

## **4.0 DESCRIPTION, EVALUATION AND RATIONALE FOR ‘ALTERNATIVES TO’ THE UNDERTAKING**

### **4.1 DESCRIPTION OF ‘ALTERNATIVES TO’ THE UNDERTAKING**

The LWC Project will transform the stretch of shoreline between Marie Curtis Park and OPG’s Lakeview site from an industrialized edge to a public and ecological asset, which is a longstanding objective of a number of initiatives including Inspiration Lakeview, LOISS and the City of Mississauga Waterfront Parks Strategy. Similarly, Mississauga’s current Strategic Plan identifies the waterfront as an area with great potential for creative development and redevelopment. Waterfront redevelopment is expected to enhance cultural and economic richness and create recreational amenities and world-class attractions to improve quality of life for residents and the experience for visitors.

As noted in Chapter 2 (specifically Section 2.1), the identification of the area of the Mississauga waterfront between Marie Curtis Park and OPG’s Lakeview site as the LWC Project is the result of several planning studies. All of these studies have identified the need for waterfront access in front of the WWTF and OPG lands and the need for enhanced recreation opportunities. Inspiration Lakeview (see Section 2.1.1.1), a community driven initiative, specifically identified the LWC Project as a key component for implementation. Furthermore, several studies by CVC and others have documented the degraded nature of the ecosystem and the desire to improve habitat. However, the WWTF extends to the shoreline and, because it is critical public infrastructure, access along the shoreline in front of the WWTF is strictly prohibited.

The Ontario *EA Act* (Section 6.1(2)) requires the identification and evaluation of ‘Alternatives To’ the undertaking, including the consideration of the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative. ‘Alternatives To’ the undertaking are defined as different ways to solve the identified problem or address the identified opportunity. The LWC Project is an opportunity to create ecological habitat and public linkages along a stretch of inaccessible and ecologically degraded waterfront in the City of Mississauga. Given the information above, the ‘Alternatives To’ must address the question of how to create ecological habitat and public linkages.

The ‘Alternatives To’ the LWC Project are defined as:

- *‘Do Nothing’*. This alternative will retain the existing conditions along the waterfront and nearshore but will include already approved or planned improvements to the Arsenal Lands and Marie Curtis Park.
- *Create new natural waterfront park on existing land*. This alternative will examine whether or not there is the potential to create habitat and public linkages on the existing land base.

- *Create new natural waterfront park on new created land.* This alternative involves creating new natural parkland along the waterfront to establish diverse aquatic and terrestrial habitats and to improve public access and recreational opportunities. This would be accomplished through the reuse of clean fill, generated by municipal and private capital projects.

## 4.2 EVALUATION OF ‘ALTERNATIVES TO’ THE UNDERTAKING

Each of the “Alternatives To” and their ability to achieve the LWC Project goal and objectives as outlined in Section 1.2.

### 4.2.1 ‘Do Nothing’

The ‘Do Nothing’ alternative would see no changes to the existing waterfront area in the LWC Project Study Area. With respect to each of the objectives:

1. **Naturalization** – the existing terrestrial and aquatic habitat is degraded in quality and does not support continuous linkages along the waterfront. The ‘Do Nothing’ alternative would not change this and therefore does not meet this LWC Project objective.
2. **Access** – the existing LWC Project Study Area does not allow for continuous public access to the waterfront for recreational, educational or cultural heritage opportunities from the western limits of Marie Curtis Park and does not connect the Waterfront Trail to the shore. The ‘Do Nothing’ alternative would not change this and therefore does not meet this LWC Project objective.
3. **Compatibility** – because the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative leaves the existing infrastructure in its current state, this alternative meets the LWC Project Compatibility objective.
4. **Coordination** – the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative does not move any local planning or development initiatives closer to meeting their goals and objectives. As such, this alternative does not meet the Coordination objective of the LWC Project.
5. **Fiscal Viability** – while the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative would not require the expenditure of any monies, it would also not create an innovative use of a currently wasted resource (i.e., the clean fill generated by public infrastructure projects). This alternative does not meet this objective.

