

APPENDIX E-9

Disposition of Comments on Draft EA

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| Community Liaison Committee: January 16, 2014 page-turn review | | |
| 3.3.4 | Were there any archeological or heritage issues? | There are no terrestrial or marine archaeological concerns. Please see Section 3.3.4 for more information. |
| 6.1 | Are the most current Lake Ontario water levels used in the analysis? There was a previous issue in terms of the Lake Ontario water levels used which resulted in a significant increase in Project budget from the Feasibility Study to the EA. | Yes, the best available data regarding Lake Ontario water levels was used. To clarify, the Feasibility Study identified a concept with land creation activities on both sides of the OPG piers. So although the same volume of fill was used in the Feasibility Study and EA, the concept developed as part of the Feasibility Study incorporated this fill over a much larger distance, allowing for footprint to extend into a much shallower depth (approximately 3-m deep water) as developed in the LWC EA. With shallower depths comes lower wave energy, and a reduced amount of shoreline protection that is required. This is where the difference in estimated Project budget stems from. |
| 6.1.1.4 | Will the re-alignment of Serson Creek through the existing stormwater channel bring Serson Creek back to its original location? | No, the realignment will not return Serson Creek to its original location as this location is under the WWTF. The proposed realignment of Serson Creek provides significant opportunity to improve the existing aquatic habitat, including providing access to Serson Creek from Lake Ontario for the first time in over 10 years. |
| 6.1.2 | The Project is creating 33-ha of terrestrial habitat. What's currently there? | Currently, the site is 33-ha of open water of degraded aquatic habitat. Please see Section 3.2.1.1 for more information. |
| 6.1.2.3 | In terms of wetland function, do you anticipate any issues? Will anything come into play that has not been considered? | Please see Section 6.1.2.2 and Section 6.1.2.3 A fluvial geomorphologist, retained as part of the SENES consulting team, liaised closely with the ecology team and restoration services staff at both TRCA and CVC to ensure that the wetlands will work as anticipated and that a full suite of problems have been anticipated and addressed. However, nature by its nature is unpredictable. As such a monitoring and adaptive management plan will be established to ensure that the wetlands function within an acceptable range of conditions. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| 6.1.2.5 | How far into the lake will you be surcharging areas to increase fish habitat? | During Detailed Design, we will be looking at other opportunities to surcharge the shoreline with additional material to augment fish habitat where the armourstone and cobble beaches tie into the lakebed. Additional fish habitat will essentially be placed within the reach of a large, land-based excavator. |
| 6.1.3 | Will there be public washrooms? | The LWC is a passive, natural park. There will not be public washrooms within the land creation area. |
| 6.1.3 | Will the design of the recreational component take into consideration the surrounding landscape? | As part of Detailed Design, public realm features will consider passive recreational activities, such as trail placement, fishing opportunities, etc. |
| 6.1.3 | As part of the design of public realm features, will there be stopping nodes for rest, viewpoints, etc. This is a key point for public enjoyment and use of the park. | Please see Section 5.2.3 and Section 6.1.3 for more information. The EA identifies that these features will be present. Additional details will be explored further as part of Detailed Design. |
| 6.3.1 | Can you clarify which access route was identified as the Preferred? | Please see Section 6.3.3.6 for more information. Route 2 was identified as the Preferred construction access route; however, as the entrance to Route 2 is not available for approximately the first year, Route 3b will be used in the interim. |
| 6.3.1 | Has any further progress been made in terms of securing construction access through the Lakeview site? | The LWC Project Team is actively pursuing a construction access agreement with OPG for the Lakeview site. At this time, OPG is unable to commit to a potential access route through the site. For the purposes of the EA, we are proceeding with construction access through the Arsenal Lands. |
| 6.3.3.1 | What was considered in terms of impacts to wildlife and plants? | The entire length of the preferred construction access route was considered. Please see Section 6.3.3.1 for more information. |
| 6.3.3.1 | Will the construction access road be fenced and will this present a barrier to wildlife movement? | Please see Section 6.3.3.1. The existing Waterfront Trail is currently fenced along its entire length, although it is recognized that holes do exist. While any gaps in the fencing will be closed prior to the start of construction, the access route may be opened during non-construction hours to facilitate movement. |
| 7.3.1.1 | Do you go through the site before construction begins to make sure there are no nesting birds? | Please see Section 7.3.1.1 for more information. The LWC Project will abide by the Migratory Bird Convention Act. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| 7.3.2 | Will the public be permitted to enter the new park during the 7 to 10 year construction timeframe? As the land creation activities are completed section by section, will there be an opportunity to permit access to the completed section while construction proceeds to the next phase? | This will be explored as part of Detailed Design. In general, access will be restricted; however, opportunities to phase the project and provide early access to certain sections will be explored. If construction proceeds from east to west, the section closest to Marie Curtis Park would be the last section to be completed, as trucks would continue to pass this area. If construction access is granted through the Lakeview site, early public access to the section closest to Marie Curtis Park may be provided, as trucks will not pass through this area once the landbase is tied off. |
| 7.3.2 | Can you clarify what is meant by “potential for public access to the water’s edge?” | Throughout the public consultation process, one recurring comment has been the public’s desire to access the water’s edge. The Mississauga’s of the New Credit First Nation have also noted a big spiritual connection to the water’s edge and a desire to see water in a more natural environment. This criterion is measuring the ability of the Alternative to provide this access to the water’s edge. |
| 7.3.2.1 | Has there been any further thought regarding the accessibility of the temporary viewing path during construction? | The temporary viewing path was conceptualized in response to a stated desire for early viewing opportunities of construction. In addition to the concerns raised by the CLC, a number of agencies noted concerns regarding liability and safety. The concept of providing early construction viewing will be looked at closely during Detailed Design. |
| 7.3.2.1 | Suggest having a viewing stand to provide an opportunity to look out and above the construction, rather than a path in front of the WWTF. | Noted. |
| 7.3.2.2 | At the last PIC, there were concerns raised regarding potential navigational issues. Will this prevent the project from going forward? | Please see Section 7.3.2.2. An NWPA permit will be required. Navigational maps will be updated based on the new shoreline configuration; and signage, including maps, will be posted at Marie Curtis Park indicating the new shoreline features, including the islands. |
| 7.3.3 | Have the impacts from noise and traffic on the local community been considered? | Please see Section 7.3.3 for results of the traffic analysis. All activities will comply with Ontario’s noise standards and the most stringent by-laws between the City of Mississauga and City of Toronto. Options for reducing noise effects will be explored during Detailed |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | | Design, such as opportunities for non-back-up procedures for trucks once a landbase has been established on the lake. |
| 7.3.3 | In terms of traffic, the only time of day traffic congestion is really bad is between 3 – 4 pm as a result of the afternoon rush-hour. Any other time I can turn left onto Lakeshore Road with only a maximum of 10 cars making the turn in front of me. | Comment noted. |
| 7.3.4 | Are there any incumbent pitfalls with this project in terms of meeting the MNR's Fish Community Objectives? | Please see Section 7.3.4.2 for more information. The LWC Project seeks to improve degraded habitat quality and connection Serson Creek to Lake Ontario for the first time in over a decade. During Detailed Design opportunities to enhance cold water fish habitat along the shoreline will also be explored. |
| 7.4 | At what point in the process will a decision be made regarding the size of the final footprint? | The final footprint will be established during Detailed Design. However, there is some flexibility if entering from the Lakeview site, as the shoreline configuration is the same until the cobble beaches begin. If there was a change up until this point, the Detailed Design could be amended, as long as it's within the EA approvals. |
| 8.2 | Where does the budget for Adaptive Management come from? Is it included in the total cost of the LWC Project or will it require a new capital budget? | The purpose of an Adaptive Environmental Management strategy is to identify undesirable environmental effects early so management interventions can be implemented to avoid major problems before they occur. If action is required within the first 2-years following construction, this would likely be covered under the standard 2-year construction warranty; however, if action is identified as being required, for example, 10-years following construction, a capital project would likely be required. |
| 8.2 | When does the 2-year construction warranty start? | The warranty is engaged following completion of construction of the LWC Project. |
| General | In Brampton, a culvert replacement project undertaken by the City has resulted in increased flooding for residents. Is there any increased flood risks from the proposed works, particularly in terms of the redirection of the creeks? | The LWC Project will not increase flood risks. |
| General | Will there be any stockpile of fill in advance of construction? The Hanlan tunnel works will be starting in a couple months. | It is not anticipated that fill will be stored in advance of the Project. However, it is intended that construction rubble will be stockpiled at the WWTF overflow parking lot in advance of construction. The construction rubble is |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | | required for the access road and containment berm, and having a supply available for the start of construction will help expedite the construction process. |
| General | Are there opportunities to bring in community volunteers to assist with the planting efforts? Inclusion is one of the best opportunities for this project. | CVC has a program dedicated to community stewardship. This will be explored further as part of the engagement and consultation process as the project moves forward into Detailed Design. |
| General | Have local concerns regarding the groyne been resolved? | During Detailed Design opportunities to reduce the size of the structure to the extent possible will continue to be explored. |
| General | Is the island connected and “walkable” at low water levels, would cormorants have an opportunity to establish? | The elevation of the island would remain the same, with waves overtopping the islands to prevent the establishment of vegetation. As depicted, the islands are not anticipated to be connected at low water levels. This will be confirmed at Detailed Design. |
| General | It is important that the new landform is secured in perpetuity for naturalization purposes only. | It is anticipated that CVC will own the new park. As part of the agreement with MNR for the acquisition of the crown waterlots, the landbase will only be used for naturalization purposes. |
| General | Consider installing “storybook” signage along the length of the construction access road to present the project and explain the works that are ongoing, including a website link. People want to be informed. | Comment noted. |
| General | Unless you have the direct link to the LWC project’s webpage, it’s hard to find where to download the EA on CVC’s website. | Comment noted. CVC is in the process of redesigning the Restoration Services webpages. |
| General | Are there numbers on estimated users once the park is complete? | The use of the park will depend on a number of factors, including the implementation of Inspiration Lakeview, which will bring more people closer to the Lake and the new park. |
| General | Once the project is constructed, consider repopulating the Aster’s which have been lost from the nearby area due to past development activities. | The species composition of the LWC Project will be determined as part of Detailed Design. |
| General | How far into the Lake is the WWTF outfall pipe located? Will the new landform be placed on top of the outfall? | Please see Section 7.3.3 for more information. Access tunnels will be constructed through the new landform to provide access to the pipes for maintenance. |
| General | At the last PIC, gentlemen suggested expressing the traffic numbers in other terms to help facilitate public understanding and visualization of the effects. How was this addressed? | This was explored; however, it was determined that the use of a percentage increase was the most accurate and effective method of conveying the information. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| General | During the CLC design charette, it was interesting to see the island option come out as the Preferred Alternative with the various groups. The majority seems to recognize that as a good solution. | Comment noted. |
| General | Region of Peel Council had concerns regarding the contingency amount. Has this been refined at all? | The entire budget, including contingency amount will be refined as part of Detailed Design. |
| General | If alternative fundraising sources are being sought, ensure that the funder's are appropriately acknowledged. I would like to suggest that naming the park after a major funding would be obscene; while naming park features would be appropriate. | Comment noted. |
| General | With a municipal election in 2014, it is important that the Project has enough public support and traction to withstand any changes on Council. | A key component of work going forward is the development and implementation of a communications strategy. |
| General | There has been minor public concern regarding the loss of the sand beach at Marie Curtis Park. Can you clarify what the natural state of this beach is? | Please see Section 3.2.2.2. The natural substrate is a mix of cobbles, gravels and sand. |
| General | Let's make it work! This is a great project and the first step in linking the City of Toronto and City of Mississauga waterfronts. | Comment noted. |
| Noted. | I would like to note that this project has done the due diligence to make sure the concerns are addressed, and I feel as though the project has gone above and beyond. Any concerns or comments that the CLC have had have been addressed. I've been very happy with this project and the process. | Comment noted |
| General Public | | |
| | I am against the current plan which involves destruction of two beaches! Asking you to redesign the LWC plan and properly consult public before ruining Marie Curtis beach!!! | Please see Chapter 10 of the EA for a full description of the extensive consultation carried out for the LWC project. The LWC results in a change to the character of 235 m of Marie Curtis Beach West and the transformation of the inaccessible remnant beach in front of the WWTF into an extensive wetland area and a new and longer beach system is being established further offshore. |
| | I am against creation of wet lands - the habitat for mosquitoes who spread west Nile virus! | The mosquito species that are the primary species for transferring West Nile Virus require standing stagnant water that do not harbor amphibian, bird and fish life. The wetlands being proposed in the design will not provide those conditions. |
| | I am against current LWC plan because of reduced area of the bay which results in higher pollution coming from the Etobicoke | Please see Section 7.3.2.2 of the EA. We have assessed effects to water quality and determined that |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | creek after showers! | the project does not negatively affect water quality. |
| | I am against the Lakeview Waterfront Plan because there is currently no good justification of dumping waste into the lake! The current justification for the plan of creation habitat for mosquitoes and having better views of downtown Toronto is simply MORONIC! | Waste will not be dumped in the lake. The land form will be created using clean fill (soil and rock). Please see response above regarding mosquitos. |
