

**Table 1 Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft ToR and Record of Consultation**

Section	Comment	Response
MOE Environmental Approvals Branch (September 7, 2012 and further clarification as required by email September 18, 2012)		
General	<p>The Environmental Approvals Branch, Project Coordination Unit conducted a review of the final ToR and is generally satisfied that the comments raised by the ministry in its review of the draft ToR have been addressed by the proponents in the final ToR or will be addressed during the preparation of the environmental assessment (EA).</p> <p>However, as discussed between ministry staff and the proponents on September 7, 2012, it is understood that the proponents will prepare and submit to the ministry an errata to the final ToR to clarify under which subsection of the <i>Environmental Assessment Act (EAA)</i> the EA is to be prepared. Additionally, the errata will include the information pertaining to footnotes 2 and 3 on page 3-10 of the final ToR.</p>	<p>Comments noted. An errata has been submitted to the Ministry. It should be noted that only footnote 2 exists on page 3-10. The reference to a third footnote was incorrect.</p>
Section 9.0	<p>Further, should the ToR be approved, it is understood by the ministry that sufficient explanation about the proponents' use and meaning of the term <i>Duty to Consult</i> will be included in the EA.</p>	<p>This term will be further clarified in the EA.</p>
Section 6.2	<p>September 18 email indicated:                      The ministry's comments on Section 6: <i>Description, Evaluation and Rationale for 'Alternatives To' the Undertaking</i> of the draft ToR clearly state that the rationale for limiting the 'alternatives to' being considered is to be presented in the final ToR. Yet, Section 6.2: <i>Evaluation of 'Alternatives To'</i> in the final ToR does not include details about what evaluation criteria were assessed to inform the evaluations which subsequently provided the rationale and led to the identification of the preferred 'alternative to': the creation of a new natural waterfront park on created land. Where is this information?</p> <p>The final paragraph in Section 6.2 of the final ToR states "Therefore, alternatives involving land creation have the greatest potential to meet the LWC Project objectives and will be carried forward to the development of 'Alternative Methods' during the EA." What does this mean, in consideration of the identified preferred alternative to? For example, why does this refer to carrying forward "alternatives" (in the plural)?</p>	<p>The errata noted above also contains the additional clarifications requested with respect to Section 6.2 of the Final ToR.</p>

Section	Comment	Response
MOE Technical Support - Air Quality (September 6, 2012)		
General, 1.0	<p>The final Terms of Reference (ToR) for LWC EA and Table 1-1 <i>“Disposition of Agency Comments on Draft ToR and Record of Consultation”</i> addresses all the Central Region Technical Support Section’s air quality comments dated June 26, 2012 except item no. 3.1.1 <i>“Potential Historical Soil Contamination”</i> at the OPG Lands.</p> <p>Central Region Technical Support is recommending that if OPG lands are obtained then a screening air quality impact assessment should be conducted during the LWC EA to determine if the proposed activities during construction or other activities pose an air quality concern at the nearest sensitive receptors.</p>	<p>As discussed during a teleconference on September 11/2012, further clarification was provided in regard to the Lakeview Waterfront Connection. Since the proposed undertaking will not include the OPG lands, it was determined that ambient monitoring will not be required.</p> <p>It was also discussed that a qualitative air quality assessment will be conducted which will involve an air emission burden analysis from the proposed truck traffic in the area for the land creation operations and a discussion on the mitigation measures that may be required to minimize off-site dust impacts at nearby sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Finally, it should be clarified that if the proponents are provided access to OPG’s waterlots up to the eastern pier, they would use the flexibility in the ToR to extend the Project Study Area to include this opportunity. This would only involve land creation on the waterlots to the east of the eastern pier with no alteration to the land.</p> <p>Post 2014, the redevelopment of the former OPG Lakeview site may be the subject of a subsequent EA to be led by other proponents, depending on the type of development proposed.</p>
MOE Technical Support – Noise (July 27, 2012)		
General	<p>We have reviewed the Final Terms of Reference (ToR) prepared by SENES Consultants Limited and dated July 2012, regarding the proposed Lakeview Waterfront Connection in the City of Mississauga.</p> <p>We concur with the approach proposed in the ToR regarding construction noise and vibration impacts. It is for this reason that we recommend that the noise aspects of the undertaking be approved as proposed in the ToR.</p>	Comments noted.

