

Objective	Revetment	Headland Beach	Island A	Island B	Island C
Naturalization	LEAST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Access	LEAST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Coordination	LEAST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Fiscal Viability	MOST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	LEAST PREFERRED	LEAST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED
SUMMARY	LEAST PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MODERATELY PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED

DRAFT

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
Naturalization	Change in shoreline character	Change in diversity of shoreline types	These specific measures will be used to compare how much beach is created or lost; how much revetment is created or lost; and the relative amount of change of beach to shoreline habitat between alternatives and the existing conditions. Alternatives that provide a larger total and relative increase in beach habitat will be scored higher	This alternative results in a uniform revetment shoreline with no diversity. No beach is created and there is a loss of 363 m of existing beach. This results in an overall loss of shoreline diversity	A total of 449 m of beach is created however a similar length of beach is lost. The remaining shoreline is revetments. This results in no change in shoreline diversity	A total of 847 m of beach, 402 m of lee island shoreline, and 1656 m of revetment is created. There is a 28% increase in the amount of beach versus hardened shoreline and a 2% increase in beach overall. Increased diversity is also created by the addition of the lee island shoreline.	A total of 935 m of beach, 518 m of lee island shoreline, and 1724 m of revetment is created. There is a 29% increase in the amount of beach versus hardened shoreline and a 3% increase in beach overall. Increased diversity is also created by the addition of the lee island shoreline.	A total of 1307 m of beach, 515 m of lee island shoreline, and 1413 m of revetment is created. There is a 40% increase in the amount of beach versus hardened shoreline and a 5% increase in beach overall. Increased diversity is also created by the addition of the lee island shoreline.
		Irregularity of shoreline to provide nearshore forage fish habitat	This ratio describes the irregularity of a shoreline. The more irregular a shoreline the more nearshore forage fish habitat is available. The higher the number the more preferred the alternative.	1.3	1.7	2.3	2.4	2.1
		Ease of access to water for wildlife	Some wildlife require easy and safe access to the water for different aspects of their lifecycle. Different shoreline treatments create or discourage easy access.	No easy access for wildlife due to revetments	Yes, easier access provided for wildlife at beaches	Yes, easier access provided for wildlife at beaches	Yes, easier access provided for wildlife at beaches	Yes, easier access provided for wildlife at beaches
	<b>Summary</b>			<b>Least Preferred</b>	<b>Moderately Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
	Ability to create functional habitat blocks	Ability to meet minimum habitat area guidelines; 7-8 ha of wetland; 4-ha of forest; and 10-ha of meadow.	Using ecological function principles, minimum habitat sizes have been provided as a guideline to ensure appropriate levels of function within the LWC Project Study Area	Forest:6.7 Wetland:8.0 Meadow:16.0	Forest:6.4 Wetland:7.7 Meadow:17.0	Forest:6.7 Wetland:7.8 Meadow:18.2	Forest:7.2 Wetland:7.7 Meadow:18.5	Forest:6.7 Wetland:7.8 Meadow:18.2
	Qualitative assessment of habitat created	Ecological function is related to the relative quality of the new habitat created. Habitat patch size, shape, potential for human disturbance through trails and infrastructure dictate future ecological function. Options deemed to have higher quality habitat will be scored higher.	Ecological function is related to the relative quality of the new habitat created. Habitat patch size, shape, potential for human disturbance through trails and infrastructure dictate future ecological function. Options deemed to have higher quality habitat will be scored higher.	Terrestrial habitat created is of similar quality for all alternatives. Differences relate to ability to isolate areas from public access (wildlife refuges) and provision of diverse and sheltered shoreline habitats. The revetment option does not provide isolated wildlife refuge areas nor does it provide sheltered diverse shoreline habitats	Terrestrial habitat created is of similar quality for all alternatives. Differences relate to ability to isolate areas from public access (wildlife refuges) and provision of diverse and sheltered shoreline habitats. The headland option does not provide isolated wildlife refuge areas but does provide moderately sheltered and diverse shoreline habitats	Terrestrial habitat created is of similar quality for all alternatives. Differences relate to ability to isolate areas from public access (wildlife refuges) and provision of diverse and sheltered shoreline habitats. The Island A option provides some isolated wildlife refuge areas on the islands and moderately sheltered and diverse shoreline habitats. While not providing the most opportunities for habitat isolation (as compared to Island C) it does provide more diverse and sheltered habitat than Island C.	Terrestrial habitat created is of similar quality for all alternatives. Differences relate to ability to isolate areas from public access (wildlife refuges) and provision of diverse and sheltered shoreline habitats. The Island B option does provide some isolated wildlife refuge areas on the islands and well sheltered and diverse shoreline habitats. While not providing the most opportunities for habitat isolation (as compared to Island C) it does provide most diverse and sheltered habitat.	Terrestrial habitat created is of similar quality for all alternatives. Differences relate to ability to isolate areas from public access (wildlife refuges) and provision of diverse and sheltered shoreline habitats. The Island C option provides the most isolated wildlife refuge areas and moderately sheltered and diverse shoreline habitats. Provides most opportunities for habitat isolation but does not provide most sheltered or diverse habitat (as compared to Island B).

