continued consultation was not required, were removed from the contact list. Table 10.12 documents those agencies contacted during the LWC Project EA.

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

Table 10.12 Agencies Contacted During the LWC Project EA

Agency	Department(s)
City of Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Community Initiatives, City Manager’s Department • Development and Design, Planning and Building • Planning, Development and Business Services Division, Community Services Department • Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works • Park Development Section, Community Services Department • Parks, Community Services • Planning • Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works
City of Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks , Forestry and Recreation • Toronto Water • City Planning • Technical Services
Go Transit / Metrolinx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Liaison Section
Government of Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canada Post • Environment Canada • Fisheries and Oceans Canada • Health Canada, Ontario Region • Transport Canada
Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Services and Approvals • Transmission Lines
Infrastructure Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Services • Property Development
Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations Unit
Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton Office
Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations and Leasing Unit, Facilities Branch
Ontario Ministry of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Programs Branch
Ontario Ministry of Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Supply Branch
Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Approvals Branch • Technical Support Section
Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ontario Growth Secretariat
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Service Office - Central Ontario
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fish & Wildlife Biology • Integrated Resource Management • Lake Ontario Management Unit • Strategic Policy & Economics Branch

Table 10.12 Agencies Contacted During the LWC Project EA (Cont'd)

Agency	Department(s)
Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture Services Unit
Ontario Power Generation (OPG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Relations and Communications • Law • Real Estate
Ontario Provincial Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Policy and Strategic Planning Bureau
Region of Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Liaison, Peel Region Police, 12 Division • Environment, Transportation & Planning Services • Planning, Policy & Research • Public Health • Transportation, Public Works • Wastewater Treatment, Public Works • Water Division, Public Works

The consultation for the LWC Project EA included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and individual meetings with key agencies, including the MNR, DFO, MOE, OPG, the Region of Peel, the City of Mississauga, and the City of Toronto. A variety of consultation mechanisms were utilized in order to keep an open line of communication with all agencies, including updates to external working groups (i.e., Aquatic Habitat Toronto); email correspondence; invitations to PICs; in-person meetings; and teleconferences.

10.8.3 Technical Advisory Committee

The TAC was established as part of the LWC Project EA ToR 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. While the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) was invited to participate on the TAC, MNR elected to meet with the LWC Project Team on an individual basis in lieu of the formal TAC. As an avenue to provide ongoing updates regarding the LWC Project, the MNR was included on all TAC correspondence, including meeting agendas, material, and minutes. The final TAC membership for the EA phase is provided in Table 10.13.

Table 10.13 Final TAC membership

Agency	Department(s)
City of Mississauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Community Initiatives, City Manager’s Department • Development and Design, Planning and Building • Planning, Development and Business Services Division, Community Services Department • Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works • Park Development Section, Community Services Department • Parks, Community Services • Planning • Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works
City of Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks , Forestry and Recreation • Toronto Water • Works & Emergency Services • City Planning
Environment Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Integration & Partnership Division, Great Lakes Area of Concern
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	
Ministry of Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Supply Branch
Ministry of the Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Support Section • Environmental Approvals Branch
Region of Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health • Transportation, Public Works • Wastewater Treatment Division, Public Works • Water Division, Public Works

Two TAC meetings were held, as part of the EA phase of the LWC Project on January 14, 2013 and March 18, 2013. In lieu of a third TAC meeting, individual meetings were held with TAC agencies in order to facilitate the flow of discussion and comments with regards to the LWC Project. Table 10.14 provides an overview of the TAC meetings, including the objectives and attendance. An overview of individual meetings held in lieu of a third TAC meeting is documented in Section 9.8.4. Appendix E-8 provides the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.14 TAC Meetings

Event & Date	Objectives	Attendance
TAC Meeting #1 January 14, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide TAC with EA status update and schedule. • To seek TAC review and comment on the Alternative LWC Project Configurations; the approach to the comparative evaluation; and the comparative evaluation criteria. 	17 TAC members
TAC Meeting #2 March 18, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To report back to the TAC on the evaluation of the LWC Project Alternative Configurations and the identification of a Preferred Alternative. • To seek comment on the evaluation and the selection of a Preferred Alternative. • Discuss potential refinements to the Preferred Alternative. • Discuss next steps. 	10 TAC members

10.8.4 Agency Meetings

In addition to consultation through the TAC, a number of individual agency consultation meetings were held.