Section	Comment	Response
<b>MOE Technical Support – Surface Water (August 14, 2012)</b>		
General	<p>We are satisfied the proposed Terms of Reference will address our mandate, but wish to be involved in the preparation of the EA.</p> <p>We reviewed the ToR and submitted comments to Lorna in the past. We are interested in staying involved with the project and would like to review the EA.</p>	Comments noted.
<b>MOE Technical Support – Waste Water (August 8, 2012)</b>		
General	I have finished reviewing the ToR for the LWC EA. The goal of the LWC project is to create a new natural waterfront park that will establish ecological habitat and public linkages on the eastern Mississauga waterfront. Wastewater Approvals Unit do not have any comment at this time however, we would like to be kept in the loop and given opportunities to comment on the development of any stormwater management plan for the study area during the EA process.	Comments noted.
<b>MNR Aurora District Office (August 24, 2012)</b>		
General	MNR's written comments on the draft ToR provided to the project proponents on June 28, 2012, and recommendations provided through subsequent discussions with the project proponents, have been addressed to our satisfaction in the final ToR. However, MNR has the following additional comments from review of the final ToR:	Comments noted.
3.1 (Problem/Opportunity Statement)	<p>The ToR makes reference to the draft Fish Community Objectives (FCO's) for Lake Ontario and indicates that the broad targets and indicators will be considered throughout the LWC EA process. These objectives include maintaining or increasing fisheries, populations and recruitment of species such as walleye, yellow perch, Northern pike and bass in the nearshore. Target areas for these cool water species are best applied to embayment and warmer areas in the eastern basin of the lake.</p> <p>The waters of the western basin in the vicinity of the LWC project and study area are suitable for cold water species like Lake Herring, Round and Lake Whitefish and Lake Trout. These waters are thermally unstable and will provide limited support for large populations of warmer water species. MNR is supportive of any benefits to the cool and warm water fish communities; however, given the existing thermal conditions, the assessment of potential impacts and/or projected benefits should be focused on cold water species.</p>	The LWC project is taking a balanced approach to provide a wide-range of habitat for the full suite of fisheries found within the area, including warm, cool and cold water habitats. The proposed changes in shoreline and near shore areas will be designed with the purpose of enhanced access for the public, and habitat for cold water species. While the fluvial and wetland components will focus on providing habitats for cool and warmwater species opportunities for creating habitat for coldwater species (e.g. lake trout and lake whitefish) on the open coast consistent with the Fish Community Objectives for Lake Ontario (MNR, 2012) will be considered through detailed design. Reference sites from along the north shore of Lake Ontario will be used in defining alternatives for consideration, as will an analysis of the past shoreline conditions (using historical air photos) found within the Project Study area, The consideration of habitat options

Section	Comment	Response
		must also take into consideration past, present and future average lake temperatures based on recent research undertaken for the Great Lakes (Dobiesz and Lester, IAGLR, 2009).
4.4 (Other Approvals)	<p>The sentence regarding ownership of the bed of Lake Ontario should read "The bed of Lake Ontario within the LWC Project Study Area is unalienated Crown land administered by MNR."</p> <p>This section should also include a statement that Crown lands required for the project will need to be acquired at fair market value determined through an appraisal.</p>	<p>The sentence regarding ownership of the bed of Lake Ontario will be changed for the EA. We acknowledge that MNR has stated that the waterlots will be required at fair market value determined through an appraisal. The co-proponents agree that an appraisal should be undertaken and will form part of the basis for developing cost scenarios for the various alternatives in the EA. The appraisal will be based on MNR supplied terms of reference and on the Region of Peel's own appraisal requirements and will be paid for by the Region of Peel. However, the co-proponents have stated an interest to pursue other alternatives for addressing waterlots other than straight fair market values and intend to seek those at the appropriate time for negotiation following the selection of the preferred alternative of the EA.</p>
4.4 (Other Approvals)	Regarding approval under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, please change the last sentence in this section to "may be required".	Comment noted
7.0 (Description, Evaluation and Rationale for 'Alternative Methods' of Carrying Out the Undertaking)	<p>In reading the ToR document, it is still not clearly evident that the capital costs indicated in this proposal includes the purchase of the Crown land (the future filled area). We have to assume that the costs of land purchase have been estimated at this time with a full cost of land purchase to be clarified as the EA process moves forward.</p> <p>MNR strongly recommends that a site specific appraisal be conducted (based on highest and best use and subject to MNR Terms of Reference and approval) for the Crown land filled area (once full extent of filled lands is accurately known) at the earliest possible convenience to allow for the documentation of a full cost-benefit analysis and fulsome determination of fiscal viability per Section 5.1 of the ToR.</p>	<p>The Co-proponents agree that a site specific appraisal will be undertaken to determine potential acquisition costs. As noted above, the co-proponents have stated an interest to pursue other alternatives for addressing waterlots other than straight fair market values and intend to seek those at the appropriate time for negotiation following the selection of the preferred alternative of the EA. Any reference to capital costs within the ToR includes any costs associated with land acquisition or other forms of land transfer.</p>