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			All alternatives meet minimum habitat size guidelines but differ in potential quality of habitat created. This alternative is <b>Least Preferred</b> based on the potential quality of habitat created.	All alternatives meet minimum habitat size guidelines but differ in potential quality of habitat created. This alternative is <b>Moderately Preferred</b> based on the potential quality of habitat created.	All alternatives meet minimum habitat size guidelines but differ in potential quality of habitat created. This alternative is <b>Most Preferred</b> based on the potential quality of habitat created.	All alternatives meet minimum habitat size guidelines but differ in potential quality of habitat created. This alternative is <b>Most Preferred</b> based on the potential quality of habitat created.	All alternatives meet minimum habitat size guidelines but differ in potential quality of habitat created. This alternative is <b>Most Preferred</b> based on the potential quality of habitat created.
	Ability of alternative to be self-compensating with respect to fish habitat	Area of aquatic habitat lost or changed (ha)	Land creation activities will create a loss of aquatic habitat and the area of loss is a key consideration in the ability of the LWC Project to self-compensate for this loss	Area lost to land creation is 30.7 ha	Area lost to land creation is 32.0 ha	Area lost to land creation is 34.2 ha	Area lost to land creation is 34.8 ha	Area lost to land creation is 34.7 ha
		HAAT model estimates of area requiring compensation lost (ha)	Different shoreline types and their resulting footprints have intrinsic differences in ecological features and functions and thus, their ability to be self-compensating from a fish habitat perspective. This measure will determine which alternatives are better able to be self-compensating by minimizing the net loss of habitat.	HAAT analysis indicates the following amount of like habitat is required to compensate for lakefilling: 3.6ha	HAAT analysis indicates the following amount of like habitat is required to compensate for lakefilling: 3.1 ha	HAAT analysis indicates the following amount of like habitat is required to compensate for lakefilling: 3.3 ha	HAAT analysis indicates the following amount of like habitat is required to compensate for lakefilling: 2.3 ha	HAAT analysis indicates the following amount of like habitat is required to compensate for lakefilling: 3.4 ha

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
		Area of aquatic Habitat Lost compared to HAAT Model estimate of area requiring compensation.	Indicator measures the amount of fill that would occur for each alternative before 1 ha of habitat compensation is required. Thus, the two indicators listed above are standardized and the greater the fill area, the higher intrinsic habitat quality provided.	8.5 ha of fill / 1ha of compensation	10.3 ha of fill / 1 ha of compensation	10.4 ha of fill / 1 ha of compensation	15.1 ha of fill / 1 ha of compensation.	10.2 ha of fill / 1 ha of compensation
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			This alternative has the least area of aquatic habitat lost however, it is least able to compensate for that loss therefore, it is <b>Least Preferred.</b>	This alternative has a moderate area of aquatic habitat lost however, it is moderately able to compensate for that loss therefore, it is <b>Moderately Preferred.</b>	This alternative has the greatest area of aquatic habitat lost however, it is least able to compensate for that loss therefore, it is <b>Moderately Preferred.</b>	This alternative has the greatest area of aquatic habitat lost however, it is best able to compensate for that loss therefore, it is <b>Most Preferred.</b>	This alternative has the greatest area of aquatic habitat lost however, it is least able to compensate for that loss therefore, it is <b>Moderately Preferred.</b>
Access	Potential for lookout areas	Number of opportunities for lookout areas	Lookout areas (providing views along the shoreline) are an important feature in enhancing public enjoyment of the waterfront. The size and the character of the shoreline created will create differences in opportunity.	Continuous lookout opportunities along shoreline; all lookout opportunities are uniform and are perched above water on revetment; excellent opportunities to create raised viewing platform; all views to lake unobstructed	Varied lookout opportunities along shoreline; some lookouts perched on revetment; some lookouts at water's edge; opportunity to create raised viewing platform; views to lake from beaches obstructed by headlands	Varied lookout opportunities along shoreline; some lookouts perched on revetment; some lookouts at water's edge; opportunity to create raised viewing platform; additional lookout opportunities created by hooked peninsula; some views to lake from beaches partially obstructed by peninsula	Varied lookout opportunities along shoreline; some lookouts perched on revetment; some lookouts at water's edge; opportunity to create raised viewing platform; additional lookout opportunities created by hooked peninsula; many views to lake from beaches obstructed by peninsula	Varied lookout opportunities along shoreline; some lookouts perched on revetment; some lookouts at water's edge; opportunity to create raised viewing platform; all views to lake unobstructed