| | Whats the rush! Apparently the OPG will reach a decision on the use of their lands in June of 2014. I am sure if we wait OPG will allow us to run the access route through their lands so we do not have to divert the waterfront trail for 10 years. Then the project could be started at the south end instead of the north end markedly decreasing the disruption to the existing park users, waterfront trial users, beach goers, and the general public at Marie Curtis Park. After all the OPG is a provincial animal and should be on board with the intent of the project. | OPG has been and continues to be consulted with respect to the use of their lands and have expressed general support for the findings of the LWC Project. |
| | It is wonderful that the project is an attempt to make to waterfront in front of the Booth sewage treatment plant accessible to the public. This provides a unique opportunity to redevelop a long neglected section of the waterfront. In my opinion however the project is of such a large scale that it is not compatible with some of the existing uses of the neighbouring city of Toronto's Marie Curtis Park. Public access in front of the sewage treatment plant could readily be provided with a much scaled down version such as a wide trail connecting the existing sand beaches. This would not have as many negative consequences for the existing uses at Marie Curtis Park. I am aware the region of Peel and the city of Mississauga need a place to dump the large amounts of fill they will be generating in the near future, but please do not ruin Marie Curtis Park just because of economics. | Please see Chapter 2 of the EA. The purpose of the project is both public access and enhanced habitat. Additional land area is required to create coastal wetlands, reconnect the creeks to the lake and provide appropriate and complimentary terrestrial habitats such as forest and meadows. Once completed, the natural passive recreation opportunities provided by the LWC Project would provide a strong complimentary function to the much more active recreation activities provided by Marie Curtis Park. |
| | <p>It looks like Mississauga and the region of Peel plan to take over west portion of Marie Curtis beach, replacing half of the existing sand beach with a swamp inland and a cobble beach on the shore with a rock groyne structure in the middle of the sandy west beach. Cobble beaches are big a mistake. The groyne will be unsightly and split the beach in two.</p> <p>People actually use the existing sand beach intensely for many activities such as sunbathing, picnics, kite boarding, windsurfing,</p> | Your description of the preferred alternative is incorrect. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a description of the conceptual design of the LWC. The groyne has been added to address concerns about the maintenance of the maximum extent of sand beach. Existing uses of the sand beach and other recreational resources in the area are understood, will continue to be provided and are documented in Section 3.3.3. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>kayaking, stand up paddle board and swimming.</p> <p>As an example, on many a hot summer weekend I have often observed the cobble beaches at Mimico Linear Park to be vacant. People find it uncomfortable to sit on stones or walk on stones. In contrast the beautiful sand beaches at Marie Curtis are full of people enjoying the beach and the large grass spaces inland. Large families are having picnics. Volley ball and soccer games are popular on the grass areas inland, the parking lots are full and the park is so popular that cars are even being ticketed for parking on the road. Why would we fill in these beaches with cobble, build a rock groyne and replace the grass areas inland with a swamp.</p> | |
| | <p>Another major issue is the proposed headlands and islands would be a significant navigational hazard for the current kite surfers using Marie Curtis West Beach. The beach is primarily used kite surfers when there is an East wind. Kiting is very dependent on the wind. We do not have engines but are considered water craft by transport Canada. We are mandated to carry safety equipment and obey the nautical rules of right of way. Due to the wind a kite surfer entering the water at the west beach must first sail in a south west direction from the beach to get a safe distance out into the lake before he can tack and change direction. The headlands and especially the proposed islands will be right in this path making it dangerous and almost impossible for the kite surfers to use the beach on an east wind. The kite surfers provide ample entertainment for the public on the shore.</p> | <p>Please see Section 7.3.2.2 of the EA for an assessment of the effects to kite surfers.</p> |
| | <p>I am very concerned that the proposed lake fill will increase the number of days the E Coli counts are too high to swim at the existing Marie Curtis East beach were the city monitors the water daily and has lifeguards. This is quite obvious because most of the E coli comes out of the mouth of Etobicoke creek after rain induced increased water flows. The flow from the creek then naturally travels in a plume to the west. I have observed this for many years and believe it has to do with the underwater valley were the creek empties into the lakebed. The proposed lake fill will create a much smaller embayment than the existing bay for this polluted plume to disperse. The polluted</p> | <p>Please see Section 7.3.2.2 of the EA. We have assessed effects to water quality and determined that the project does not negatively affect water quality.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | <p>water will be then directed to the existing Marie Curtis East beach, resulting in higher E coli levels and more closed beach days. Representatives at various public presentations of the project have pointed out to me that the Marie Curtis East beach is not a blue flag beach. This is also mentioned a number of times in the preliminary environmental assessment. Does our beach not matter because it has yet to reach blue flag status? The city of Toronto takes good care of its beaches at Marie Curtis, keeping them clean and usable for everyone. The city has invested a lot of money recently on improvements such as the boardwalk, parking improvements, path improvements and goose deterrent plantings. Each year more and more people use the beach and the park. Each year the pollution improves and the number of days the beach is closed due to high E coli decreases. Why would we propose a massive lake fill project that would make the high E. Coli levels worse?</p> | |
| | <p>I am a frequent user of the Marie Curtis Park beach on the west side of Etobicoke Creek. I find the current master plan for the LWC to be completely unacceptable and I urge the development team to start over.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| | <p>First of all, you are destroying a wild beach to the west of Marie Curtis Park and transforming it into a swamp. You make it sound like it is good for environment yet I disagree as 250 trucks a day for the next 10 years completely overshadows any environmental effects of the LWC plan all together in terms of pollution.</p> | <p>Your statement is incorrect. The remnant beach south of the WWTF will be transformed into a coastal marsh (wetland), which will provide much more diverse habitat conditions for fish, birds and other wildlife than the existing conditions. In addition, a much longer cobble beach system will be established further offshore which will greatly increase public access to the water's edge. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a full description of the conceptual design of the LWC and Chapter 7 of a discussion of the effects from both construction and the long term establishment of the LWC</p> |
| | <p>Secondly, converting up to 50% of Marie Curtis West Beach is completely unacceptable. They are building artificial beaches in downtown Toronto and yet you decide to destroy one... what kind of short term thinking is that?</p> | <p>This statement is incorrect; 50% of Marie Curtis West Beach will not be destroyed. Please see Chapter 6 of the EA.</p> |
| | <p>Thirdly, coming up with a master plan for LWC before the OPG lands decision in June of 2014 is foolish. Why not wait an extra six months to find out the future of the OPG lands (ex-lakeview generation station) before making any plans. It sounds like the</p> | <p>The LWC project is being planned to take advantage of fill materials available in the area from the Hanlan feedermain project. Use of this fill material at source as it comes out of the ground will reduce truck traffic and</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | development committee is in a rush - makes me wonder why! | effects to the surrounding community. In addition, the planning for the LWC has occurred in parallel with Inspiration Lakeview and has received general support from both OPG and the City of Mississauga. |
| | Lastly, I've been to the latest public meeting on the LWC, and it was SPECIFICALLY said that the size of the LWC project depends on the amount of landfill available and that the project developers don't care about preserving as much of the sand beach as possible. | This statement is incorrect. Please see Chapter 10 of the EA. |
| | I am against destruction of the wild beach on the west side of Marie Curtis Park!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Do not destroy the nature, please! | The LWC will greatly increase the amount, diversity and function of nature within the area. |
| | i have just found out that there is a plan to restructure the shoreline at marie curtis west beach. how disappointing this is to hear. this area is so beautiful and natural and wild as it is. i thought it was such a gem when i discovered it. i have read the plans and it just makes me shake my head. this area is already perfect and to think that there is this amount of money available to spend when there is nothing wrong with it. i truly feel that this money needs to be allocated to areas where funding is lacking. this plan proves to me that there needs to be restructuring in the powers that be who are in charge of financial decisions. i do hope that this project will not go ahead. | Comment noted |
| | <p>I have reviewed the draft EA for the above project and I still have major concerns regarding the impact this project will have on the long sand beach on the west side of Etobicoke Creek. The beach is over .5 kilometer long-if one were to include the beach past the waste water treatment plant fence line the beach is even longer.</p> <p>As there is no way to preserve the total sand beach with this existing alternative the project should be abandoned until a way is found to save the long sand beach and also, if possible, the beach that is just south of the waste water treatment plant. Wildlife takes refuge in that bay, especially in this winter weather.</p> <p>If waterfowl and birds are using the ponds at the wastewater treatment plant for habitat, and it is a danger to them, the wastewater treatment plant must find a way to prevent them from using this environment. Even with additional wetland the wildfowl will continue to use this property if it is not sealed off</p> | As discussed in Chapter 6 of the EA, the LWC will change the character of approximately 235 m of the Marie Curtis Park Beach West. Most of the beach will not be affected. The isolated sand beach south of the WWTF is on private property and will be transformed into an ecosystem with much higher ecological productivity for a wide range of fish, birds and other wildlife. The purpose of the LWC project is to provide higher quality and quantity habitat for a wider range of wildlife including waterfowl that currently use the WWTF ponds. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | somehow. | |
| | <p>You must ensure that the soil and water in this project are clean. You must also ensure that there is no cross-contamination from adjacent soil and water. You will be allowing First Nations people to gather medicines from these lands. These medicines will be used in Ceremony or for food.</p> <p>A "low risk"(page 10/36) of cross contamination from the adjacent Ontario Power Generation lands is not good enough.</p> | <p>Fill materials used for this project must meet Provincial regulations. The project will adhere to all Provincial requirements with respect to soil and ground water quality.</p> |
| | <p>I am not categorically opposed to the Lakeview Waterfront Connection project.</p> <p>I believe that Marie Curtis West beach should not be disrupted for this project and the water/beach interface should remain as is in the Toronto section of the beach.</p> <p>Construction vehicles should not be entering the site through parkland.This is a 7 to 10 year project-another route must be found.</p> <p>Construction of the park should begin in the west most area and then work east towards the Toronto border.</p> <p>No construction should begin until additional parking is provided for in the plans</p> | <p>Reducing the amount of overlap with the beach in the City of Toronto will continue to be explored to the extent possible, while still providing for public access and connections with Applewood Creek into the naturalized areas.</p> <p>Parking is ongoing with the City of Mississauga and OPG in the Inspiration Lakeview process, and will be a key element of the future Arsenal Lands Master Plan Process.</p> <p>Discussions with OPG regarding construction access through the Lakeview lands have started and are a priority activity throughout 2014 and 2015. The earliest that construction could commence is mid-2015</p> |
| | <p>AFTER REVIEWING THE DRAFT E.A. A NUMBER OF TIMES I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THE RESIDENTS OF SOUTH ETOBICOKE AND THE WIND SURFING AND KITEBOARDING COMMUNITIES WERE NOT CONSULTED IN A TIMELY MANNER AND THAT NEWSPAPER ANNOUNCEMENTS NEGLECTED TO STATE THAT A PARK AND A BEACH IN TORONTO COULD BE DIRECTLY IMPACTED BY THIS PROJECT.</p> | <p>Please see Chapter 10 of the EA for a full discussion of consultation undertaken. The content of newspaper notices is outlined in the MOE Code of Practice for Consultation in Ontario's EA Process.</p> |
| | <p>On page 3-11 of the draft EA it is stated that Marie Curtis beach has not reached Blue Flag status. Why is this important to this draft E.A.?</p> | <p>This section describes the existing conditions and is simply a way to describe the beach and has no other significance. The designation of a Blue Flag is an international recognition. The lack of Blue Flag status indicates that there are likely some water quality issues.</p> |
| | <p>On page 3.63 it is stated that Marie Curtis Park is Public open space but figure 3.27 shows it as a park. Why the difference?</p> | <p>Public open space designation refers to the Arsenal Lands. Reference to Marie Curtis Park has been removed.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>On page 3.64 Table 3.7 states park should be maintained in primarily natural state.....conservation projects that are designed to have minimally adverse impacts on natural features and functions. How does putting a groyne jutting out into the lake off of the sand beach midway along the existing beach and then gravelling over and cobbling much of the remainder fulfill that objective? Everyone that I speak to who uses the beach is appalled that anyone would even think of such a thing.</p> | <p>Please see Chapter 7 of the EA for a complete discussion of the LWC project effects. The groyne has been proposed to maximize the retention of the sand beach to the east in response to public comments. The beach to the west of the groyne will transition gradually into the new landform.</p> |
| | <p>On page 5.8 it is stated "identify desired design elements" Were there any people who are representatives of Toronto involved in this?</p> | <p>This information was consulted on at Public Information Centres and residents from Toronto were invited to attend and provide comment. In addition, City of Toronto staff were consulted with and provided comments.</p> |
| | <p>Were there any people from Toronto representing Toronto interests on the Community Liasion Committee? Although the majority of the project is in Mississauga or off the shore of Mississauga it is a Toronto sand beach and park that is being impacted by the chosen preferred alternative. The existing sand beach in Toronto will be partially destroyed by this project.</p> | <p>Efforts were made to seek representation from Toronto associations on the CLC however none were represented on the CLC. 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. The key role of the CLC was to provide feedback on the content and format of presentation materials in advance of the PICs. As such, the CLC was not a decision-making body. The notices for PICs were distributed and advertised within both the City of Mississauga and the City of Toronto. In addition, City of Toronto staff has been part of the Technical Advisory Committee throughout the project.</p> |
| | <p>On page 5.19 when writing about "the public"-at this point in the project were the Toronto Public involved?</p> | <p>Yes, residents from the City of Toronto were invited to all consultation events during the EA Terms of Reference and EA itself.</p> |