Section	Comment	Response
Table 8-4 (Environmental Assessment Studies)	The table contains a section entitled "Unalienated Crown Land Assessment". The information on study elements and objectives indicates assessing value of MNR owned waterlots and potential financial implications to the project. This description should be changed to state, "undertaking an appraisal to determine fair market value for Crown land that may be required for the project".	The appraisal, for the purpose of the EA, is intended to get an upset estimate of land costs to assist in the costing of the preferred alternative. As much as possible the terminology will be changed to refer to the lands as "unalienated Crown Land" but where 'Water Lots' are used in reference to such lands, it is acknowledged that no such water lots have been created or presently exist, and that it is used for convenience sake only.
Table 8-4 (Environmental Assessment Studies)	Additionally, this section indicates undertaking discussions with MNR on alternative arrangements under consideration for the use of Crown land. MNR is unclear what the project proponents are proposing in this regard. In a letter to the Project Leader at Credit Valley Conservation dated June 28, 2012, MNR clarified that land tenure will be required during the construction (Land Use Permit) and for permanent occupation of the Crown lake bed (sale and patent).	Comments noted. The EA Act requires proponents to wait until approval is granted to acquire land. Thus, formal discussions with respect to any transfer of land will not occur until after EA approval has been achieved. The co-proponents note MNR's position and would like to work collaboratively to resolve at the appropriate time.
<b>Ministry of Energy (August 17, 2012)</b>		
General	We are satisfied the proposed Terms of Reference will address our mandate, but wish to be involved in the preparation of the EA. We will monitor the process and ask for contact if required. Please continue to provide notices and updates.	Comments noted.
<b>Ontario Power Generation (August 24, 2012)</b>		
General	OPG provided initial comments on the draft Terms of Reference on June 25, 2012 noting that the City of Mississauga, the Province and OPG had signed on MOU to develop a shared vision for the OPG property that will build on the Inspiration Lakeview work and that Lakeview Park had been licenced to the City for a number of years.	Comments noted.
General	We would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the Terms of Reference and provide additional clarity on our previous comments. We wish to continue to participate in the EA process and would appreciate being kept informed of the EA workplan and schedule as the project moves forward.	Comments noted.
2.2.2 (City of Mississauga)	Reference is made to "conformance with various planning and guideline documents, including the Master Plan for Inspiration Lakeview (City of Mississauga, 2011)." There is no reference provided for this document in Section 11.0 and to the best of our knowledge a master plan has not yet been completed in support of Inspiration Lakeview. Clarity on this reference should be provided by the proponent.	The reference to the Master Plan for Inspiration Lakeview should be the Vision document. This will be corrected in the EA.