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
	<b>Summary</b>			<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
	Potential for changes to use of waterfront for recreation	Potential for use of area for new activities such as fishing, birding, etc.	The size and character of the land and shoreline created will create differences in opportunity.	New opportunities created for recreational activities such as fishing, birding, picnicking, resting nodes, open play, interpretive nodes, etc.	New opportunities created for recreational activities such as fishing, birding, picnicking, resting nodes, open play, interpretive nodes, etc.	New opportunities created for recreational activities such as fishing, birding, picnicking, resting nodes, open play, interpretive nodes, etc.	New opportunities created for recreational activities such as fishing, birding, picnicking, resting nodes, open play, interpretive nodes, etc.	New opportunities created for recreational activities such as fishing, birding, picnicking, resting nodes, open play, interpretive nodes, etc.
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>				
	Potential for public access to water's edge	Percent change in accessible water's edge	Ease of regular access to the water's edge will enhance public enjoyment of the waterfront, and facilitate a variety of uses.	-10%. Loss of accessible water's edge relative to existing conditions.	+14%. Gain of accessible water's edge relative to existing conditions.	+20%. Gain of accessible water's edge relative to existing conditions.	+22%. Gain of accessible water's edge relative to existing conditions.	+25%. Gain of accessible water's edge relative to existing conditions.
	Potential to create tiered trail system providing seasonal access		A key component of east-west public linkages along the waterfront is the Waterfront Trail, which is forced to bypass much of the actual waterfront within the LWC Project Study Area. Alternatives will provide opportunities to change the path of the Waterfront Trail to better connect with trails and parks to the east and west of the LWC Project Study Area and to provide connections back to	Limited potential to create tiered trail system	Excellent potential to create tiered trail system	Excellent potential to create tiered trail system	Excellent potential to create tiered trail system	Moderate potential to create tiered trail system
	Potential to create multi-use trail connection across area of land creation			Excellent potential to create multi-use trail connection				

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
			Lakeshore Road and the adjacent communities.					
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
Potential for displacement of <i>built heritage resources</i> due to construction	Cultural heritage value of built heritage resources and <i>cultural heritage landscapes</i> within land creation area and area for potential realignment of Serson Creek.	It may be necessary to assess the areas to be affected to avoid or mitigate the effects to any identified resources of cultural heritage value or interest.	There are no cultural heritage resources nor built heritage elements in the land creation area or the area of the Serson Creek realignment. Therefore, no potential to affect these resources.	There are no cultural heritage resources nor built heritage elements in the land creation area or the area of the Serson Creek realignment. Therefore, no potential to affect these resources.	There are no cultural heritage resources nor built heritage elements in the land creation area or the area of the Serson Creek realignment. Therefore, no potential to affect these resources.	There are no cultural heritage resources nor built heritage elements in the land creation area or the area of the Serson Creek realignment. Therefore, no potential to affect these resources.	There are no cultural heritage resources nor built heritage elements in the land creation area or the area of the Serson Creek realignment. Therefore, no potential to affect these resources.	
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
Potential effects from construction on marine- and land-based archaeological resources	Significance of archaeological resources within footprint of land creation and area for potential realignment of Serson Creek.	It may be necessary to assess the areas to be affected to avoid or mitigate the effects to any identified resources of archaeological value or interest.	There are no archaeological resources in the land creation area. There is limited potential for archaeological resources in the area of the Serson Creek realignment.	There are no archaeological resources in the land creation area. There is limited potential for archaeological resources in the area of the Serson Creek realignment.	There are no archaeological resources in the land creation area. There is limited potential for archaeological resources in the area of the Serson Creek realignment.	There are no archaeological resources in the land creation area. There is limited potential for archaeological resources in the area of the Serson Creek realignment.	There are no archaeological resources in the land creation area. There is limited potential for archaeological resources in the area of the Serson Creek realignment.	
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
Potential for effect from construction on traditional uses of lands by <i>First Nations</i>	Extent of traditional uses of lands within LWC Project Study Area	The new waterfront park must respect and wherever possible enhance traditional uses of lands by First Nations	There are no traditional uses practiced in the LWC Project Study Area. However, the Mississaugas of the New Credit	There are no traditional uses practiced in the LWC Project Study Area. However, the	There are no traditional uses practiced in the LWC Project Study Area. However, the Mississaugas of the	There are no traditional uses practiced in the LWC Project Study Area. However, the Mississaugas of the	There are no traditional uses practiced in the LWC Project Study Area. However, the Mississaugas of the	