| | <p>On page 7.35 the E.A. states that removing 235 meters of sand beach will have negligible impact on users. I beg to differ.Beach users will be crammed into a much shorter distance.Soft landing spots for kayakers ,wind surfers and kite boarders will be greatly reduced.</p> | <p>Your statement is incorrect. On page 7.35 it states that the LWC will reduce or alter the amount of physically accessible sand beach at the water's edge by approximately 235m. This area of beach is not being removed however, the character will change and this change in character will have a negligible effect on users. The length of beach available to the public will be much longer than the current conditions.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | <p>On page 7.48 the draft EA discusses parking. This is a huge issue. Parking at Marie Curtis park is already at premium on summer weekends. Access to the new park will be severely restricted because of the industry at the Mississauga waterfront. If a Mississauga park is going to be drawing in huge crowds of people the parking must be taken into consideration in the design stage. Already there is illegal parking going on at the east side of the park when the lots are full.</p> | <p>Land created by lake filling can only be used for a limited number of uses and parking is not one of them. CVC, TRCA and the Region of Peel will work with the City of Mississauga to provide parking as part of the planning for the Arsenal lands and the redevelopment at the former OPG Lakeview site.</p> |
| | <p>On page 10.4 Table 10-1 on the notice of commencement for PIC1 to PIC 3 the headers are for Region of Peel and Credit Valley. There is no mention of Marie Curtis a Toronto Park.</p> | <p>The content of a Notice of Commencement is outlined in the MOE Code of Practice for Consultation in Ontario's Environmental Assessment Process. The headers indicate the name of the project and the proponents. The map included in the notice indicates that the Project Study Area includes Marie Curtis Park.</p> |
| | <p>Page 10-12 I would like to point out that Direct Community Engagement occurred AFTER the preferred alternative had already been chosen.</p> | <p>Please see Chapter 10 of the EA for a detailed discussion of all consultation activities undertaken over the course of the EA. Direct community engagement occurred throughout the EA and was enhanced following the selection of the preferred alternative. It should be noted that comments with respect to the preferred alternative have been overwhelmingly positive.</p> |
| | <p>Page 10-9 table 10-4 indicates that at the BEGINNING of PIC 2 the Preferred Alternative island Beach C had already been chosen.</p> | <p>Correct, the preliminary preferred alternative was presented along with the evaluation on which this choice was based in order to get public comment on how we determined the preferred alternative and on the preferred alternative.</p> |
| | <p>Page 10-10 indicates the make up of the Community Liaison Committee. If a sand beach in a Toronto park was part of the discussion then a Toronto Councillor, a Toronto M.P., a representative from Toronto Parks and the TRCA should have also been on the committee. City of Toronto had no representation at the earlier discussions even though a public sand beach in a Toronto park was being considered to be destroyed.</p> | <p>The TRCA and City of Toronto have been involved in LWC project planning since the commencement of the Terms of Reference in February 2012. TRCA staff were present at all CLC meetings.</p> |
| | <p>Page 10-20 Beaches chart states 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. This suggests that by the time of the second public meeting the preferred alternative had already</p> | <p>Yes, please see Table 10.4. Based on the comments received following PIC 2, the preferred alternative was refined to minimize effects to the sand beach.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | <p>been chosen. Is this the case?</p> | |
| | <p>Page 10-33 Comment-"Will there be an opportunity to re-evaluate the alternative if during the refinement stage we learn new information?"</p> <p>Response-"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"</p> <p>I believe this is profoundly unfair seeing that Toronto was not represented on th CLC and that after the first Public meeting the Alternative had already been chosen.When more of the Toronto public learned of the plans the plan could only be modified not changed.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| | <p>on page 10-37 "what is the current construction of the shoreline near the water treatment plant?" The response is "It is mainly composed of armourstone rocks with a steep grade" Why is the 180 meter long sand beach not mentioned?</p> | <p>The comment referred to the current construction of the shoreline and the response referenced that the majority of it is engineered. The sand beach you refer to is not part of the constructed shoreline.</p> |
| | <p>On page 10-60 the document itemizes consultation activities with Toronto. On January 8, 2013 there was a meeting to discuss in particular Island Beach C. For some reason I cannot find particulars on this meeting in Appendix E-8. Who was at this meeting and what was discussed?</p> | <p>The items discussed at the meeting are listed in Table 10.20 and the meeting included staff from City of Toronto Parks and Water divisions, and staff from TRCA, and CVC.</p> |
| | <p>A couple of times in the document there are references to the sand being replenished. At one point it states both the east and west beaches are replenished and at one point it says the east beach is replenished. Could you please clarify this and state exactly how many truck loads of sand and where that sand has been deposited? In the last 25 years much sand has been deposited on the west beach of Marie Curtis Park.</p> | <p>Based on discussions with City of Toronto Staff, sand has been placed on both the east and west beaches on an as required basis. We do not have access to information about how many truck loads of sand.</p> |
| | <p>On Page 10-36 it is stated that "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 O.P.G.'s lakeview site is LOW.The former OPG lakeview site has undergone SOME remediation activities to address soil and groundwater contamination. Please explain how you are going to prevent ANY cross-contamination</p> | <p>Fill materials used for this project must meet Provincial regulations. The project will adhere to all Provincial requirements with respect to soil and ground water quality.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | from this groundwater and soil so that First Nation Communities gathering and using medicines in this new park will not be harmed? | |
| | True community engagement would have involved residents and representatives from the City of Toronto from the earliest stages .If a Toronto public beach had the potential to be impacted or destroyed by the project it was the responsibility of the proponents to ensure that Toronto residents were informed before the Preferred Alternative was chosen. | Representatives from the City of Toronto have been involved in project planning from the earliest stages. City of Toronto residents have been invited to attend all consultation events. |
| | I am against destruction of the wild beach on the west side of Marie Curtis Park. Please do not do this. So many people want to keep it as is... | Comment noted. |
| | Hello Please count me in on the folks who are not in favour of this crazy waste of money and the increased pollution to this area of Toronto that was recently identified in the news as a higher rate of cancer area. I am against the current plan which involves destruction of two beaches! Please redesign the LWC plan and properly consult public before ruining Marie Curtis beach. | Comment noted |
| | - I am against destruction of the wild beach on the west side of Marie Curtis Park | Comment noted |
| | <p>After reviewing the draft EA for the above project, I felt compelled to respond with concerns regarding this project, although your purpose for inviting responses at this point appears little more than gratuitous.</p> <p>First and foremost, Direct Community Engagement occurred after the preferred alternative had already been chosen. This suggests that by the time the second public meeting was scheduled, there was no opportunity to contribute any valuable/reasonable alternative suggestions by the general public. By all appearance, there were no invitations extended to the general public for review/feedback in Toronto until decisions had already been made.</p> | This statement is not correct. Residents from the City of Toronto were invited to attend consultation events from the inception of the EA. All notices were published in the Etobicoke Guardian and posted to a variety of on-line community resources including Councillor Grimes' newsletter. |
| | This project is a surprising candidate for funding under any kind of beautification program budget. There is no indication that leaving it alone would compromise the environment, public safety, erosion, etc. Marie Curtis Park/beach is already a beautiful park with a wonderful beach many currently enjoy. | No funding is being provided by City of Toronto as funding for the LWC project will come from the Region of Peel. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | <p>Why would Ontario want to inject an extraordinary amount of tax dollars in fixing what isn't broken? Last I heard, Toronto City Hall was battling a losing war with budget demands and asking the Province for assistance with storm damage. That money, if earmarked for local parks, would be better served solving the water quality issues or cleaning up storm ravaged parks.</p> | |
| | <p>I also question how the environment/wildlife will be protected. How can you be certain that the quality of the fill is appropriate, will each load be tested for impurities ie petroleum? Are the cities being paid to accept the fill that isn't wanted in other communities? While it might seem like a clever and ideal way to dispose of waste to some (recipient communities are becoming more and more concerned about this practice), it seems more in tune with the garbage barge faux pas of the '80s.</p> | <p>An extensive soils testing and tracking and monitoring protocol will be used to ensure that every load of fill is clean and meets Provincial standards. Garbage and sites with impacted soils will not be accepted in the area.</p> |
| | <p>I'm a resident along Lakeshore and recently just heard about the unnecessary destruction of the sand beach and its surroundings. I've been going to and enjoying the lake along with the sand literally my entire life. It's been the only place that locals can retreat to that gives you a sense of being outside of the city. Not only will it disrupt the entire park for years to come with large truck traffic, pollution and destruction it will become a safe haven for west Nile. The parks gone through a lot already in the last few years, the public isn't asking for our tax paying dollars to turn out beautiful sand beach into gravel, something that will be significantly unenjoyable. Marie Curtis has a beach where people from all over town of all ages come to enjoy their time and have been for dozens and dozens of years. Why change that. Hope to be able to lay on the beach again this summer and the next.</p> | <p>Please review Chapter 7 of the EA for a complete discussion of project effects and benefits.</p> <p>The public will be able to continue relax and lay on the beach during and after construction.</p> |
| | <p>This message continues my concerns regarding the future of the sandy beaches located on west portion of Marie Curtis Park (adjacent lands included), and proposed method for Peel Region to deal with excessive earth problem. TRCA is recognized as a valuable organization and leader in important aspects of our environment. This also applies to completed construction projects. So I also appreciate new projects improving our environment. Furthermore I am not opposed to the idea of a trail extension around waste water treatment plant located west of M.C.P., as well, I am not opposed to the combining of industrial</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|---|
| | <p>business with environmental benefits. Unfortunately the project as presented ,called LWC, submits existing environmental values to industrial business, and the whole arduousness of LWC project has been transferred to Marie Curtis Park users, and Toronto property south/western boundaries.</p> | |
| | <p>In order to achieve goals presented in LWC project, such as new park and waterfront trail around sewage plant, it is not necessary to absorb whole west (hidden - smaller) sandy beach and convert a half of longer west sandy beach to cobble stone beach. Proposed construction access through west portion of Marie Curtis Park and absorbing most of West Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail is not the only reasonable option either. - Why not use Hydro Rd. and existing infrastructure - internal roads of former Power Plant ending near potential lake fill located nearby the existing shoreline @ pier's trunk e.g.?</p> | <p>The alternatives were developed through the consideration of a number of factors relating to naturalization, coastal processes, public access and reuse considerations.</p> <p>Construction access through the OPG lands is not available at this time. Negotiations have been ongoing with OPG. OPG has written a letter of support for the Preferred Alternative for the LWC EA. The route through the Arsenal Lands, which is located in the Region of Peel was identified in the LWC EA as the Preferred and is the only access route currently available. The LWC EA identifies the rerouting of the existing pedestrian/bicycling trail to avoid any disruption to traffic flow during construction.</p> |
| | <p>- Why not use west side of the pier for the part or whole lake fill (least arduous)?</p> | <p>Locating the LWC project on the west side of the pier does not provide the public linkage between Marie Curtis Park and Inspiration Lakeview and would not be in conformance with the visioning undertaken for the Inspiration Lakeview project.</p> |
| | <p>- Why not create new park on former Arsenal Lands instead? Remediation of A.L. was carried out in 1998/1999 by TRCA for MC Park extension. Meanwhile recent construction activities on A.L. attempts to transfer this property for different purposes.</p> | <p>Planning for the Arsenal Lands will also be undertaken through a separate process. The construction activities currently underway there are temporary and are part of the Hanlan Feedermain expansion works. Plans to upgrade the existing Small Arms Building are also underway.</p> |
| | <p>-Why not start construction activities from pier's trunk instead of as proposed from Marie Curtis Park?</p> | <p>Construction access through the OPG lands is not available at this time. Negotiations have been ongoing with OPG. OPG has written a letter of support for the Preferred Alternative for the LWC EA. The route through the Arsenal Lands, which is located in the Region of Peel was identified in the LWC EA as the Preferred and is the only access route currently available.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | - Why not make only necessary shoreline correction required for waterfront trail along sewage plant, which may require minimum interference into existing shoreline and completely save both beaches? | The LWC project has 5 objectives which must be met. The naturalization, access and fiscal viability objectives cannot be met with only minimal change to the shoreline. Please see Chapter 4 of the EA. |
| | - Existing sandy beaches appear/have been so far for decades stable and do not require extra protection. Such protection may be required only as a result of bay geometry change caused by proposed lake fill near west beach. | Correct. The Goal of the LWC Project is to establish a new natural waterfront park along the eastern Mississauga Waterfront. The intent is not to provide shoreline protection for existing conditions. |
| | - It will not be the end of the world if the proposed fill and park will be located more south west in the order to minimize pollution concentration and preserve existing sandy beaches. | This cannot be done if the project is to meet its stated objectives particularly related to naturalization and access. The result of circulation modeling in support of the LWC EA indicates there will be no significant change in water quality. |
| | - Why not use deeper water for lake fill (although it may be more difficult but still possible to do and require less space) eventually? | This would not achieve LWC project objectives. |
| | - Why so marginal number of local people have been informed about LWC project? | Please see Chapter 10 of the EA. Extensive efforts to elicit public input has been made throughout the LWC EA process. |
| | - Why not leave unchanged Apple wood Creek as the present location of the delta appears o.k. | A key component of the LWC EA is to reestablish a wide range of natural ecosystem habitats that once occurred along the coast in this area. This includes the creation of coastal wetland habitats bounded by coastal meadows and forests. A key component to ensure ecological function is providing connections with both the Lake and Applewood and Serson Creeks. . |
| | - I didn't find in proposed design of the project any attempt to present other options than those which require existing beaches destruction in whole or greater part. | Please see Chapter 5 of the EA. The alternatives considered had varying degrees of overlap on Marie Curtis Park Beach West. Four of the alternatives did not overlap with all or a significant part of Marie Curtis Park Beach West. Through the use of the groyne and refinements of the Preferred, we were able to greatly reduce the degree of overlap with Marie Curtis Park Beach with the preferred alternative of the LWC. |