Section	Comment	Response
3.1 (Problem/ Opportunity Assessment and Figure 3-1)	A description is provided of the City of Mississauga's visioning process referred to as Inspiration Lakeview and the ways in which the Lakeview Waterfront Connection EA supports this vision. The Inspiration Lakeview vision represents the City's long-term vision for the area. Consistent with our previous comments, it should be recognized that the City, the Province and OPG entered into an MOU in 2011 to develop a shared vision for OPG's Lakeview site. This process is separate and distinct from the Inspiration Lakeview visioning process, although aspects of the vision may be used in the formulation of the shared vision. This is an important distinction when viewing the Inspiration Lakeview Vision Map shown in Figure 3-1, particularly as it relates to the treatment of Serson Creek.	Comment noted. We recognize that the eventual use of the Lakeview land will be the subject of on-going discussions pursuant to the MOU. The discussion in Section 3.1 is meant to provide the rationale for the LWC based on past planning efforts and the LWC is a product of the Inspiration Lakeview visioning process.
3.1.2 (Project Goal Element: Create Public Linkages)	A key problem identified is "Public access to and along the Lake Ontario waterfront has been impeded by security restrictions associated with industrial activities at both OPG's former Lakeview Generating Station and the Region of Peel's WWTF." Consistent with our previous comments, Lakeview Park has been licenced to the City of Mississauga for public recreational playing fields since 1995. In addition, since 1994 OPG has licenced to the City a portion of its lands to accommodate the waterfront trail for public access. When considering the utility and function of these licences, consideration should be given by the proponent as to whether the words "impeded" and "disruption" are appropriate to describe connectivity and public access along the Lake Ontario waterfront in the vicinity of the Lakeview site.	The co-proponents recognize the efforts made by OPG to provide public access and recreation. The access objective is meant to capture the long-term desire to bring access and recreation to the water's edge and is not meant to diminish OPG's contribution to the community. In the EA, we will provide further clarification as to OPG's provision of public access as part of the existing conditions section.
4.3 (Coordinated Planning Process)	We recommend to the proponent that the second bullet be amended to read "the development of a shared vision for the OPG Lakeview site according to the process set out in the June 2011 MOU between the City of Mississauga, OPG and the Province of Ontario."	Comment noted. This edit will be made to the EA.
5.2 (Study Areas)	It should be noted that OPG provided a letter response on August 20, 2012 to CVCA's request of June 15 respecting use of its water lots in the Lakeview Waterfront Connection EA. OPG confirmed to CVCA, that it supports, in principle, the inclusion of a portion of its water lots in Lake Ontario located on the east side of the eastern pier for study as part of the EA. However, the response clarified that no commitment was being provided to CVCA respecting the inclusion of these water lots in the Project or their future use/ownership.	Comment noted.

Section	Comment	Response
<b>Ministry of Tourism, Culture &amp; Sport (August 27, 2012)</b>		
7.0 (Description, Evaluation and Rationale for 'Alternative Methods' of Carrying Out the Undertaking)	As noted above, one of the objectives of the proposed project is to: "Create safe and accessible public linkages for access to and along the waterfront including the Waterfront Trail while allowing for compatible recreational, education and cultural heritage opportunities." It is not clear what is meant by "cultural heritage opportunities." Section 7.2 of the ToR provides further information indicating that this would include interpretation of the area's cultural heritage and that the design elements of the project configuration will be developed with sensitivity to the ecological and cultural history of the shoreline (page 7-3).	Based on the results of the variety of archaeological, heritage and marine archaeology studies conducted previously and as part of this EA, we will avoid and/or conserve key cultural heritage sites, and where appropriate, celebrate those identified resources as part of the Project detailed design.
7.0 (Description, Evaluation and Rationale for 'Alternative Methods' of Carrying Out the Undertaking)	What research and documentation will inform cultural heritage interpretation and sensitive design? It is suggested that the EA include further detail on how this will be achieved and implemented.	As noted in Section 8.4 of the ToR we are undertaking both terrestrial and marine archaeological assessments and we are using heritage assessments undertaken for adjacent properties to inform our decision-making. As noted above, should cultural heritage or archaeological resources be affected by the project we will mitigate the effects by avoiding and/or conserving the resources where possible. Detailed design for the LWC will incorporate significant site and area history as part of the site development.
Table 7-1	<p>Table 7-1 includes a preliminary list of comparative evaluation criteria and indicators for evaluation. One of the criteria included under "Access" is: "Potential for displacement of built heritage resources due to construction." The indicators for this potential impact are described as "cultural heritage value of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within land creation area." Both the criterion and the indicators are too narrow. A broader range of impacts, in addition to displacement, should be considered, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of any, or part of any, built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, heritage attributes or features;</li> <li>• Alteration that is not sympathetic or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance of cultural heritage resources;</li> <li>• Shadows created that alter the appearance of a built heritage resource, cultural heritage landscape, heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden;</li> <li>• Isolation of a built heritage resource or heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship;</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The list of comparative evaluation criteria presented in the ToR is preliminary and will be subject to considerable refinement through agency and public consultation once the alternatives have been developed. We will consider these comments as part of the refinement exercise.