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
	and Métis		and Métis.	First Nation indicated a need to access the water. All options provide access to enhanced river and wetlands, however, the revetment option does not allow access to the shoreline.	Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation indicated a need to access the water. All options provide access to enhanced river and wetlands. Headland option allows for shoreline access.	New Credit First Nation indicated a need to access the water. All options provide access to enhanced river and wetlands. Island A option allows for shoreline access.	New Credit First Nation indicated a need to access the water. All options provide access to enhanced river and wetlands. Island B option allows for shoreline access.	New Credit First Nation indicated a need to access the water. All options provide access to enhanced river and wetlands. Island C option allows for shoreline access.
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Least Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>
Fiscal Viability	Estimated Capital Cost	Volume of purchased material	Alternatives will be compared based on their estimated volumes of material required for different shoreline protection types with options requiring lower volumes of material being preferred. All alternatives generally use the same volume of fill.	552,000 tonnes	765,000 tonnes	852,000 tonnes	935,000 tonnes	794,000 tonnes
		Land Cost : Area of waterlot required	The only land cost associated with the project is the cost of waterlots.	40.6 ha of waterlot required	46.7 ha of waterlot required	55.8 ha of waterlot required	55.4 ha of waterlot required	56.9 ha of waterlot required
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>
	Annual maintenance costs for naturalized area	Debris management costs	Alternatives with lower potential to accumulate debris, particularly in the vicinity of Marie Curtis Park, are	Low potential for debris accumulation due to shoreline configuration	Higher potential for debris accumulation along beaches	Higher potential for debris accumulation within the embayment	Higher potential for debris accumulation within the eastern "hook" feature	Higher potential for debris accumulation along beaches

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
			preferred.					
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Least preferred</b>
Compatibility	Potential for effects to existing WWTF outfalls	Changes in access to outfall: # of access points covered	Access to the WWTF outfalls is required for maintenance purposes.	2 manholes covered				
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>				
	Changes to site security for WWTF	Ability to maintain/enhance site security for the WWTF	Land creation at the shoreline along the WWTF will provide public access to a previously restricted piece of critical infrastructure. Based on this, maintaining or enhancing security at the WWTF is an essential consideration for the alternatives.	Opportunity to maintain/ enhance site security by establishing a treed swamp and forest between the WWTF and the trail to discourage public access to the WWTF	Opportunity to maintain/ enhance site security by establishing a treed swamp and forest between the WWTF and the trail to discourage public access to the WWTF	Opportunity to maintain/ enhance site security by establishing a treed swamp and forest between the WWTF and the trail to discourage public access to the WWTF	Opportunity to maintain/ enhance site security by establishing a treed swamp and forest between the WWTF and the trail to discourage public access to the WWTF	Opportunity to maintain/ enhance site security by establishing a treed swamp and forest between the WWTF and the trail to discourage public access to the WWTF
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>				
Coordination	Consistency with City of Mississauga Waterfront Parks Strategy (2008)	Consistency of alternative with Waterfront Parks Strategy	Alternatives will be ranked based on their consistency with the key strategic goals outlined in the Strategy, to ensure that the LWC Project does not conflict with these goals. The goals include better integration and connectivity of Waterfront Parks; improved connections to the city at-large; the introduction of more sustainable elements into the parks; and	Consistent with Waterfront Parks Strategy				

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
			promotion of a stronger relationship between the parks and the existing natural systems.					
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
	Consistency with the Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	Consistency of alternative with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	The shoreline and Serson Creek within the LWC Project Study Area was identified as a "Green" area within the Inspiration Lakeview Vision Plan. This portion of shoreline was discussed as an area to establish a new continuous waterfront south of the WWTF. Alternatives will be ranked based on their consistency with this vision, to ensure that the LWC Project remains consistent with the larger development plans at OPG's Lakeview site.	Consistent with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	Consistent with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	Consistent with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	Consistent with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview	Consistent with Visioning for Inspiration Lakeview
		Ability to integrate alternative with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site	As a key area for establishing public linkages identified in the Inspiration Lakeview vision, the ability of alternatives to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site is important in the larger Inspiration Lakeview planning process.	Good potential to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site	Excellent potential to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site	Excellent potential to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site	Excellent potential to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site	Excellent potential to integrate with potential plans for OPG's Lakeview site