| | Nov. 27 2013 in Cawthra Senior Centre was held public presentation for Peel Region Projects. During this presentation information was released about "Inspiration Lakeview project", comprising converting portion of OPG former Power Plant property into recreational area in | Construction access through the OPG lands is not available at this time. Negotiations have been ongoing with OPG. OPG has written a letter of support for the Preferred Alternative for the LWC EA. The route through the Arsenal Lands, which is located in the Region of |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | vicinity of pier's trunk (studies in force), so they also need construction access for this project. Why not create one construction access for both projects? | Peel was identified in the LWC EA as the Preferred and is the only access route currently available. |
| | Building of rubble dykes (berms necessary to prevent direct contact of the soil fill with the lake) near the beach as per last version of the project will cause migration with the waves of the smaller rubble particulars such as bricks, and blocks, other smaller concrete chunks to the beaches. This processing may not be visible immediately, but should be evident within say 5 years. So in this configuration of the lake fill we are going to loose all sandy beaches anyways, as a consequence of this project. Not only dykes will cause this problem, all close proposed structures will generate chunks converting sandy beaches into rock beaches as well. As I learned from the project and other sources, the west sandy beach is historical - being our heritage (recognized for possibly 200 years). Before Etobicoke Creek redirection after Hurricane Hazel in 1954, this beach was in form of sandy bar separating the creek from lake to allow discharge to the lake near Apple wood Creek. But it was a sandy beach anyways, and developed naturally in a positive manner for the environment. As a frequent user of this beach for past 24 years I had a chance to observe these processes, and enjoyed the beauty of the beach, quietness, being thankful for such gift from previous, and current generations who took care of this little wilderness, quietness within very noisy city. For those 24 years we had organized many informal groups of colleagues, friends, enthusiasts of windsurfing, swimmers, canoe, kayak, surfboard users, fisherman's, walking along the beach people and some more interested among them, with many joining our "clubs", being successful in this kind of recreation. Then when the era of kite surfing and paddle boarding came, a new enjoyable activity positively affected the beach and adjacent bay. Is this quiet form of beach and bay use invasive to the local environment? Will the proposed 7-10 years construction activities - with associated turbidity, pollution, absorbing hidden beach and half of the west beach plus over 30 hectares of the bay, plus large portion of the living park's west side, larger portion of traditional west bicycle trail not be invasive to the local environment? Who | Confinement berms are required in the early stage of the project. Confinement berms will be buried by vegetation in the hind area of the project with revetment and cobble beaches in the fore area. Turbidity resulting from project construction will be limited in time and space, and modeling suggests that there is no significant impact on pollution. Opportunities for enjoyment of the shoreline, nature appreciation, and a sense of being out of the City will be enhanced as a result of the Project. The Trail will be realigned to ensure no change in pedestrian and bicycle flow during construction and following construction there will be several additional trail routes made available through the area. Construction will occur during weekdays allowing undisturbed use of the Park in the evenings and weekends. |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| | believes that?. | |
| | <p>Let me present some other comments to controversial statements found in the project.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cobble beach is not the same as the sandy beach -just let those not recognizing the difference, try to walk barefoot or with neoprene boots over it. Who wants people to walk over wearing construction boots? | Comment noted. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The swampy pond is not the same as sandy waterfront beach. I believe this does not require an explanation | Comment noted; the project does not consider construction of a swampy pond. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only 12 m of the trail will be affected according to your team statement. Why then about 300 - 700m (depending on version) of the existing trail's length is covered with proposed access route? The author means 12 m wide access route then? The access route will be excluded from construction site? If not it will be against safety regulations (MOL) to open the access to public after work hours. What will be the condition of the existing trail after even 1-st day of 200 trucks delivery. Is it environmentally friendly to construct heavy roadway through park lands and their ecosystem? | <p>The 12m refers the maximum amount that the proposed access road would extend into the City of Toronto along the existing trail. In discussions with City of Toronto staff and following a site walk along the trail, it is apparent that this amount of overlap into the City of Toronto can be reduced to only five metres or less. The access road will be following the alignment of the existing waterfront trail to minimize impacts. This access road will widen the existing pathway to allow for two way construction truck access. A new trail section will be construction along Lakeshore to ensure the flow of pedestrian and cyclist traffic during the construction period. The existing Waterfront Trail will be reinstated at the end of construction or rerouted according to the recommendations of the Arsenal Lands Master Plan.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Somewhere in the project I found that the reason for the waterfront trail relocation is that it is not safe to ride a bike on the current portion of the trail along the Lakeshore Road East. So for about 10 years the length of such unsafe trail will be significantly increased. Does it make sense? | The statement is not correct. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trail around sewage plant requires fill. That much - over 30 hectares? Just 10-15 m maximum offset from existing shoreline protection is enough! (See Mimico Linear Park phase 2- where such narrow fill was enough). | This would not meet stated project objectives. Please see Chapter 2 of the EA. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Park supervisor stated that extra sand had been placed over west beach. Could this statement be more specific I have never seen any extra sand delivered to the west beach during last 24 years. In such circumstances isn't cooperation suggested to relocate lake fill to the west side of the pier and use the existing | Construction access through the OPG lands is not available at this time. Negotiations have been ongoing with OPG. OPG has written a letter of support for the Preferred Alternative for the LWC EA. The route through the Arsenal Lands, which is located in the Region of Peel was identified in the LWC EA as the |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|---|
| | <p>transportation infrastructure: Hydro Rd. and OPG lands roadways for delivery instead of those proposed in the project? Even if it requires extreme negotiation effort, the benefits cannot be underestimated.</p> <p>I am categorically opposed to annihilation of Etobicoke's landmark, especially that it seems to be planned to be done surreptitiously, without real public knowledge. What is the public rationale of it?</p> | <p>Preferred and is the only access route currently available.</p> |
| | <p>I live in the area and enjoy Marie Curtis Park on a regular basis spring, summer, fall and winter!! I am against any more changes</p> <p>To the park and surrounding areas. As A resident, Marie Curtis Park is very enjoyable as it is even with all the current changes done, the path is still the path, just because it is new ultimately is it is the same.</p> <p>Do not do anything to the beach, they are best as is, no need to be disturbing them.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| | <p>add me to your list for people who want to preserve Marie Curtis ... I'm not a retiree with lots of time, but I'll be happy to add my name to lists, etc.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| | <p>a resident of Long Branch and a user of Marie Curtis Park summer and winter please note the following.</p> <p>- I am against destruction of the wild beach on the west side of Marie Curtis Park</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| | <p>My experience with the TRCA and trails is the Mimico Linear Park. What an absolute disappointment. For many years we tried to have community input to no avail. Decisions were made in 2003, no input wanted past that date. It is too narrow, no benches or place to sit and there are conflicts between cyclists and dogwalkers. Dogwalkers deliberately block cyclists who are using "their" trail. We have been waiting nearly 2 years to have signs put up for cycling. No place to throw a frisbee or anything park related except walking. Just don't plan to stop anywhere. Here is my view of the future based on my dealings with the TRCA.</p> <p>Users will find a trail too narrow for the comfortable sharing of space by both people walking and people riding bikes. Users of</p> | <p>Trails for the LWC Project will be designed according to applicable trail guidelines pertaining to Waterfront Trail standards, and CVC/ City of Mississauga trail guidelines.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity for public input on the detailed design.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------|
| | <p>different types should be brought into contention as much as possible. Busy sections should never be wider, nor should the trail be ever twinned at places that are likely, nor have been persistently found, to have this contention. We want to estimate the number of people who are using our trail by the complaints we receive.</p> <p>Users will also find that they will only want to keep moving along the trail and will find few reasons or places to stop and rest, nor to do other things.</p> <p>Because the trails are only recreational they will never be cleared in the winter. Therefore of little use for transportation. Trail users must bring their own way-finding (maps, charts, compass, sextant, GPS, etc) as the TRCA will not print & distribute maps, nor post any route finding signs of any kind along routes. Junctions along the trail, as well as connectors to/from the trail will never be signed. No maps showing the adjacent community will be posted, ever. Signage will only consist of random pictures and brief blurbs about plants and animals that may or may not be found in the vicinity. Would-be trail users will have difficulty finding and using the trail, and will have no help in knowing where the trail goes, nor have any help in finding any points of interest along the trail, nor any means of knowing of what the trail connects to. Trail users must be prepared beforehand, or else be willing to invest the time to get to know the trail by trail & error. If a map is posted, it will be at an inconvenient location & invite users to see segment of trail that they came from.</p> <p>Trail users who are in a wheelchair, or who are pushing strollers and/or other wheeled conveyances, should never have a problem as long as they stay on that trail segment. However, getting on or off the trail, or connecting to other trail segments, may prove difficult. (see next point)</p> <p>People like to congregate and look-out over bridges. Some people fish from bridges. Bridges should always be narrower than the trail segments they connect in order to save money. As contention increases, as bridges encourage people to connect to different trail segments, should be places of difficulty for wheeled conveyances to travel over. Bridge decking, as much as possible, should be made from wood to be slippery and</p> | |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|----------|
| | <p>treacherous to wheeled conveyances. Bridges should also have multiple speed bumps of some sort to discourage people on bike from riding too fast; and these bumps should also make it inconvenient to stroller and wheelchairs and anything else with wheels. (see previous point)</p> <p>Bridges should never have "bump-outs" where people can linger and hang-out without interfering people who are merely crossing over the bridge. As these bump-outs will never exist, there is no point to make them large enough to accommodate benches, nor other places to sit & rest.</p> <p>Bushes, trees, and other plants will be trimmed back from the edge of the trail only along flat, straight & unencumbered portions of the trail. Plants will grow over and narrow the trail near junctions, at curves, and along areas of significant grade. Strategic planing of, and lack of trimming of, Trees, bushes & plants will mean sight-lines will be especially difficult at junctions and along curves; even more so if the curve is also on a grade.</p> <p>Benches, if provided, will be far and few between. Benches should always face the trail, and never face towards any vistas nor any other park features (like children's play areas). Picnic benches will NEVER be installed or placed.</p> <p>No shelters of any kind will be provided.</p> <p>Bathrooms will never be installed. No place to get water.</p> <p>No bike parking of any kind will be provided, not even near any park features which may act as an anchor. Families who ride to, for instance a play area, should never find enough bike parking to be able to leave their bikes to play, have a picnic and walk around the area knowing that their bikes will be safe. Users on bicycles will only find it possible to ride through the along the trail must never find convenient places to stop and park their bike.</p> <p>Wherever the trail crosses a place with motor-vehicle traffic, the trail must make this connection as dangerous as practical. Users should find trail segments broken up by driveways and cross-roads, and should be deterred from leaving that segment. Users should not find a well-connected trail system.</p> <p>In short, the trail is not something to encourage the community to come and linger in the park, it a only means of getting through the park. The trail is the primary feature to be found in the park,</p> | |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>and that should be highlighted by placing a few benches facing the trail. the trail should be so narrow that all users are uncomfortable when multiple users are using the trail at the same time; contention is the keyword.</p> <p>I am also disappointed by a cobble beach. Right now one of the last natural sand beaches in Toronto is at Marie Curtis. Sand beaches encourage swimming sunbathing and using a beach. A cobble beach is uncomfortable, manufactured and poorly used. I am dismayed that your staff wouldn't even listen to suggestions that sand is what the community wants.</p> <p>I know this is not what you want to hear but it s what I honestly fell. I had great hopes for the potential of this park. Not now. On February 5 I am attending the Lakeshore Planning Council AGM. The guest speaker is going to talk about Olmstead parks. I look at the vision and creativity of his designs then what we are going to get. It is sad.</p> | |
| | <p>I urge you to suspend any further work on this project as there are myriad concerns that have not been properly addressed not the least of which is that the Toronto portion of the project contains a rare natural sand beach that must be saved and protected from future damage resulting from work on this project.</p> <p>The project has not been properly communicated to City of Toronto residents East of the project that use the beach and park. I encourage your team to bring more citizens into the loop which includes adjacent communities of New Toronto, Alderwood and Long Branch. Thank you.</p> | <p>Comment noted. Please see Chapter 10 of the EA for a full discussion of how concerns have been addressed and what consultation has been undertaken.</p> |
| | <p>The concept and goals of the Lakeview Waterfront Project are wonderful!</p> <p>How the citizens of Toronto have been kept out of the public consultation process, and how their input about protecting the Marie Curtis Park sand beach has been ignored is shameful. The sand beach at Marie Curtis park is a treasured, well-loved and well-used little piece of paradise. Yet the LWC proponents intend to destroy half the sand beach by putting cobblestone on 235 metres of it.</p> <p>Very few people living in the City of Toronto Ward 6 know that</p> | <p>The citizens of Toronto have been invited to engage in the consultation process since the commencement of the Terms of Reference in February 2012. Please see Chapter 10 for this information.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 6 of the EA for a description of the changes to the character of the sand beach.</p> |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------|