Section	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from or of built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes;</li> <li>• A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.</li> </ul>	
Table 7-1	Additionally, the evaluation should take into consideration the presence of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes located within the entire study area, not just within the land creation area.	The evaluation will take into consideration any resources in the Project and Regional Study Areas affected by construction activities.
8.0 (Description of the Environment Potentially Affected by the Proposed Undertaking)	MTCS notes that the proponents have indicated that both land based and marine archaeological assessments will be carried out as part of the EA. With respect to built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes, the ToR indicates that there are properties within the study area that have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act by the City of Mississauga, specifically the Small Arms Building and associated Water Tower located in the Arsenal Lands. Additionally, the report indicates that other elements of cultural heritage value include: “a row of deciduous trees to the west of the Small Arms Building, the woodlot south of the Small Arms building and the former rifle range and associated elements”. It is not clear whether all the features or attributes listed are all a part of a single designation bylaw, or if some have been identified separately. This should be clarified in the EA.	All of the cultural heritage elements are defined by a single Bylaw of all built and landscape heritage features through the City of Mississauga. This was based on a study conducted on behalf of TRCA in 2009 for 1352 Lakeshore Road East. This will be clarified in the EA.
8.0 (Description of the Environment Potentially Affected by the Proposed Undertaking)	While some cultural heritage resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, others can only be identified after evaluation. As such, it is recommended that the proponents consider undertaking a heritage assessment to identify any other potential built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes that may be present within the study area. Consultation with the public, local municipality, municipal heritage committee and any other local heritage organizations would help inform the need and content of the study. In addition to identifying additional potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, the study would include recommendations on conservation of resources, mitigation of impacts, interpretation, and sympathetic project design, as necessary.	A heritage assessment has been conducted previously by TRCA as landowners of the Arsenal Lands. The remainder of the Project Study Area has been developed for industrial use and there are no heritage structures present on the OPG Lakeview or WWTF sites which are contemplated as potential construction access points. Therefore, further assessments are not required. Consultation has been undertaken with the City of Toronto, City of Mississauga, the Region of Peel, CVC and TRCA regarding these issues.
8.3.2	Section 8.3.2 of the ToR discusses land ownership. It indicates that 43% of the shoreline within the CVC’s jurisdiction is comprised of public lands, with part of them being owned by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of the Environment (page 8-37). Additionally, directly to the west of the study area is the Lakeview Site, owned by Ontario Power Generating (OPG). The report notes	Any potential consideration of alternatives adjacent to the OPG lands will only affect OPG water lots and the shoreline and not the land itself. The marine archaeological assessment has looked at the OPG waterlots up to the eastern pier. The land portions of the

Section	Comment	Response
	<p>that the OPG land is currently undergoing an evaluation process to determine the future uses of its lands and waterlots, as part of a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Mississauga and Province of Ontario to develop a shared vision for OPG's Lakeview site, which is anticipated to conclude in June 2014. The ToR states that should the opportunity arise to consider the use of the OPG land and waterlots prior to June 2014, the LWC Project Study Area could be extended to include them.</p> <p>With this landownership in mind, please note that the <i>Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties</i> (Standards &amp; Guidelines), prepared pursuant to Section 25.2 of the Ontario Heritage Act, came into effect on July 1, 2010. The Standards &amp; 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.</p>	<p>OPG site is generally lakefill. OPG has demolished all structures associated with the former Lakeview Generating Station with the exception of a few small buildings. In the event that construction access and staging is contemplated through the OPG lands as part of the EA, any remaining built structure elements will be avoided.</p>
City of Mississauga (August 27, 2012)		
2.2.2	<p>Correction:          "The City of Mississauga is interested in ensuring that any proposed plans along the Mississauga waterfront are in conformance with various planning and guideline documents, including the Master Plan for Inspiration Lakeview...."          'Master Plan' should be replaced with 'Inspiration Lakeview: A Vision' document. The Inspiration Lakeview team is currently working through developing the Master Plan.</p>	<p>The reference to the Master Plan for Inspiration Lakeview should be the Vision document. This will be corrected in the EA.</p>
7.2 Step 2 – Identification of Desired Design Elements	<p>In addition to the proposed desired design elements it is preferred that the 'recreational attributes' point be revised to also reflect educational and cultural heritage aspects to be more consistent with the project's objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational, <u>educational and cultural heritage attributes</u></li> </ul>	<p>The educational and cultural heritage aspects of the alternatives are unlikely to be identified as part of the development of the alternatives. Both the educational and cultural heritage aspects of the project are refinements to the eventual preferred alternative and may be addressed through programming. Thus, it is not appropriate to add these considerations to this step in the development of alternatives.</p>
7.2 Step 2 – Identification of Desired Design Elements	<p>Access can be achieved by a trail, pathway or by a view which offers visual connectivity. In addition to the proposed desired design elements it is suggested that there be one additional design element considered which reflects providing views and visual connectivity throughout the site.</p>	<p>Potential viewing areas will be assessed as part of the comparative evaluation of alternatives described in Step 3. Views are not part of the desired design elements to be added in Step 2 as these represent fundamental project attributes for which EA approval is required.</p>