10.8.4.1 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)

Throughout the EA, the LWC Project team met with MNR to provide updates regarding the LWC Project EA and seek input into the LWC Project. Table 10.15 provides an overview of correspondence and meetings with MNR during the EA phase. Appendix E-8 provides the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.15 Consultation Activities Held with MNR

Date	Purpose
January 10, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide MNR with update on the LWC Project EA status; schedule; and change in Project Study Area. • Seek MNR review and comment on the Alternative LWC Project Configurations; how alternatives were developed; the approach to the comparative evaluation; the comparative evaluation criteria; and proposed configurations for Serson Creek.
April 2, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report back to the MNR on the evaluation of the Alternative LWC Project Configurations and the identification of a Preferred Alternative. • Seek comment on the evaluation and the selection of a Preferred Alternative. • Discuss potential refinements to the Preferred Alternative. • Discuss next steps.
October 29, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide MNR with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Discuss opportunities to incorporate cold water fish habitat as part of detailed design works; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.
November 7, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide AHT with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Discuss the HAAT modelling completed in support of the LWC Project EA; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)

Throughout the EA, the LWC Project team met with DFO to seek input. In addition to DFO's participation on the TAC, the LWC Project team provided regular updates as part of Aquatic Habitat Toronto (AHT) meetings, and through individual meetings, as outlined in Table 10.16. Appendix E-8 documents the presentations.

Table 10.16 Consultation Activities held with DFO

Date	Purpose
March 27, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To seek DFO’s input into HAAT modeling as part of the LWC Project.
April 4, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss aquatic habitat created and improved as part of the LWC Project.
June 6, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide AHT with an update on the LWC Project EA, including status and schedule; and • Discuss refinements to the Preferred Alternative.
November 6, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide AHT with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Discuss the HAAT modelling completed in support of the LWC Project EA; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.3 Ministry of the Environment (MOE)

The LWC Project team initiated communication with the MOE at the commencement of the LWC Project EA, and has maintained an open line of communication throughout the EA phase. Communication mechanisms included email status updates, teleconferences, and in-person meetings. Table 10.17 provides an overview of consultation activities with MOE. Appendix E-8 provides the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.17 Consultation Activities Held with MOE

Date	Purpose
December 18, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide MOE with a status update regarding the LWC Project EA, including schedule, amended Project Study Area to include the OPG waterlots, and potential to reroute Serson Creek through the current overflow channel; and • Present the Alternative Project Configurations and Preliminary Evaluation Criteria.
July 19, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide MOE with an update on the LWC Project EA status; schedule; and • Discuss the preliminary proposed construction access route and mitigative measures.
October 21, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide MOE with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.4 Ontario Power Generation (OPG)

The LWC Project team has engaged with OPG throughout the ToR and EA phases of the LWC Project. In addition to individual meetings held with OPG, and as a means to maintain an open line of communication, OPG was invited to participate on the LWC Project team teleconference meetings. The agendas and minutes of the Project team teleconferences were circulated to OPG. Table 10.18 provides an overview of consultation activities with OPG. Appendix E-8 provides the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.18 Consultation Activities Held with OPG

Date	Purpose
November 12, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss opportunities to access OPG waterlots and Serson Creek as part of the LWC Project, pending ToR approvals.
November 21, 2012 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference. • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project, including consultation timelines and Serson Creek realignment opportunities realignment opportunities.
January 3, 2013 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference. • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project and next steps.
March 28, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an update on the LWC Project
May 9, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference with drawings presented via webinar. • Discuss potential construction access routes. • Present the preliminary refined Preferred Alternative. • Present the draft rough grading plan of the LWC Project.
June 13, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar. • Present the refined draft grading plan and discuss public feedback with regards to the LWC Project.
July 31, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar. • Present the refined Preferred Alternative, artist’s renderings and the temporary construction access. • Provide the proposed dates for the next round of consultation activities. • Provide an overview of the expanded outreach being undertaken throughout the summer at Marie Curtis Park and Lakefront Promenade Park.
November 14, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide OPG with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative. • Discuss the availability of OPG waterlots. • Present the preliminary construction phasing plan and the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative. • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.5 City of Mississauga

As a LWC 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 City of Mississauga’s participation on the TAC and regular bi-weekly LWC Project team meetings, individual meetings were held with City of Mississauga

*Environmental Assessment
Lakeview Waterfront Connection*

departments to discuss the LWC Project. Table 10.19 provides an overview of consultation activities with the City of Mississauga outside of regular LWC Project team meetings. Appendix E-8 documents the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.19 Consultation Activities Held with City of Mississauga