| | <p>half of our beautiful sand beach is going to be destroyed, so there has been no outcry. The LWC Project proponents have done their best to ensure very few citizens in Toronto realize we will lose half of our beach.</p> <p>The construction phase of this project has not yet begun, however the LWC proponents are not willing to re-open public consultation and include the citizens of Toronto because you have already arrived at a preferred solution without us. You actually state in the draft EA that you will not re-open consultation.</p> <p>I am aware that most of the project is in Mississauga, but the impact to our beach is HUGE. Instead of building on what we have you are destroying it and replacing it with something else. Why can't we keep our beautiful little sand beach and have the Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project. It is possible to have both. There is no will among the developers of the project to make it happen.</p> <p>I saw in the EA how you detailed the feeble attempts to "consult" the people of Toronto. Let's look at your efforts to consult the citizens of Toronto without all the smoke and mirrors you employ.</p> <p>On your Community Liaison Committee, there wasn't one person from Toronto or representing Toronto. Our MP and City Councillor were not included, nor were any Toronto's business organizations or community groups on it. Please clarify for me how this is open, inclusive public consultation. I am puzzled how you arrived at that conclusion.</p> <p>The EA states that there was a sign put in Marie Curtis Park parking lot for a few days prior to the Public Information Sessions. Those were not consultations – you were in the park to tell us what you had already decided. You had your preferred option. The draft EA states that you "NOTED" our input, which proves you did nothing with our input other than writing it down.</p> <p>The sign and the people manning the tent talked about the Lakeview Waterfront Project, they did not raise the impact to the sand beach unless they were asked about it. When they were asked about it – they rhapsodized about the project and said there would be a negligible impact to a degraded beach.</p> <p>Everytime we raised concerns about losing half our sand beach</p> | |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------|
| | <p>one of the proponents would pipe up to tell us it was degraded. If that is degraded sand beach – it looks like a little piece of heaven to me and many of my neighbours.</p> <p>As a matter of fact in the EA the word degraded is used 27 times (that’s not including the Appendices).</p> <p>Our beautiful little beach is described in the EA as: “This is not a dune as the sand is replenished by the City of Toronto and influenced by waves rather than being formed by wind. The feature is generally degraded, with significant amounts of refuse and trampling due to pedestrian activities.”</p> <p>Your description is not the beach I see when I go to Marie Curtis park. Replenishing sand is part of maintaining a park with a sand beach. How does replenishing the sand make it more reasonable to destroy half of the sand beach? You propose replenishing it with STONE! That is your idea of a better solution?</p> <p>The EA also mentions it is not a Blue Flag beach. That is irrelevant. You folks are missing the point.</p> <p>Marie Curtis park has a sand beach located in an urban city with very few sand beaches. It is a rarity, is a treasure and we should do everything we can to protect and enhance it. Little kids go to this beach to walk barefoot and dig in the sand. People go to sit on the beach and enjoy the lake and the sand.</p> <p>Have you ever tried making a sand castle on a cobble beach? The citizens of Toronto are being misled. You didn’t want to educate them on the loss of half of the sand beach when you had your tent in Marie Curtis park. You didn’t want to include us in open honest public consultation where you detailed the impact to the beach because you might have to choose another option if the citizens of Toronto realized they could keep the sand beach and the LWC project could still go ahead using another design.</p> <p>Myself and other people who use the beach specifically asked for a sign to be put on the beach similar to signs developers put up, and we asked it be displayed all summer. We also asked that the sign focus on the impact of the project to the beach. However, you gave us a small sign on the ground in the parking lot for a few days announcing the Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project information sessions. Did you mention in the</p> | |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------|
| | <p>EA that the print on the sign was so SMALL that you had to get out of the car to actually read it? I think you should add that to your EA draft. You should also add to the EA that NO ONE KNEW anything was happening to their neighbourhood beach and that is exactly what you folks wanted.</p> <p>You should be embarrassed to claim you have had open public consultation. Efforts to consult and inform the citizens of Toronto about the project and the impact to Marie Curtis park beach have been just enough that you can claim you have public consultation and look good to the Ministry. But we both know that open, inclusive public consultation did not take place for the citizens of Toronto.</p> <p>You talk about the ads in the Guardian and the flyers delivered. I am sure the folks at the Ministry will be impressed. However, nothing about Marie Curtis Park Beach was mentioned in either the Guardian Ads or the flyers. So again the citizens of Toronto were not informed there would be an impact to the sand beach located in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>It is almost like you purposely misled the citizens of Toronto isn't it?</p> <p>I mean, if one thought that you folks were manipulative and had a hidden agenda to push your preferred option ahead at any cost.</p> <p>I was at a private meeting that you held to inform the handful of problem citizens like myself why your preferred option was the best final solution. People at the meeting shared knowledge they had about the beach with you and it was dismissed as anecdotal evidence. We were told that your conclusions were based upon scientific modeling – which is really an educated guess, and on professional judgement.</p> <p>Our knowledge and history living in the area were dismissed. Just like our input and concerns have been dismissed. Actually I have found the proponents quite dismissive of the citizens of Toronto in every stage of this project.</p> <p>Let's look at one of the professional judgements in the EA which reads...“Land creation activities have the potential to change the recreational opportunities at Marie Curtis Park west's existing sand beach. Changes to the sand beach could affect the recreational experience of current beach users. Potential effects</p> | |

Table E9-1 – Disposition of Public Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------|
| | <p>are assessed using professional judgment.”</p> <p>It is good that you folks are so wise that you can decide for us whether or not we are really losing anything of value when you destroy half of our sand beach.</p> <p>Mr. Charendoff the most dis-heartening thing about this process is that you will steamroll us and destroy our treasured neighbourhood beach and there doesn't seem to be anything we can do to keep our beach intact and still see the Lakefront Waterfront Connection plan move ahead.</p> <p>I hope you and all the other proponents are proud of your efforts.</p> <p>I guess for you the ends justify the means. I expect better.</p> | |
| First Nations and Métis | | |
| | <p>Thank you for your consultation request to Alderville First Nation regarding the above noted project which is being proposed within our Traditional and Treaty Territory. We appreciate the fact that Credit Valley Conservation recognizes the importance of First Nations Consultation and that your office is conforming to the requirements within the Duty to Consult Process.</p> <p>As per the Alderville First Nation Consultation Protocol, your proposed project is deemed a level 3, having minimal potential to impact our First Nations' rights, therefore, please keep Alderville apprised of any changes to your project.</p> | Comment noted |
| | <p>As a member of the Williams Treaty First Nations, Rama First Nation acknowledges receipt of your letter dated December 12, 2013, which was received the same day by Purolator.</p> <p>A copy of your letter has been forwarded to Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Please direct all future correspondence and inquiries, with a copy to Rama First Nation, to Ms. Sandy-McKenzie.</p> | Comment noted |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---|--|--|
| MOE – Environmental Approvals Branch | | |
| 1.0 Introduction | Confirm that no MOE Environmental Compliance Approvals will be required and no Permits to Take Water will be required from the MOE Environmental Approvals Branch- and include rationale- section 1.5 (table 1.2) | None of these approvals will be required for the LWC Project. |
| Section 2.1 | Indicate that section 12.0-References lists all the background studies and provides links to those documents that are available on the internet. | Where possible internet links to referenced documents will be provided in Section 12 |
| Section 2.1.1.4 | The sentence that reads “Cost savings are possible if fill haul sites are located more than 120 minutes from the fill source”- should it read “less than 120 minutes...?”- please confirm | Yes, the original statement is correct. |
| Section 2.1.2.2 Project Opportunities | The sentence that reads “Similar shoreline restoration projects, such as Port Union in Scarborough, resulted in 10 and 100 fold increases in pelagic fish populations (e.g., Emerald Shiners) along the coast.”- not sure what “resulted in 10 and 100 fold increases...” is insinuating- please consider revising wording. | To clarify, the shoreline restoration projects have resulted in the increase in fish populations. |
| | Include copies of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments in the appendices to the EASR and provide references in section 3.3. | These documents will be provided as appendices to the EA. |
| Section 3.1.2 | The sentence that reads “The LWC Regional Study Area overlies the Etobicoke Shale Outcrop which consists of a thin till layer that originally covered the bedrock has been scoured by glacial action leaving a prominent area of bedrock substrate that extends from the mouth of Mimico Creek westward to Burlington.” – sentence does not make sense and could be re-worded- please consider revising. | We have considered revising the sentence and will add the word “that” between “bedrock” and “has”. |
| Section 3.36 | Consider including a sentence/reference which indicates which groups were included in the consultation list and what notices/documents were provided for their review/comment. (reference to Section 10.7) | Proposed edit has been made |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|
| Section 4.1 | 3rd paragraph- Include which section of the EA Act identifies the identification and evaluation of “alternatives to” the undertaking (i.e. 6.1 (2)) | Proposed edit has been made. |
| 5.3.1.3 Comparative Evaluation | Please list all of the objectives/criteria that were assessed for each alternative method (i.e. naturalization, access, etc) | The tables that contain this information have been referenced within this section. |
| 5.3.2.2 Access | Sentence indicates that “The evaluation of the access objective is based on three criteria:” - however four criteria are listed- please revise | Proposed edit has been made |
| Table 10.12 Agencies Contacted During the LWC Project EA Table 10.13 Final TAC membership | Change Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE) “Environmental Assessment Approvals Branch” to “Environmental Approvals Branch” | Proposed edit has been made |
| Ontario Power Generation | | |
| 1.3.2.2 | The Inspiration Lakeview work completed to date by the City resulted in a vision. The City, Province and OPG continue to work together to develop a “Master Plan” for the lands, anticipated to be completed in 2014. OPG recommends reference be made to “Inspiration Lakeview: A vision and next steps” 2011 replace “Master Plan” in this section. | Proposed edit has been made |
| 1.5 (Table 1.2) | The referenced table provides a listing of various approvals required for the project. OPG recommends that OPG’s approval be added in the event the project requires the use of OPG’s water lots. This approval may take the form of a license or lease agreement with OPG. | Table 1.2 is to list approval requirements from regulators. Agreements with respect to the use of property or land, or in this case water lots, will be noted separately. |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|---|
| 2.1.3.1 | OPG recommends that this section be revised to include a section describing the licenses provided to the City by OPG for both recreational parklands and a waterfront trail. Although the alignment of the trail is north of the former Lakeview Generating Station operating island, this trail provides connectivity between Marie Curtis Park and Lakeview Promenade Park. The former operating island is fenced to protect the public from a safety perspective and the lands have not been remediated to a park standard that would allow public access at this time. | A statement will be added to this section to indicate what parts of the Waterfront Trail and parklands are provided by license to the City by OPG. |
| 2.3.1 | It is not understood as to why the areas for which the fill material is being sourced is not included in the LWC Regional Study Area. This information would be of assistance to understand the extent of fill being transported to the Lakeview area. | Fill materials are being sourced from other capital works projects and exactly which projects may not be known until the time of construction. The effects for removing the fill material from the sites as been assessed as part of the EAs for these projects. Therefore, the LWC project only needs to examine the effect of the movement of the fill material from area highways to the LWC site. |
| 3.3.1.3 | Please note that the Inspiration Lakeview visioning process was not limited to OPG’s Lakeview site. It also included additional lands to the north of the OPG Lakeview site currently designated for employment uses. | Comment noted |
| 3.3.2 | This section does not recognize ownership of water lots by OPG that are located within the Project Study Area. OPG recommends that this section include a description of the water lots owned by OPG if they are to be included as part of the LSA. | Comment noted. We will include a statement with respect to the water lots owned by OPG. |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| 3.3.3.1 | OPG recommends that this section include a description of the licenses referred to in our comments in Item #3, including both the recreational license and waterfront trail license. Although the lands under these licenses are not directly on the waterfront, both licenses provide for passive and active recreational activities in the vicinity. OPG licenses approximately 16 acres of parkland to the City for recreational programming. In addition, the waterfront trail license provides connection opportunities between Lakefront Promenade Park and lands to the east of our Lakeview site. | Proposed edit has been made |
| 3.3.4.2 | Please provide source for this information. The date noted (1989) for the last two barges referenced is inconsistent with the 1968 sinking of the three barges. | The barges were manufactured in 1889. |
| 5.2.1.2 | OPG recommends changing “Inspiration Lakeview planning activities currently contemplate re-routing...” to “Inspiration Lakeview visioning activities contemplated the possibility of re-routing”. | Proposed edit has been made |
| 5.2.4.2 | OPG recommends inclusion of the word “potential” to precede “a waterfront connection between the existing waterfront trail” in the third sentence. | Proposed edit has been made |
| 6.1.2.2 | Are there any implications for the risk of flooding or flood plain/hazard land mapping on the OPG Lakeview site as a result of the proposed flow re-routing? Please confirm. | No, there is no additional flood risk to the OPG Lakeview site as a result of the Serson flow re-routing. |
| 6.3 | With respect to the comment, “The OPG lands are currently unavailable for use by the LWC Project proponents to access the construction area”, OPG recommends that an explanation as to why the lands are unavailable be included. OPG has advised Peel/CVCA staff that it has concerns with the length of time that hauling activity would take place on our Lakeview site and is particularly concerned as to how this may affect the master plan being developed in collaboration between the City, Province and | We have noted in the EA that construction access through the OPG lands is not available at this time. Negotiations have been ongoing with OPG. OPG has written a letter of support for the Preferred Alternative for the LWC EA. In order avoid unnecessary planning delays, the route through the Arsenal Lands, which is located |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---|---|--|