Section	Comment	Response
8.4 Environmental Assessment Studies	Table 8-4 details studies to be undertaken to support the LWC EA. 'Access' is an objective that cannot be measured or determined by any of the proposed studies. A 'Design Study' would help to explore and study spaces, connections, pathways, access and egress from a planning perspective and help to understand how we can achieve our objective - 'Access'.	Access is being assessed in the context of the LWC EA with respect to how well access is provided to the site and across the site at a coarse level of assessment. A design study is appropriate as part of detailed design once EA approval has been achieved. The level of detail in design necessary to support the suggested design study will not be achieved as part of EA planning.
City of Toronto – Parks, Forestry and Recreation Branch (August 17, 2012)		
2.2.1	Mention that Marie Curtis Park is owned by TRCA and managed by City of Toronto.	Comment noted. This will be clarified in the EA.
4.3	List other City of Toronto Planning related documents that are relevant to the project.	These documents will be added to the EA.
5.2	The LWC Project Study Area should be expanded to the easterly limit of 42 <sup>nd</sup> Ave so as to include the east side of Marie Curtis Park. The beach fronting this park on the east and west sides of Etobicoke Creek is a contiguous natural shoreline feature that may be impacted by the project.	The Project Study Area only looks at the area where direct physical works would be contemplated. The Marie Curtis Park Beach East is part of the Regional Study Area and effects to the beach system in its entirety will be assessed as part of the effects assessment and the evaluation of project alternatives.
Figure 5-1	Expand limit of Project Study Area in the graphic.	See previous answer.
Figure 5-3	Expand limit of Project Study Area in the graphic.	See previous answer.
Table 7-1 (Naturalization)	<p><b>Add Criteria</b> Potential for negative/positive effects on natural beach and shoreline morphology at Marie Curtis Park.</p> <p><b>Indicators</b> Qualitative assessment of impacts to natural beach at east and west sides of Etobicoke Creek.</p> <p><b>Rationale</b> The beach at Marie Curtis park is one of the last remaining beach shorelines in the City of Toronto and is a key recreational amenity for the City. Improved or diminished quality of the beach shoreline will affect the recreational opportunities within the park.</p>	Comments noted. The list of comparative evaluation criteria presented in the ToR is preliminary and will be subject to considerable refinement through agency and public consultation once the alternatives have been developed. We will consider these comments as part of the refinement exercise.
Table 7-1 (1 - Naturalization)	<p><b>Add Criteria</b> Qualitative assessment of impacts to increase/decrease of debris accumulation</p>	Comments noted. The list of comparative evaluation criteria presented in the ToR is preliminary and will be

Section	Comment	Response
and/or 2 - Access)	<p>along beach shoreline at Marie Curtis Park east and west of Etobicoke Creek.</p> <p><b>Indicators</b> Qualitative and quantitative assessment of impacts to shoreline and beach quality at Marie Curtis Park including cost impacts associated with debris removal.</p> <p><b>Rationale</b> The beach at Marie Curtis park is one of the last remaining beach shorelines in the City of Toronto and is a key recreational amenity for the City. Beach maintenance and debris removal at this location are critical components of maintaining access to the beach waterfront.</p>	<p>subject to considerable refinement through agency and public consultation once the alternatives have been developed. We will consider these comments as part of the refinement exercise.</p>
Table 7-1 (2 - Access)	<p><b>Add Criteria</b> Potential to enhance/degrade pedestrian/cycling trails between the waterfront areas and the City of Toronto Waterfront trail system, and Marie Curtis Park Trails.</p> <p><b>Indicators</b> Qualitative and quantitative assessment of traffic impacts through the park and associated impacts to existing trail networks – extent of new linkages. Potential to require additional crossing to Etobicoke Creek at a location further south than the existing pedestrian bridge.</p> <p><b>Rationale</b> A key component of east west linkages to the City of Toronto includes access across Etobicoke Creek via an existing pedestrian bridge. Alternatives will impact the access to this trail that may impact the existing trail network through Marie Curtis Park and access across Etobicoke Creek.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The list of comparative evaluation criteria presented in the ToR is preliminary and will be subject to considerable refinement through agency and public consultation once the alternatives have been developed. We will consider these comments as part of the refinement exercise.</p> <p>The provision of additional access across Etobicoke Creek is not part of this project.</p>
8.1.1.1 (Shoreline)	<p>The length of sand beach for the Toronto Area shoreline should be enlarged to include the portion of beach on the east side of Etobicoke Creek with Marie Curtis Park.</p>	<p>As described above, the Project Study Area does not include the east side of Etobicoke Creek as no direct works are intended for this area. The length of the sand beach east of Etobicoke Creek is discussed in Section 8.1.1.1 for the Regional Study Area.</p>
8.1.2 (Bathymetry)	<p>The LWC Project Study Area should be expanded to the easterly limit of 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave so as to include the east side of Marie Curtis Park. The beach fronting this park on the east and west sides of Etobicoke Creek is a contiguous natural shoreline feature that may be impacted by the project.</p>	<p>As described above, the area to the east of Etobicoke Creek is considered as part of the Regional Study Area. Effects to the beach system in its entirety will be assessed as part of the effects assessment and the evaluation of project alternatives.</p>
Figure 8-1	<p>Expand limit of Project Study Area in the graphic.</p>	<p>See previous answer.</p>