While the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative meets the Compatibility objective of the LWC Project, it does not meet the other four objectives. In addition, this alternative would not achieve the goal of the LWC Project.

#### **4.2.2 Create New Waterfront Park on Existing Land**

This alternative evaluates the ability of the goal and objectives of the LWC Project to be met through creation of a new natural waterfront park on the existing land. With respect to each of the objectives:

1. **Naturalization** – the existing terrestrial and aquatic habitat along the waterfront in the LWC Project Study Area is degraded, of poor quality and does not allow for linkages along the waterfront. The creation of a new waterfront park on the existing land alternative would not change this and, therefore, does not meet this LWC Project objective.
2. **Access** – the existing LWC Project Study Area does not allow for public access to the waterfront for recreational, educational or cultural heritage opportunities and it does not connect the Waterfront Trail to the shore. This alternative would not change this situation and therefore does not meet the LWC Project Access objective.
3. **Compatibility** – the Region of Peel cannot move the WWTF operations back from the shoreline; as such, this alternative leaves the existing infrastructure in its current state and the creation of a new waterfront park on the existing land meets this LWC Project objective.
4. **Coordination** – the creation of a new waterfront park on the existing land will not allow for public waterfront access and does not improve the existing terrestrial and aquatic habitat; as such, this alternative will not move any local planning or development initiatives closer to meeting their goals and objectives. As such, this alternative does not meet this objective of the LWC Project.
5. **Fiscal Viability** – creation of a new waterfront park on the existing land would presumably require the expenditure of public monies; however, it would not create an innovative use of a currently wasted resource (i.e., the clean fill generated by public infrastructure projects). As such, this alternative does not meet this objective.

While this alternative does meet the Compatibility objective of the LWC Project, it does not meet any of the other four objectives. In addition, because new ecological habitat will not be created and public linkages to the waterfront will not be created, this alternative also does not meet the goal of the LWC Project.

#### **4.2.3 Create New Waterfront Park on New Land**

This alternative evaluates the potential to establish a new natural waterfront park on land that is created using clean fill. With respect to each of the objectives of the LWC Project:

1. **Naturalization** – the addition of land on the lakeside of the WWTF will allow for the creation of both terrestrial and aquatic habitat that will be better quality than existing habitat and will allow for linkages along the waterfront. This alternative does meet this LWC Project objective.
2. **Access** – the addition of land that is lakeside of the WWTF will alleviate security concerns associated with the WWTF, allow for public access to the waterfront for recreational, educational or cultural heritage opportunities and will allow for the connection of the Waterfront Trail to the shore. As such, this alternative does meet the LWC Project Access objective.
3. **Compatibility** – this alternative will require further design to ensure it is compatible with existing infrastructure; however, ensuring compatibility is not likely to be insurmountable. As such, this alternative will be designed to ensure that this LWC Project objective is met.
4. **Coordination** – this alternative will not only create ecological habitat, it will also create new opportunities for public access to the waterfront as well as recreational opportunities that will move local planning and development initiatives closer to meeting their goals and objectives. As such, this alternative does meet this objective of the LWC Project.
5. **Fiscal Viability** – while this alternative will require the expenditure of public monies, it would also create an innovative use of a currently wasted resource (i.e., the clean fill generated by public infrastructure projects). Use of this currently wasted resource is expected to help offset the required funding. This alternative meets this LWC Project objective.

This alternative will or has the potential to meet the goal as well as all five LWC Project objectives.

#### **4.2.4 Summary**

As there is no potential to create habitat and public linkages on the existing land, new land must be created to establish the new natural waterfront park. For all of the LWC Project objectives, the creation of ecological habitat and public linkages through the creation of land is the preferred way to solve the identified problem/opportunity when compared to doing nothing or using the existing land base. Therefore, alternatives involving land creation have the greatest potential to meet the LWC Project objectives and will be carried forward to the development of ‘Alternative Methods’.

The ‘Do Nothing’ alternative will be assessed against the preferred alternative as part of the detailed assessment in Chapter 7.