Date	Purpose
November 21, 2012 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference; and • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project, including consultation timelines and Serson Creek realignment opportunities.
January 3, 2013 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference; and • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project and next steps.
March 6, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek input into potential access routes from the QEW to Lakeshore Road; and from Lakeshore Road to the LWC Project site at the water's edge.
May 9, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference with drawings presented via webinar; • Provide an overview of the potential construction access routes; and • Present the preliminary refined Preferred Alternative and draft rough grading plan of the LWC Project.
June 13, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar; and • Present the refined draft grading plan and discuss public feedback with regards to the LWC Project.
July 31, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar; • Present the refined Preferred Alternative and artist's renderings; • Present the temporary construction access; • Provide the proposed dates for the next round of consultation activities; and • Provide an overview of the expanded outreach being undertaken throughout the summer at Marie Curtis Park and Lakefront Promenade Park.
August 27, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek input from City of Mississauga regarding the proposed access routes from Lakeshore Road to the project site at the water's edge.
November 1, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the City of Mississauga's Corporate Services, Transportation & Works, and Planning & Building Departments with an update on the LWC Project EA, including consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the preliminary construction phasing plan and proposed construction access route through the Arsenal Lands; • Seek comment on the proposed temporary Waterfront Trail closure mitigation measures and opportunity to create a right-hand turn lane for truck traffic entering the LWC Project site from Lakeshore Road East; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.
November 4, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the City of Mississauga's Corporate Services and Community Services Departments with an update on the LWC Project EA, including consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the preliminary construction phasing plan and proposed construction access route through the Arsenal Lands; • Seek comment on the proposed temporary Waterfront Trail closure mitigation measures; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Discuss the potential opportunity to reinitiate the Arsenal Lands Master Planning process concurrently with the LWC Project; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.6 City of Toronto

In addition to the City of Toronto’s participation on the TAC, additional individual meetings were held with the City of Toronto to maintain an open line of communication with City staff and provide a forum for detailed discussions regarding the Project as it relates to the City of Toronto. Table 10.20 provides an overview of consultation activities with the City of Toronto outside of regular TAC meetings. Appendix E-8 provides the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.20 Consultation activities held with City of Toronto

Date	Purpose
January 8, 2013	To provide an update regarding the LWC Project EA status, schedule, and change in Project Study Area and to seek review and comment regarding the Alternative LWC Project Configurations, in particular, Island C, in terms of ownership, operations, and other City of Toronto priorities.
July 31, 2013	To provide an overview of the refinements to the preliminary Preferred Alternative completed in response to comments received as part of PIC#2 regarding sand beach at Marie Curtis Park beach west, and discuss key comments and concerns received with regards to the LWC Project.
October 31, 2013	To provide an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; present the proposed construction access route, preliminary phasing plan, and results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; and discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.7 Environment Canada

In addition to Environment Canada’s participation on the TAC, the LWC Project team provided regular updates as part of Aquatic Habitat Toronto (AHT) meetings, and through individual meetings, as outlined in Table 10.21. Appendix E-8 documents the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.21 Consultation Activities held with Environment Canada

Date	Purpose
April 4, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present the Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss aquatic habitat created and improved as part of the LWC Project.
June 6, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide AHT with an update on the LWC Project EA, including status and schedule; and • Discuss refinements to the Preferred Alternative.
November 7, 2013 (AHT Meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide AHT with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; • Discuss the HAAT modelling completed in support of the LWC Project EA; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.

10.8.4.8 Region of Peel

As the LWC Project co-proponent, Region of Peel provided project oversight and assisted with coordination between relevant Region of Peel departments. In addition to the Region of Peel's participation on the TAC, individual meetings were held with Region of Peel departments to discuss the LWC Project. Table 10.22 provides an overview of consultation activities with the Region of Peel outside of regular LWC Project team meetings. Appendix E-8 documents the meeting agendas, presentations, and material.

Table 10.22 Consultation Activities held with Region of Peel

Date	Purpose
November 21, 2012 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project team teleconference; and • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project, including consultation timelines and Serson Creek realignment opportunities.
January 3, 2013 (Teleconference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference; and • Provide an update on the status of the LWC Project and next steps.
May 9, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference with drawings presented via webinar; • Provide an overview of the potential construction access routes; and • Present the preliminary refined Preferred Alternative and draft rough grading plan of the LWC Project.
June 13, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar; and • Present the refined draft grading plan and discuss public feedback with regards to the LWC Project.
July 18, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the WWTF staff and local Councillor with an update regarding the LWC Project, including the Refined Preferred Alternative and preliminary cost analysis; and • Present preliminary construction access and proposed construction viewing options.
July 31, 2013 (Webinar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWC Project Team teleconference, with drawings presented via webinar; • Present the refined Preferred Alternative and artist's renderings; • Present the temporary construction access; • Provide the proposed dates for the next round of consultation activities; and • Provide an overview of the expanded outreach being undertaken throughout the summer at Marie Curtis Park and Lakefront Promenade Park.
October 24, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received direction from RoP Council to proceed with Detailed Design pending EA approval.
November 4, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Region of Peel Water Division, Wastewater Treatment Division, and Public Health department with an update on the LWC Project EA consultation activities and refinements to the Preferred Alternative; • Present the proposed construction access route and preliminary phasing plan; • Present the results of the Detailed Assessment of the Refined Preferred Alternative; and • Discuss the anticipated EA timelines.