| | OPG. The goal of the master plan is to redevelop OPG’s Lakeview site into a sustainable mixed-use community. The length of time proposed to haul fill through the Lakeview site may not align with the master plan. This item will be subject to further discussion between the parties. | in the Region of Peel was identified in the LWC EA as the Preferred. |
| Page 7-56 | The statement made in the second sentence is not entirely accurate. As described in our comments, OPG licenses a trail to the City that connects Marie Curtis Park to Lakeview Promenade Park. Although this trail is not directly along the waterfront, connectivity between these parks is provided as of today. If the second sentence is to remain, OPG recommends adding the word “immediately” to precede” along the waterfront” to be more accurate. | Proposed edit has been made |
| Table 10-12 | OPG recommends adding the various department that were included in the consultation, including Real Estate and Services, Law and Corporate Relations and Communications. | Proposed edit has been made |
| Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport | | |
| 3.3.4.1 | The ESR states that Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessments were completed for this project. For your information MTCS records indicates that a Stage 1 and Stage 2 report have been received by this Ministry and have been entered into the provincial register. | Comment noted |
| 3.3.4.2 | The ESR states that a marine archaeological assessment was completed for this project. MTCS records indicate that we have received the report but we still have to review it. Our letter will be sent in due course. | Comment noted |
| 3.3.5 | This section does not accurately describe the current cultural heritage environment nor does it use language and terminology consistent with either the heritage designation by-laws or the Ontario Heritage Act. | Section 3.3.5 has been revised |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------|
| | <p>The second paragraph indicates that structures within the Arsenal Lands are designated under the OHA. In fact, the whole of the Arsenal Lands (Part 1 on RP 43R4461) are designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest by the City of Mississauga By-law No. 258-2009. The Small Arms Building and Water Tower are only two among many heritage attributes listed in the By-law. The list of Heritage Attributes also include rows of trees, a woodlot, setbacks, open space and views etc.</p> <p>The last sentence of the second paragraph states that the rifle range and baffles will formally be designated as a heritage site by the end of 2013. It is not clear what this is referring to.</p> <p>MTCS recommends that section 3.3.5 be revised to provide a more accurate and robust description of the current culture heritage environment, together with corresponding mapping to indicate the location of the designated and/or inventoried heritage.</p> <p>The following is based on information provided by TRCA and the City of Mississauga. We in no way represent that this fully represents the extent of the cultural heritage environment within the EA study area. That said, the following are heritage designations/recognitions that affect the study area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Arsenal Lands (Part 1 on RP 43R-4461) designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest by By-law No. 258-2009. The designation By-Law and Heritage 3 of 4 Register Report provide a comprehensive Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and a Description of Heritage Attributes, and as such are not repeated here. 2. The Arsenal Lands have been identified as being a unique | |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|----------------------------------|
| | <p>cultural heritage landscape and are included on the City of Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory.</p> <p>3. The Long Branch Indoor Rifle Range located at 1300A Lakeshore Road East (Part 1 RP 43R-34702) is designated as being of CHVI by. The Statement of CHVI and the Description of Heritage Attributes are included in the By-law.</p> <p>4. Notice of Intention to Designate Heritage Property issued on December 11, 2013 for the Outdoor Firing Range at 1300 Lakeshore Road East.</p> | |
| 6.3.3.3 | <p>The proposed access routes were evaluated under four criteria including removal, disruption and proximity to “heritage features” and potential for archaeological resources. It was determined that “none of the routes would involve direct removal or disruption to designated heritage features”. . . .and “Only “proximity to heritage features “ and “potential for archaeological resources” were considered further in the analysis” (page 6-43)</p> <p><i>Indicator: Distance between road and heritage feature (page 6-44)</i></p> <p>This section lists the heritage features considered in considering this access route.</p> <p>As noted above, the whole of the Arsenal Lands are subject to the heritage designation by-law. While the proposed access route considers distance, proximity etc. to individual heritage attributes identified in the designation by-law, the ESR should nevertheless make clear that the whole property is subject to designation By-law.</p> <p>Accordingly, MTCS recommends that this section be revised to clearly articulate the extent of the designation and use language</p> | Section 6.3.3.3 has been revised |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>consistent with the OHA and the designation by-law (eg. heritage attributes (not heritage feature).</p> <p>In addition, since the proposed access route will impact a designated heritage property, Heritage Planning staff of the City of Mississauga should be afforded the opportunity to review this EA report and its conclusions and recommendations. Mississauga Heritage Planning staff should also be consulted for advice on Heritage Permit requirements.</p> | |
| | <p>We understand that an alternative access arrangement is actively being pursued with Ontario Power Corporation (OPG). As MTCS previously advised in 2012, the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (Standards & Guidelines), prepared pursuant to Section 25.2 of the Ontario Heritage Act, came into effect on July 1, 2010. The Standards & Guidelines apply to all ministries and prescribed public bodies, including OPG. These may apply to this undertaking should the project involve a property of cultural heritage value or interest located on land owned or controlled by the province. Please note provisions may be applicable when property is transferred from provincial control. This may include a long-term lease. We recommend that MTCS heritage staff be consulted.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| City of Toronto | | |
| <p>1.3.1.2</p> | <p>CVC is noted as the future owner of the new LWC Park once constructed. Who will own the portions of the park within TRCA/City of Toronto boundary (i.e. Any new land built or the groyne structure) – TRCA?</p> | <p>Discussions will be held between City of Toronto, CVC and TRCA during Detailed Design to resolve this issue.</p> |
| <p>2.1.3.1</p> | <p>Add to description of the Waterfront Trail in the second paragraph: To the east the Waterfront Trail travels south of the Arsenal Lands through Marie Curtis Park.</p> | <p>Proposed edit made.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| 2.1.3.1 | Paragraph 4: City of Toronto Parks staff would like to clarify that the although some of the debris that impacts the Marie Curtis Park shoreline, comes from the Etobicoke Creek, the majority comes from South and West of this site and washes in during storm events. | Edits made to reflect urban creeks and rivers as sources of debris. |
| 2.3.2 | Add: that Marie Curtis Park is managed and operated by the City of Toronto. | Proposed edit made. |
| 3.1.1.1 | <p><i>LWC Regional Study Area</i></p> <p>The City of Toronto portion of the LWC Project Study Area should also list the length of Marie Curtis Park beach that falls on the west side of Etobicoke Creek.</p> | Under the Project Study Area, the length of beach to the west of Etobicoke Creek has been added. |
| 3.1.1.1 | Paragraph 3: Suggested edit to last sentence - The City of Toronto has had to nourish Marie Curtis Park Beach on an as needed basis and not as part of routine maintenance operations, primarily focused on the east side of Etobicoke Creek. In response to recent storm events, and to ensure safety and to provide access for permitted uses such as volleyball, beach nourishment is now occurring (on an as needed basis) on the west side of Etobicoke Creek as well. Also remove reference to "Chapman" and replace with City of Toronto Parks Staff. | Proposed edit has been made |
| 3.1.5 | <p>Littoral Sediment Transport <i>LWC Regional and Project Study Area</i></p> <p>Paragraph 1: Suggested edit to last sentence - the City of Toronto has had to nourish the Marie Curtis Park beach on both sides of Etobicoke Creek to ensure safety and to continue to provide access for permitted uses such as volleyball. This is completed on an as needed basis only and is not a part of routine maintenance operations.</p> | Proposed edit has been made |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| 3.1.6 | <p>Ice and Debris <i>LWC Regional and Project Study Area</i> Last Sentence: Suggested edit - City of Toronto Parks staff have confirmed that as a part of their regular maintenance operations the beaches at Marie Curtis Park east and West are mechanically raked up to the municipal boundary. Parks would like it noted that there are no mechanical means to rake cobble.</p> | <p>Comment noted and proposed edit has been made.</p> |
| 3.3.3.1 | <p>Recreation <i>LWC Project Study Area</i> Paragraph 1: Suggested edit to last sentence – The Beach at Marie Curtis Park West is unofficially used by kite boarders and wind surfers. Recent park improvements to this area have added permitting for beach volleyball from May through October. The westerly limit of this beach is also an area used for socially unaccepted activities.</p> | <p>Proposed edit has been made.</p> |
| 3.3.3.1 | <p>Recreation <i>LWC Project Study Area</i> Paragraph 3: Suggested edit - The Waterfront Trail continues east – running south of the Arsenal lands through Marie Curtis Park to Etobicoke Creek.</p> | <p>Proposed edit made.</p> |
| 3.3.3.2 | <p>Marine <i>LWC Regional and Project Study Area</i> Paragraph 1: Suggested edit - Toronto Parks mechanically rakes the beaches at Marie Curtis Park 2 to 3 times a week Sand is added to the beaches by City staff on an as needed basis only and is not a part of routine maintenance operations.</p> | <p>Proposed edit made</p> |
| 5.1.4 | <p>The cross slope gradients of proposed beaches should be minimized to promote safe and walkable access to the water's edge. A slope of 4h:1v is listed here – how walkable is this? In another section of the report 5h:1v is referenced as assumption</p> | <p>This section documents assumptions that went into the generation of Alternatives for comparative purposes. Slopes were determined based on coastal processes and</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | for establishing the width of the beach and 6h:1v is referenced as the below water slope. A lesser slope is preferred. | beach materials and did not take into account accessibility at this time. |
| 5.2.4.2 | <p>Recreation Trail: A trail connection to the west towards the OPG and the “Inspiration Lakeview” lands is critical so as not to create a new park land form that is only accessible from the TRCA and City of Toronto property to the east. Parking, emergency and operational access need to be studied further and resolved in more detail with solutions provided for and accessible from within CVC and/or the City of Mississauga boundaries. To date it is unclear how the westerly trail connection will be made.</p> | This section documents assumptions made with respect to including a recreational trail in the Alternatives for comparative purposes. The issues raised by the City are common to all alternatives and were not dealt with at this stage of evaluation. |
| 5.3.2.2 | <p>Potential for changes to use of waterfront for recreation: Island Beach C alternative: City of Toronto notes on-going concern over impacts to entire length of Marie Curtis Park Beach West and loss of beach due to proposed landform in Island Beach C. It is understood that this option has been further developed to reduce these impacts and that a further reduction of impacts to the beach will be explored and considered through detailed design.</p> | Comment Noted. |
| Table 5.7 and 5.8 | City of Toronto notes concern over operational logistics of Island Beach C – Preferred Alternative as it relates to operations and maintenance of the naturalized areas, trails and beaches. Resolution to be sought through detailed design and an agreement or MOU between agencies to delineate responsibilities may be required. | Comment noted. CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will continue to meet with the City of Toronto throughout the detailed design phase to resolve issues arising from jurisdictional overlap and the interconnection of the LWC with facilities in Marie Curtis Park. |
| Fig 6.1 | <p>Overview of the LWC Project Preferred Alternative It is understood that this is a high level conceptual graphic of how the plan will layout. Trail connections are shown to connect at Marie Curtis Park beach west on the TRCA-City of Toronto side. Please confirm that trail connections will be made on the City of</p> | CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will continue to meet with the City of Toronto throughout the detailed design phase to resolve issues arising from jurisdictional overlap and the interconnection of the LWC |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | Mississauga property. Alternatives to this would need to be presented and fully vetted with City of Toronto staff prior to finalization. | with facilities in Marie Curtis Park. |
| 6.1.1.2 | Cobble Beach: To promote walkability and minimize scouring from wave action the transition from the below water slope and the above water slope should be more gradual and should be evaluated in more detail through detailed design. | The slope at the water’s edge is dictated by coastal processes. During detailed design we will re-assess materials and slopes to minimize maintenance requirements and optimize walkability to the extent possible. |
| 6.1.1.2 | Cobble Beach: Near groyne structure: It was understood that the area immediately west of the groyne will be comprised of sand for approximately 50m. Please confirm as this is not reflected clearly in the description provided. | The following text has been added to the EA. The 50-m of beach beyond the groyne will remain similar to the existing sand beach with sandy beach conditions dominating in summer, calm weather conditions shifting to more of a gravel during winter storms. |
| 6.1.1.2 | Please provide a cross section to show the slope and transition of the proposed beaches – and specifically at the transition to Marie Curtis Park Beach west. The description in words does not adequately or clearly illustrate the grade/condition of the proposed beach. | This information will be developed during detailed design and discussed with the City of Toronto. |
| 6.1.1.2 | What are the details relating to the groyne structure? How does it interact and bisect Marie Curtis Park beach west? More detail and sections of this structure and its interface with Marie Curtis Park Beach west are needed. | This information will be developed during detailed design and discussed with the City of Toronto. However, we will make providing access over and around this structure a key consideration in its design. |
| 6.1.1.5 | Shoreline Protection Grading: The crest of the cobble beach cannot be knocked down if the slope of the beach is not walkable. Please provide schematic sections and elevations to assist in understanding of proposed grades and transition to existing grades at Marie Curtis Park Beach west. | This information will be developed during detailed design and discussed with the City of Toronto. |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| 6.1.2.1 | <p><i>Site Grading and Topography:</i> Please provide schematic sections and elevations to assist in understanding of proposed grades and transition to existing grades at Marie Curtis Park Beach west.</p> | <p>This information will be developed during detailed design and discussed with the City of Toronto. However, it is anticipated that the LWC Project will start near existing grades where it overlaps with Marie Curtis Park Beach and increase in elevation as the project extends out further into deeper water.</p> |