Section	Comment	Response
9.2.4 (Key Stakeholders)	City of Toronto should be added.	Comment noted. This edit will be made for the EA.
<b>City of Toronto – City Planning (August 20, 2012)</b>		
4.3 (Coordinated Planning Process)	Toronto Official Plan, Chapter 3, Section 3.4 The Natural Environment and Chapter 4, Section 4.3 Parks and Open Space Areas set out City's objectives and policies for Natural Areas and Parks designated lands which are the designations which apply to Marie Curtis Park.	Comment noted. Section 4.3 of the ToR is meant to describe the other projects proceeding which are adjacent to the LWC lands rather than the land use designations. This information will be added to the existing environment section of the EA.
5.2	The LWC Project study area should include the Marie Curtis Park lands within the City of Toronto, which extend to 42 <sup>nd</sup> Street.	The Project Study Area only looks at the area where direct physical works would be contemplated. The Marie Curtis Park Beach East is part of the Regional Study Area and effects to the beach system in its entirety will be assessed as part of the effects assessment and the evaluation of project alternatives.
Figure 5-1	Expand limit as noted in 5.2 above.	See previous comment.
Figure 5-3	Expand limit as noted in 5.2 above.	See previous comment.
Table 8-2	LWC Project Study Area Zoning: Marie Curtis Park (Toronto) – Zoned 'G' – Parks and Playgrounds. Permits public parks and related recreation facilities.	Comment noted. This correction will be made in the EA.
8.3.3 (Archaeology)	Marie Curtis Park is identified on the City of Toronto "Interim Archaeological Potential Map (2011)." See link below – this document should be reviewed and/or contact Susan Hughes, City of Toronto, Heritage Preservation Services at (416) 338-1096.  <a href="http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/pdf/ap_map_west.pdf">http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/pdf/ap_map_west.pdf</a>	Based on a review of the Archaeological Master Plan Update ( <a href="http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/pdf/update_interimscreening_april06.pdf">http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/pdf/update_interimscreening_april06.pdf</a> ) and the map referenced in the comment, we do not expect that Community Planning Staff will require an archaeological assessment, since we are not expecting applications for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Plan of Subdivision or Site Plan Control.  Contact will be made with Heritage Preservation Services at the City as part of EA consultation to ensure that archaeological issues are addressed to the satisfaction of the City.
<b>City of Toronto - Toronto Water (August 21, 2012)</b>		
Table 8-4 (Water	Add consideration of impacts on water quality at R.L. Clarke Treatment Plant	The regional water quality model is able to consider

