

# Lakeview Waterfront Connection Environmental Assessment Final Terms of Reference (July 2012)

## ERRATA (September 19, 2012)

For the document titled Lakeview Waterfront Connection Environmental Assessment Project Final Terms of Reference, July, 2012, the following changes apply:

### **Executive Summary, page ES-2**

First bullet “has been completed as set out in section 6(1) of the *Ontario EA Act*...”

Second bullet “indicates that the environmental assessment will be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in section 6.1(2) of the *Ontario EA Act*”

*Changed to*

First bullet “has been completed as set out in section 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the *Ontario EA Act*...”

Second bullet “indicates that the environmental assessment will be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in section 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the *Ontario EA Act*”

### **Section 1.2, page 1-1**

First bullet “indicates that the environmental assessment will be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in section 6.1(2) of the *Ontario EA Act* “

*Changed to*

First bullet “indicates that the environmental assessment will be prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in section 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the *Ontario EA Act* “

### **Section 3.2, page 3-10**

Footnote 2 is missing, and should be:

<sup>2</sup> These estimates are based on the calculations undertaken in the Feasibility Study (CVC and TRCA, 2012), which assume average tipping fees of \$40/load and trucking costs of \$85/hour. This results in a price of \$250.70 per load for the 1-2 million cubic metres of fill requiring disposal.

**Section 6.2, page 6.2**

The following clarifications are made to this section to support the focussing of the ToR and the EA and is consistent with information presented to the public and agencies as part of the consultation activities during preparation of the ToR.

Section 6.2 should read as follows:

*Each of the “alternatives to” were evaluated as to their ability to achieve the LWC Project goal. The LWC Project goal reflects two of the LWC Project objectives related to naturalization and access. Given comments received on the Draft ToR the evaluation of ‘alternatives to’ was simplified to focus on the ability of each ‘ alternative to’ to first meet the project goal and thus the LWC Project objectives related to naturalization and access. The LWC Project goal and objectives are detailed in Section 5.1.*

*For the two objectives specified in the LWC Project goal (provide naturalization and public access for this portion of the Mississauga waterfront) evaluation criteria were utilized to measure whether the ‘alternatives to’ could meet those fundamental minimum requirements for the LWC Project. As discussed in Section 5.1, for the Naturalization objective, the LWC Project must be able to provide opportunities to create a wide suite of aquatic and terrestrial habitat types that are appropriate for this portion of the waterfront. For the access objective, the LWC Project must be able to provide opportunities for public access to and along the waterfront. If an ‘alternative to’ cannot meet either of these objectives, then that ‘alternative to’ will not be considered further in the EA.*

*The evaluation simply assessed whether or not the ‘alternatives to’ had the potential to create habitat and to create access as follows:*

**Table 6-1 Preliminary Evaluation of ‘Alternatives To’**

<b>Project Objectives</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Do Nothing</b>	<b>Create New Natural Waterfront Park on Existing Landbase</b>	<b>Create New Natural Waterfront Park on Created Land</b>
<b>Naturalization</b>	<i>Potential to create aquatic habitat</i>	<i>No potential to create aquatic habitat on WWTF site.</i>	<i>Low Potential as opportunities would be limited to minor modifications of existing shoreline with little opportunity for creating a full suite of aquatic habitats appropriate for the area.</i>	<i>High potential as the creation of new lands will allow the establishment of a diverse range of aquatic habitats and functions appropriate for the area.</i>
	<i>Potential to create terrestrial habitat</i>	<i>No potential to create terrestrial habitat on WWTF site.</i>	<i>No potential to create terrestrial habitat on WWTF site.</i>	<i>High potential as the creation of new land will permit the establishment of a diverse range of terrestrial habitats and functions appropriate for the area.</i>

<b>Access</b>	<i>Potential to create access to the waterfront and reconnect the Waterfront Trail to and along the water's edge</i>	<i>No potential to reconnect Waterfront Trail to and along the water's edge.</i>	<i>No potential to create access to and along the waterfront, as providing access would compromise WWTF security</i>	<i>High Potential as a network of trail connections can be established to and along the waterfront from Marie Curtis Park to the OPG Piers.</i>
<b>SUMMARY</b>		<b><i>Dropped from further consideration as it does not meet LWC Project goal</i></b>	<b><i>Dropped from further consideration as it does not meet LWC Project goal</i></b>	<b><i>Best potential to meet the LWC Project goal thus, will be carried forward as the basis for the development of 'Alternative Methods' during the EA</i></b>

Therefore,

1. *Do Nothing: The 'do nothing' alternative does not create access, and does not reconnect the Waterfront Trail to the shoreline nor does it create terrestrial and/or aquatic habitat.*
2. *Create new natural waterfront park on existing landbase: The WWTF is critical public infrastructure, with operations extending to the shoreline. Given access is restricted around the WWTF, there is no potential to create habitat or create public linkages and passive recreation opportunities on the existing land base. Furthermore, the Region of Peel cannot pull WWTF operations back from the shoreline. Therefore, this alternative does not meet the LWC Project goal and objectives.*
3. *Create new natural waterfront park on created land: Given there is no potential to create habitat and public linkages on the existing land base, new land must be created to establish the new natural waterfront park. Land creation activities will destroy some low quality aquatic habitat but they also provide the opportunity to create higher quality aquatic, terrestrial and wetland habitat, with a softer shoreline that is more accessible to both human beings and wildlife.*

*In summary, for the LWC Project goal and objectives, the creation of ecological habitat and public linkages through the creation of land is the preferred way to solve the identified problem/opportunity when compared to doing nothing or using the existing land base. Therefore, the 'alternative to' involving land creation will have the greatest potential to meet the LWC Project goal and objectives and will be carried forward as the basis for the development of 'Alternative Methods' during the EA. The 'Do Nothing' alternative will be assessed against the preferred 'alternative method' as part of the detailed assessment.*