| 6.2 | <p><u>Sediment and Debris:</u> Please confirm assumptions and anticipated operational logistics of debris management– along length of new shoreline. The City of Toronto maintains sand beach only. Ongoing discussion of operation and maintenance requirements for the new parkland will be required through detailed design.</p> <p><u>Naturalization:</u> Please confirm assumptions and anticipated operational logistics of maintenance of naturalized areas for portions that fall within TRCA and City of Toronto jurisdiction. The City of Toronto does not provide regular maintenance to naturalized areas. On-going discussion of operation and maintenance requirements for the new parkland will be required through detailed design.</p> <p><u>Recreational Trails:</u> Please confirm assumptions and anticipated operational logistics of trail maintenance and state of good repair for portions of trails that fall within TRCA and City of Toronto jurisdiction. The EA references the CVC policy for trail maintenance – please clarify. On-going discussion of operation and maintenance requirements for the new parkland will be required through detailed design.</p> | <p>As noted above, it is anticipated that the LWC will be owned and managed by CVC. During detailed design discussions will be held to determine who will be responsible for ownership and management of those aspects of the LWC that overlap with Marie Curtis Park and the Arsenal Lands.</p> <p>Operational logistics of trail maintenance will form part of ongoing discussions with Cities of Toronto and Mississauga and CVC. Maintenance of trails is anticipated to be fully assumed by CVC as part of ownership and maintenance, and to adhere to Policies 4.2.A.A and 4.2.A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CVC. 2007. General Trail Maintenance Schedule. Operations: Operational Policies and Procedures • CVC. 2007. General Trail Maintenance. Operations: General Trail Maintenance |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| 6.3.2 | <p>Add bullets to list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish a communications strategy and protocol for managing communications between Cities, Agencies and Public through Construction - Coordination with City of Toronto for Construction signage as needed. Advanced notification requested. - Coordination with TRCA and City of Toronto for tree removals and restoration as required. | Proposed edit made. |
| 6.3.3.2 | <p>Indicator: Length of trail disrupted</p> <p>Construction access should minimize impact to any new Waterfront Trail improvements completed at the City of Toronto and City of Mississauga boundary.</p> <p>Add to the description for Alternative 2: The disrupted portion of Waterfront Trail within the City of Toronto will be limited Impacts to the trails within TRCA/City of Toronto limits should be minimized to within approximately 5 m of the boundary area. Any impacts beyond this must be discussed with City of Toronto staff.</p> <p>The Waterfront Trail within the Marie Curtis Park will become a dead-end trail for the duration of the LWC construction, therefore An alternate routing of Waterfront Trail will be established along Lakeshore Road East.</p> | Proposed edit made. |
| 6.3.3.2 | <p>Indicator: Area of Marie Curtis Park disrupted</p> <p>Construction access cannot be provided through Marie Curtis Park and LWC project activities must avoid all areas of recreational and trail use and any newly completed construction to the greatest extent possible.</p> | Comment noted |
| 6.3.3.2 | <p>Indicator: Nature of disruption to redevelopment activities</p> <p>Construction access cannot be provided through Marie Curtis Park</p> | Comment noted |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|---|
| | and LWC Project activities must avoid all areas of recreational and trail use and any newly completed construction including the Waterfront Trail improvements completed at the City of Toronto and City of Mississauga boundary to the extent possible. The trail within the Marie Curtis Park will become a dead-end trail for the duration of the LWC construction therefor an alternate routing of the Waterfront Trail will be established along Lakeshore Road East. | |
| 6.3.3.2 | <p>Summary of Access Route for Social Environment Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>It should be noted that Route 2 leaves all recently completed upgrades through Marie Curtis Park West intact, however does result in a dead-end trail at the limit of the City of Toronto Boundary.</p> | Comment noted |
| 6.4 | <p>Build-out Scenario 1 and 2 – OPG Water Lots</p> <p>How do the water lots relate to the area in front of Marie Curtis Park Beach west? Please provide a figure to show the limits of the water lots.</p> | Water lots in front of Marie Curtis Park are unalienated Crown land managed by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Figure 2.4 shows the limits of water lots that exist in the LWC Project Study Area. |
| 6.4.1 | <p>Stage 1 - Land Creation</p> <p>...tree protection and site drainage are listed twice</p> | Comment noted. Edit has been made. |
| 6.4.2 | <p>Stage 2 – Park Development</p> <p>It is understood that coordination with City of Toronto through detail design will be ongoing for review of details relating to park development.</p> <p>Will interpretive signage be installed on TRCA / City of Toronto Property? On-going coordination requested to assess.</p> | These details to be discussed during detailed design |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|-----------|---|---|
| Table 7-1 | <p>Compatibility: Add a “check” to impacts under the construction category for the “Changes to Parking Capacity” bullet. Construction activities will likely impact parking within Marie Curtis Park. As such the City of Toronto would like to request that a parking strategy be developed for both the construction period and post establishment of the LWC EA. The Marie Curtis West parking lot cannot provide parking for the new LWC Park. This lot is already very well used. In addition the entrance drive from Lakeshore Road East is closed between November 1st and late March.</p> | <p>Construction workers will be directed to park within the staging areas adjacent to the construction access route. Parking areas within MCP are too far removed from the staging areas for worker parking.</p> <p>As owners of the Arsenal Lands TRCA will work with the City of Mississauga for both the planning for the Arsenal Lands. The parties will also work with the City of Mississauga and OPG to address parking for users of LWC on the former lakeview site. Parking cannot be provided on the created land area.</p> |
| Table 7.1 | <p>What assumptions are being made with respect to operation and maintenance of portion of LWC Park that is within TRCA/City of Toronto jurisdiction? On-going consultation and coordination required to assess impacts.</p> | <p>To be addressed as part of detailed design. It is anticipated that CVC will own and manage the LWC.</p> |
| 7.13.1.2 | <p><i>Establishment and Post-Establishment Effects</i> To what extent was sediment from Etobicoke Creek considered in the modeling exercise regarding the impacts to the Lake Ontario shoreline by Marie Curtis Park beach west?</p> | <p>Sediment from Etobicoke Creek will either be deposited in the near shore or offshore areas of Lake Ontario. If the issue raised pertains to water quality from Etobicoke Creek, this was considered as part of the water quality modeling undertaken.</p> |
| 7.13.1.2 | <p><i>Establishment and Post-Establishment Effects</i> Please confirm if sediment and outfall from Etobicoke Creek was considered in the modeling exercise regarding the impacts to the Lake Ontario shoreline by Marie Curtis Park beach west? Where are these effects included and quantified in the EA document?</p> | <p>Sediment and outfall from Etobicoke Creek was considered as part of the water quality modeling undertaken. E.Coli and Total Phosphorus, the parameters of concern for the beaches, were used in the simulations and their contribution from Etobicoke</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | | Creek was used as an input to the lake model. |
| 7.3.2.1 | <p>Construction Effects – Indicator: Potential for signalization of trail crossing with construction vehicles Explanation for alternate route of Waterfront Trail would be more clearly illustrated if a graphic was provided. Where exactly is the “temporary entrance” that is referred to?</p> | A figure depicting the alternate route for the Waterfront trail and the temporary entrance will be provided in Chapter 6 |
| 7.3.2.1 | <p>Construction Effects – Indicator: Potential for dust, vehicle emissions and noise to affect park and Waterfront trail use and enjoyment. At no cost to the City of Toronto, the City of Toronto requests that signage be posted within Marie Curtis Park to inform park users of the LWC project well advance of construction start. Signage will be updated on an as needed basis through the duration of the project. Coordination with Parks for placement and installation required.</p> <p>Noise from construction activities will impact City of Toronto Residents. How does the City of Mississauga Noise Control By-Law 360-79 relate to neighbouring municipalities?</p> | The Noise Control By-laws of both municipalities are very similar. The only difference is the time limitations for construction work on Saturdays. There is no intention for construction to occur on Saturdays for the LWC project. |
| 7.3.2.1 | <p>Construction Effects – Indicator: Potential for changes in ability to access and use park during construction due to traffic congestion or changes to access. It is understood that the 7-10 year construction time frame is estimated. All measures should be taken to minimize the duration of the impacts to Marie Curtis Park West and the Waterfront Trail including methods considered for construction staging and sequencing.</p> <p>Impacts and restrictions to access in Marie Curtis Park West for construction need to be minimized in extent and duration. On-going consultation through detailed design needs to minimize and/or</p> | Agreed. |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|--|
| | <p>eliminate these impacts where possible.</p> <p>At no cost to the City of Toronto, the City of Toronto requests that signage be posted within Marie Curtis Park to inform park users of the LWC project well advance of construction start. Coordination with Parks for placement and installation required.</p> <p><i>Paragraph regarding the temporary walking path:</i> The City of Toronto has on-going concern about the temporary walking path specifically as it relates to safety and emergency access. Access to this trail for recreational and emergency purposes needs to be provided on City of Mississauga property. The entrance drive from Lakeshore Road East into Marie Curtis Park West is closed between November 1st and late March and cannot be considered as a possible access route.</p> | |
| 7.3.2.2 | <p>Establishment / Post-Establishment Effects <i>Indicator: Potential for changes to water quality at Marie Curtis Park with respect to swimming</i></p> <p>The City of Toronto has on-going concerns with respect to “the possibility of reduced local circulation velocities that may somewhat affect local water quality along the existing sand beach” in Marie Curtis Park.</p> <p>The report uses the phrasing that modeling results have indicated that “there may be a slight increase in e-coli levels immediately following rainfall events.” Previous communications regarding impacts to water quality from the project team indicated that changes would be negligible.</p> <p>The Draft EA does not communicate the same message with regard</p> | <p>The description of potential changes to water quality in this section has been revised to more accurately reflect the results of the modeling undertaken. The water quality modeling concludes that there is no significant change in water quality at Marie Curtis Park West Beach as a result of the LWC Project.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>to water quality near Marie Curtis Park Beach. Please address this apparent dichotomy in language; City staff are prepared to assist with addressing this point. For example, please quantify and define how these potential changes can be eliminated and/or monitored and if present can be mitigated. Decreases in the water quality along this beach are not desirable.</p> | |
| 7.3.2.2 | <p><i>Establishment / Post-Establishment Effects</i> <i>Indicator: Potential for changes to existing recreational activities on the sand beach at Marie Curtis Park West.</i> The indicator needs attention once the previous indicator is addressed. The following type of text may need to be addressed: Previous communications regarding impacts to water quality indicated that changes would be negligible. The draft EA does not communicate the same message with regard to water quality near Marie Curtis Park Beach. Please clarify change.</p> <p>Through detailed design impacts to the recreational use and experience of Marie Curtis Park Beach West must be minimized or eliminated if possible. This beach is well used and highly valued by the local area residents.</p> <p><i>Indicator: Potential for changes to use for windsurfers and kite boarders.</i> Reference is made to the installation of new signage for Windsurfers Kite Boarders in Marie Curtis Park West? Currently there is no signage in Marie Curtis Park west regarding this use. Please remove reference to future installation of signage at Marie Curtis Park beach west regarding kite boarding and windsurfing. Further discussion and coordination required with City of Toronto through detailed design. At no cost to the City of Toronto, the City of Toronto requests that</p> | <p>See response above</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The reference to signage for kite boarders will be removed. CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will continue to work with the City of Toronto staff to resolve these issues during detailed design.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>this signage be posted within Marie Curtis Park to inform park users of the LWC project well advance of construction start. Coordination with Parks for placement and installation required.</p> | |
| 7.3.2.2 | <p>Establishment / Post-Establishment Effects <i>Indicator: Percentage of accessible water’s edge.</i> Description provided here for impacts to Marie Curtis Park Beach West does not appear to reflect the modified Island Beach Alternative C and needs to be updated. This description references the existing beach falling behind the new created landform.</p> | <p>The measurements are correct for the maximum limit of 2M cubic metres for the Preferred Alternative. These measurements would be a bit smaller at the minimum limit of 1.5M cubic metres for the Preferred Alternative.</p> |
| 7.3.2.2 | <p><i>Indicator: Potential to create tiered trail system providing seasonal access.</i> Westerly connections on the Mississauga – Inspiration Lakeview /OPG side which include solutions for parking are critical to ensure this is not a dead-end system. It is assumed this will become part of the Waterfront Trail System and will be a paved surface.</p> <p><i>Indicator: Potential to create multi-use trail connection across area of land creation.</i> Westerly connections on the Mississauga – Inspiration Lakeview / OPG side which include solutions for parking are critical to ensure this is not a dead-end system. It is assumed this will become part of the Waterfront Trail System and will be a paved surface.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| 7.3.2.3 | <p>Summary of the Access Objective <i>Indicator: Percentage of accessible water’s edge.</i> Description provided here for impacts to Marie Curtis Park Beach West does not appear to reflect the modified Island Beach Alternative C and needs to be updated. This description references the existing beach falling behind the new created landform.</p> | <p>The measurements are correct for the maximum limit of 2M cubic metres for the Preferred Alternative. These measurements would be a bit smaller at the minimum limit of 1.5M cubic metres for the Preferred Alternative.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|---|---|
| 7.3.3 | <p>Summary of the Access Objective <i>Indicator: Number of Intersections requiring changes to facilitate LWC related construction.</i> Intersection signals within City of Toronto jurisdiction will need to be coordinated through City of Toronto Transportation Services.</p> <p>Within the 1st paragraph on page 44 the reference to “Section 6.X” is incomplete.</p> | <p>Agreed, any need for coordination of intersection signal timing will be coordinated through City of Toronto Transportation Services. Section reference has been removed.</p> |
| 7.3.3.2 | <p>Establishment / Post-Establishment Effects <i>Criterion: Changes to parking capacity Indicator: Potential to affect parking capacity at Marie Curtis Park and adjacent areas.</i> There is an assumption that parking for the LWC project can be accommodated in the existing Parking lot in Marie Curtis Park West. The City of Toronto has provided ongoing comment that the solution for parking cannot be accommodated in the Marie Curtis West parking lot. Parking numbers quoted in the EA document are likely low and not a true reflection of the usage in this lot. Construction activities were on-going in the summer 2013 and may have impacted park & parking lot usage.</p> <p>The recent Marie Curtis Park improvements will likely result in increased visitor to the park. Marie Curtis Park west also provides overflow parking for Marie Curtis Park East, which is frequently at full capacity. Alternate solutions need to be found to address the parking needs for the LWC project. In addition, the entrance drive from Lakeshore Road East into Marie Curtis Park West is closed between November 1st and late March. This access drive provides the only access to the Marie Curtis Park west parking lot.</p> | <p>It is noted that the parking lots in Marie Curtis Park West cannot accommodate LWC park users and edits have been made to the EA and Traffic report to reflect this change. CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will work with the City of Mississauga to address parking needs in the Arsenal lands or in the redevelopment plans for the former OPG Lakeview site. Parking cannot be provided on the created land area.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---------|--|--|