Section	Comment	Response
circulation modelling)	intakes and Marie Curtis Beach (east and west).	effects on water quality at R.L. Clarke Treatment Plant intakes and Marie Curtis Beach (east and west). Any change in water quality at these locations as a result of the LWC will be reported in the EA.
<b>Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada</b>		
General	We do not need to review any further documents	Comment noted.
<b>Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</b>		
General	With the changes to CEAA, this project is no longer relevant and we do not need to review further documents.	Comment noted.
<b>Ministry of Economic Development and Innovation (August 27, 2012)</b>		
General	We do not need to review any further EA documents.	Comment noted.
<b>Ministry of Infrastructure</b>		
General	Tanzeel Merchant is now the contact of MOI.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
<b>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (August 1, 2012)</b>		
General	David Sit and Larry Clay are the correct contacts.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
<b>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport</b>		
General	Paul Kulpa is the new contact.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
<b>Niagara Escarpment Commission</b>		
General	We do not need to review any further documents	Comment noted.
<b>Ministry of Transportation (August 7, 2012)</b>		
General	The proposed Lakeview Waterfront Connection project is outside MTO permit control therefore we have no comments to provide.	Comment noted.
<b>Region of Peel, Water Division (August 14, 2012)</b>		
General	We are satisfied the proposed Terms of Reference will address our mandate, but wish to be involved in the preparation of the EA.	Comment noted.
<b>Region of Peel, Public Works (July 25, 2012)</b>		
General	Regional planning staff consider the project goal of creating a new natural waterfront park with public linkages to be consistent with the intent of our Regional Official Plan. For that reason, I am pleased to advise that I am satisfied with these Terms of Reference.  In addition to restoring the natural environment and providing recreational opportunities, I note that this project will have the additional public benefit of using clean fill from local public infrastructure projects, thereby avoiding the environmental and dollar costs of long-distance disposal of these fill materials.	Comments noted.

Section	Comment	Response
Infrastructure Ontario (September 6, 2012)		
General	<p>As you may be aware, <i>IO is responsible for managing real property that is owned by Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario as represented by the Minister of Infrastructure (MOI)</i>. There is a potential that IO manages lands that fall within your study area. As a result, your proposal may impact IO managed properties and/or the activities of tenants present on IO-managed lands. In order to determine if IO property is within your study area, IO requires that the proponent of the project conduct a title search by reviewing parcel register(s) for adjoining lands, to determine the extent of ownership by MOI or its predecessors (listed below) ownership. Please contact IO if any ownership of provincial government lands are known to occur within your study area and are proposed to be impacted. IO is obligated to complete due diligence for any realty activity on IO managed lands and this should be incorporated into all project timelines. IO managed lands can <b><i>include within the title but is not limited to</i></b> variations of the following: Her Majesty the Queen/King, OLC, ORC, Public Works, Hydro One, PIR, MGS, MBS, MOI, MTO, MNR and MEI. Please ensure that a copy of your notice is also sent to the ministry/agency on title. As an example, if the study area includes a Provincial Park, then MNR is to also to be circulated notices related to your project.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The LWC project will not affect provincial lands but will affect unalienated crown land which is the lake bed of Lake Ontario and managed by MNR. We will consult with MNR on this issue.</p>

**Table 2 Disposition of Public, First Nations and Métis Comments on Draft ToR and Record of Consultation**

Section	Comment	Response
<b>General Public/Businesses</b>		
General	(Received August 13, 2012)  I am a resident of Mississauga inquiring about the physical boundary of this assessment. Any study should include the old Texaco lands on the western portion of Port Credit?	The old Texaco lands on the western portion of Port Credit are the subject of a separate study being undertaken by the City of Mississauga. Please contact the City if you have questions or comments about the old Texaco lands site.
	(July 27, 2012) Notice of Submission was forwarded by Filamat Composites Inc. (local business) to Dundee Realty (landowner). Filamat would prefer e-mail correspondence.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
	(August 22, 2012) Edwin Makkinga and Jim Arnot are the contacts for Enbridge Gas.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
	(August 22, 2012) Mike Dobson is the contact for Enbridge Gas.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
<b>First Nations and Métis</b>		
<i>Metis Nation of Ontario (August 15, 2012)</i>		
General	I have referred this to Mark Bowler, Director of Lands, Resources and Consultation for review and action.	The contact list was updated with this new information.
<b>Curve Lake First Nation (August 3, 2012)</b>		
General	Curve Lake First Nation would like to be kept updated on the progress of the project, but we will not be providing comments at this time. If any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues should arise, that has potential for anticipated negative environmental impacts or anticipated impacts on our Treaty and Aboriginal rights we require that we be notified as soon as possible.  Thank you for recognizing the importance of consultation and respecting your duty to consult obligations as determined by the Supreme Court of Canada.	Comments noted.
<b>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</b>		
General	No comments at this time, wish to remain informed of the project as it proceeds.	Comment noted.
<b>Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (September 11, 2012)</b>		
General	The comments would be for archaeology aspects, burial areas and species at risk.	Comments noted. We will continue advising the MNCFN on these issues as the EA progresses.