| 7.3.4.1 | <p>Criterion: Consistency with Marie Curtis Park Revitalization Plan <i>Indicator: Ability to integrate recreational opportunities and trails between LWC, Arsenal Lands and Marie Curtis Park</i></p> <p>Third paragraph references a 12m overlap with the new Waterfront Trail upgrades in Marie Curtis Park. This is not accurate and needs to be corrected per site visit on Jan.21st 2014 between TRCA and the City of Toronto to confirm understanding of the property line location.</p> <p>The City Manager’s Office and Councillor Grimes have been informed that there will be no impacts within Marie Curtis Park. Impacts to Marie Curtis Park need to be eliminated wherever possible or minimized.</p> | <p>The proposed construction access route will be diverted in order to avoid overlap with the recently upgraded Waterfront Trail in Marie Curtis Park West to the extent possible. CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will continue to meet with the City of Toronto throughout the detailed design phase to resolve issues arising from jurisdictional overlap and the interconnection of the LWC with upgraded trail facilities in Marie Curtis Park. It is noted that providing good, seamless integration of trails and other park resources may require some reworking.</p> |
| 7.3.4.2 | <p>Criterion: Consistency with visioning for Inspiration Lakeview <i>Indicator: Consistency of alternative with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview</i></p> <p>How likely is it that the Westerly trail connection through OPG to the Inspiration Lakeview site will be achieved? What is the anticipated timing for this connection to be made?</p> | <p>This information is unknown at this time. Planning for Inspiration Lakeview is on-going under and Memorandum of Understanding between the Province of Ontario, the City of Mississauga and Ontario Power Generation. Some information is anticipated in June 2014.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|-----------|--|--|
| 7.3.4.3 | <p><i>Summary of the Coordination Objective</i> Third paragraph references a 12m overlap with the new Waterfront Trail upgrades in Marie Curtis Park. This is not accurate and needs to be corrected per site visit on Jan.21st 2014 between TRCA and the City of Toronto to confirm understanding of the property line location.</p> <p>The City Manager’s Office and Councillor Grimes have been informed that there will be no impacts within Marie Curtis Park. Impacts to Marie Curtis Park need to be eliminated wherever possible or minimized.</p> | <p>The proposed construction access route will be diverted in order to avoid overlap with the recently upgraded Waterfront Trail in Marie Curtis Park West to the extent possible. CVC, Region of Peel and TRCA will continue to meet with the City of Toronto throughout the detailed design phase to resolve issues arising from jurisdictional overlap and the interconnection of the LWC with upgraded trail facilities in Marie Curtis Park. It is noted that providing good, seamless integration of trails and other park resources may require some reworking.</p> |
| Fig 7.1 | <p>Overlay property line information on the graphic for the preferred alternative.</p> | <p>Property line data is not available for the area.</p> |
| 8.1.3 | <p>Environmental Performance Monitoring</p> <p>Water quality in Lake Ontario is not mentioned. Please add water quality to the list of performance indicators that will be monitored to drive future AEM measures. This relates specifically to the water quality along the Marie Curtis Park West shoreline and beach area.</p> | <p>Water quality is listed in Table 8.3. This list will be finalized during detailed design.</p> |
| 8.2.2.1 | <p>What triggers will be used to inform decisions and actions to be taken with regard to water quality along the Marie Curtis Park West shoreline and beach area. What adaptations can be made to address issues with water quality if they arise?</p> | <p>Triggers will be determined during detailed design. Any proposed adaptations will be identified if problems arise during construction or during establishment</p> |
| Table 8.4 | <p>See comments above and add Water Quality and associated triggers and refinements to this table.</p> | <p>Appropriate edits have been made to Table 8.4</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|------------|---|--|
| Chapter 9 | <p>General Comment: Ensure the City of Toronto continues to be included in the evaluation process if amendments are required to the LWC EA.</p> | <p>City of Toronto staff will be included in the amendment process.</p> |
| 9.2.1 | <p>Ensure Water quality is included as one of the criteria.</p> | <p>Proposed edit was made.</p> |
| Table 9.2 | <p>What is meant by the reference to shifting the location of the groyne structure north? Please clarify?</p> <p>General comment: additional detailed information about the groyne structure and its relationship to Marie Curtis Park beach is needed and should be provided through detailed design – for review & coordination.</p> | <p>During detailed design the potential to shift the groyne to the southwest and minimize encroachment on Marie Curtis Park Beach west will continue to be explored. Detailed information with respect to the groyne structure will be developed during detailed design.</p> |
| Chapter 10 | <p>General Comment: Moving forward, ensure the City of Toronto, City of Toronto residents and stakeholders continue to be included in the evaluation and decision making processes through the finalization of the LWC EA and detailed design. In addition, they should also remain informed and notified of progress or significant changes through implementation. Future meeting locations need to be mindful of the residents that travel from City of Toronto locations and may need access via public transportation.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| Table 11.1 | <p>Compatibility: Understand that parking requirements for the LWC are an issue and need to be addressed as part of future planning initiatives. Marie Curtis Park cannot provide the parking for the LWC project.</p> <p>Coordination: Correct reference to 12m overlap, since this is not accurate. Access road construction cannot impact new Waterfront Trail improvements in Marie Curtis Park. Alignment of the access road needs to eliminate these impacts – see comments Chapter 7.</p> | <p>Comments noted and revisions made as discussed above.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Table 11.1 | <p>Fiscal Viability: Seems early to assume there will be “no impacts”. There will likely be impacts to the operational budgets required to maintain these areas.</p> | All projects have operation and maintenance costs associated with them and these are not typically considered to be disadvantages. |
| City of Mississauga | | |
| Section 3.3.1.1 | <p>Throughout this section reference is made to Mississauga Plan (City of Mississauga, 2003). Please note, Mississauga Official Plan (2012) was adopted by City Council on September 29, 2010 and partially approved by the Region of Peel on September 29, 2011. The Plan was appealed in its entirety; however, on November 14, 2012 the Ontario Municipal Board issued a Notice of Decision approving Mississauga Official Plan, as modified, save and except for certain appeals. For the policies under appeal in Mississauga Official Plan, the relevant policies in Mississauga Plan (2003) will remain in effect. I am attaching a link to our web site which further details the specific appeals.http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/mississaugaofficialplan.</p> <p>As noted on our website, until all appeals are resolved, both official plans will need to be referred to since they are both partially in effect. Once all matters have been decided, Mississauga Plan (2003) will no longer apply.</p> <p>In addition, a final report on the Port Credit Local Area Plan and Built Form Guide was presented to PDC on December 2, 2013 and was subsequently endorsed by Council with some modifications on December 11, 2013. The final implementing documents are currently being prepared by the Policy Planning Division for Council adoption. Some of the references on pg. 3-61 to lands designated “To be Determined” and to the draft Port Credit Local Area Plan for Port Credit, on this page and pg. 3-62 are therefore outdated.</p> | Proposed edit has been made |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Section 3.3.1.2 | In the Port Credit section remove the word “Remnants of...” Start the sentence with “Port Credit’s heritage can be” | Proposed edit made |
| Section 3.3.1.2 | Add the words “Port Credit” to the GO Transit Station title. “...centrally located near the Port Credit GO Transit Station....” | Proposed edit made |
| Section 3.3.1.3 | <p>Reference is made to the status of Inspiration Port Credit, namely that “<i>A final community meeting is planned for the fall of 2013 before the plan is sent to City Council for approval.</i>” The IPC draft recommendations will be presented to the community for input on March 25, 2014 and following this, their intentions are to target PDC on May 5, 2014 for consideration for approval of the final IPC recommendations. Subsequently, they would prepare the Official Plan Amendment to implement the City-initiated master plan.</p> <p>Pg. 3-69 also makes references again to the draft Port Credit Local Area Plan. Lastly, reference is also made to the Lakeview District Policy Review and status of the Lakeview Local Area Plan. It should be noted that a report on the draft Lakeview Local Area Plan is scheduled for the February 3, 2014 PDC meeting to initiate the public consultation process. It is anticipated that additional review and input into this policy document and attendance at community meetings will continue throughout 2014.</p> | Proposed edit has been made |
| Section 3.3.1.3 | <p>Reflecting comments from the point above, and accuracy with site titles, the following edits are suggested:</p> <p>Similar to Inspiration Lakeview, Inspiration Port Credit is a process whereby the City of Mississauga is working with landowners, residents and other stakeholders on a master plan and an implementation guide for the waterfront sites. The lands being considered are the Port Credit Harbour Marina lands and the Imperial Oil Limited (formerly Texaco) lands. The process will help</p> | Proposed edit has been made |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>guide the City towards the realization of the full potential of these waterfront sites. The process was launched on May 9, 2012 by City Council, and options were presented to the community for comment and feedback on March 26th, 2013. A final community meeting is planned for the spring 2014 before the plan is submitted to City Council.</p> | |
| <p>Section 3.3.1.3</p> | <p>Reflecting comments from the point above, and accuracy with site titles, the following edits are suggested:</p> <p>The Canada Lands Company created a demonstration plan for the redevelopment of 1 Port Street (Port Credit Harbour Marina), an area of land and water on the Mississauga waterfront immediately to the east of the Credit River. This plan is being peer-reviewed by the City as part of Inspiration Port Credit. The draft Port Credit Local Area Plan identified the site as having potential as a mixed use, water-related development that takes advantage of the site’s location in downtown Port Credit and on the lake. The master plan process will involve the creation of a detailed vision for the 1 Port Street site that will ultimately set out permitted uses, densities, heights and building forms.</p> | <p>Proposed edit has been made</p> |
| <p>Section 3.2.4.1 Wildlife Corridors, Page 3-43, Title Riparian Corridors, 2nd paragraph</p> | <p>Both Serson Creek and Applewood Creek crossings are within the study area for LWC; are there any improvements or coordination that can be done between the LWC and Lakeshore Road East culvert replacement projects?</p> | <p>CVC Planning staff have been coordinating with the City of Mississauga on design criteria relating to their culverts. In addition, following development of the detailed design for the new culverts, HEC-RAS models for each watershed will be re-established for consideration in the detailed design for the LWC Project downstream.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Section 5.2.1.1, Coastal Terrestrial Habitat, Page 5-9, Item 5.2.1.2., Stream and Wetland Habitat, 1st paragraph, line 7: “Given this configuration, fish are unable to migrate from the lake to Serson Creek.”</p> | <p>The City of Mississauga wants to ensure that all requirements for the Serson Creek and Applewood Creek culvert replacement project are to CVC’s satisfaction and that the culvert replacement will not contribute/affect to the downstream work in the LWC project and the fish migration. Further, we want to emphasize that all stakeholders had an opportunity to provide input on the design for both structures and that all necessary permits are obtained.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| <p>Section 6.1.2.2, Serson and Applewood creek, page6-8,</p> | <p>The City of Mississauga’s new culvert crossings will accommodate regional flood level.</p> | <p>Comment noted</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3 Construction Access Routes</p> | <p>If an alternative route (specifically through the OPG site) is being considered how will this be assessed? In Section 9.0 EA Amendment Process there is mention of an assessment, will it be assumed that the same indicators and rationale used for assessing routes 1, 2, 2B, 3, 3B will be used during an amendment process for an alternative route proposed?</p> | <p>Section 9 provides the Amending procedures. An amendment will be undertaken if the OPG property become available.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Section 7.3.1.2 Establishment/ Post Establishment Effects, Page 7- 19, 3rd paragraph</p> | <p>Will the water control gates affect capacity at Lakeshore Road East crossings?</p> <p>It is noted that Applewood Creek is to have a higher sediment load. Is there any need for maintenance?</p> | <p>The water control gates are located in the feeder channels connecting through the levees to the wetlands. They will not affect flow conveyance through the primary channels nor cause backwater effects upstream.</p> <p>The sediment transport assessment indicates that both streams have little bedload and that long term dredging of the channels are not anticipated.</p> |
| <p>Section 9.2 LWC Approach to Post EA Modifications</p> | <p>Figure 9.1 Approval Process for Proposed Modifications to the LWC Project</p> <p>The red arrow seems to be connecting the wrong box. It would make more sense for the red arrow to start at the 'Reject Modifications and propose new ones' and then finish at the 'Identify needs for project modifications'.</p> | <p>Comment noted. The reject modifications are an automatic feedback to the start of the process.</p> |
| <p>Section 10.6 Summary of Public Comments</p> | <p>10.9 Summary of Comments and Responses</p> <p>Please clarify if the comments from the November 2013 haul routes meeting with the City of Mississauga have been added to this table.</p> | <p>Table 10.9 is a summary of public comments. Table 10.19 contains a summary of the November 2013 meeting.</p> |
| <p>Section 10.8.4.5 City of Mississauga</p> | <p>Please provide additional detail on the August 27, 2013 meeting. Which department was included in this discussion? Inspiration Lakeview was not involved in this meeting.</p> | <p>Clarification to be made to table: August 27, 2013 (email correspondence). With City of Mississauga Heritage regarding proposed access route to the water's edge.</p> |
| <p>Appendix D, Evaluation of Alternatives and Effects Assessment Tables</p> | <p>It should be noted and clear that the detailed evaluation table figures are based on the 2.0 million m³ fill requirements.</p> | <p>Add note to bottom of tables.</p> |

Table E9-2 – Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft EA

| Section | Comment | Response |
|--|---|--|
| General | The City of Mississauga would like to continue with a coordinated approach and ensure alignment between the LWC and Lakeshore Road East culvert replacement projects. | Comment noted |
| General | Throughout the document there is mention that Serson Creek will be revitalized and used as a stormwater channel and a baseflow channel to feed into the proposed wetland. Has the flow levels taken into consideration the amount of stormwater that could be generated from the development of the Inspiration Lakeview lands west of the creek? | No, in the absence of any preferred alternative for Inspiration Lakeview, there has been no accommodation for additional stormwater from the Lakeview lands. The Master Planning process will need to undertake additional hydraulic modeling of Serson Creek to assess remaining capacity in the design. It is important that any stormwater discharged to Serson Creek is of sufficient quality to ensure the creek and wetlands remain habitat and are not deemed stormwater management facilities. |
| MOE (Technical Support Section) | | |
| 1.5 | In the “Level of Government, Provincial” section of Table 1.2 (Section 1.5, Other Approvals, Page 1-12), please include the Ministry of the Environment and the potential need to acquire Permit(s) to Take Water under the Ontario Water Resources Act (Section 34). | Comment noted. |