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
	Consistency with LOISS	Consistency of alternative with priorities identified by LOISS	Alternatives will be ranked based on their consistency with the priorities identified in LOISS, to ensure that the LWC Project does not conflict with these priorities and helps to meet the goals of LOISS.	Alternative will provide for naturalization of this portion of the Mississauga waterfront. A key element of LOISS is to improve the diversity and quantity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat of the shoreline. The revetment alternative offers the least opportunity for achieving desired improvements.	Alternative will provide for naturalization of this portion of the Mississauga waterfront. A key element of LOISS is to improve the diversity and quantity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat of the shoreline. The headland alternative offers moderate opportunity for achieving the desired improvements	Alternative will provide for naturalization of this portion of the Mississauga waterfront. A key element of LOISS is to improve the diversity and quantity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat of the shoreline. The Islands A alternative offers moderate opportunities for achieving the desired improvements.	Alternative will provide for naturalization of this portion of the Mississauga waterfront. A key element of LOISS is to improve the diversity and quantity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat of the shoreline. The Islands B alternative offers moderate opportunities for achieving the desired improvements.	Alternative will provide for naturalization of this portion of the Mississauga waterfront. A key element of LOISS is to improve the diversity and quantity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat of the shoreline. The Islands C alternative offers moderate opportunities for achieving the desired improvements.
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
	Consistency with Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy	Consistency of alternative with priorities identified by the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy	Alternatives will be ranked based on their consistency with the recommendations and targets identified in the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy, to ensure that the LWC Project does not conflict with these elements and helps to meet the objectives of the Strategy.	All alternatives meet the First Goal for the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy. Assuming flows in Serson Creek are realigned, the Revetment Alternative contributes to four of the Conservation Targets of the Strategy: Native	All alternatives meet the First Goal for the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy. Assuming flows in Serson Creek are realigned, the Headland Alternative contributes to five of the Conservation	All alternatives meet the First Goal for the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy. Assuming flows in Serson Creek are realigned, the Island A Alternative contributes to six of the Conservation Targets of the Strategy: Native Migratory Fish;	All alternatives meet the First Goal for the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy. Assuming flows in Serson Creek are realigned, the Island B Alternative contributes to six of the Conservation Targets of the Strategy: Native Migratory Fish;	All alternatives meet the First Goal for the Lake Ontario Biodiversity Strategy. Assuming flows in Serson Creek are realigned, the Island C Alternative contributes to six of the Conservation Targets of the Strategy: Native Migratory Fish;

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
				Migratory Fish; Coastal Wetlands; Coastal Terrestrial System; and Rivers, Estuary and Connecting Channels	Targets of the Strategy: Native Migratory Fish; Coastal Wetlands; Nearshore Zone; Coastal Terrestrial System; and Rivers, Estuary and Connecting Channels	Coastal Wetlands; Nearshore Zone; Coastal Terrestrial System; Rivers, Estuary and Connecting Channels; and Islands	Coastal Wetlands; Nearshore Zone; Coastal Terrestrial System; Rivers, Estuary and Connecting Channels; and Islands	Coastal Wetlands; Nearshore Zone; Coastal Terrestrial System; Rivers, Estuary and Connecting Channels; and Islands
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Least preferred</b>	<b>Moderately preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>	<b>Most preferred</b>
	Consistency with Marie Curtis Park and Arsenal Lands Master Plan	Ability to integrate recreational opportunities and trails between the LWC, Arsenal Lands and Marie Curtis Park	The Master Plans for the Arsenal Lands and Marie Curtis Park identify a number of new and enhanced recreational opportunities. Alternatives will be ranked on their potential to create linkages between these amenities and the shoreline within the LWC Project Study Area, and thus meet the goals of these Master Plans.	All alternatives offer opportunities for connections to the existing trail networks through Marie Curtis Park and linkages to the Arsenal Lands.	All alternatives offer opportunities for connections to the existing trail networks through Marie Curtis Park and linkages to the Arsenal Lands.	All alternatives offer opportunities for connections to the existing trail networks through Marie Curtis Park and linkages to the Arsenal Lands	All alternatives offer opportunities for connections to the existing trail networks through Marie Curtis Park and linkages to the Arsenal Lands.	All alternatives offer opportunities for connections to the existing trail networks through Marie Curtis Park and linkages to the Arsenal Lands.
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>
	Consistency with MNR's Lake Ontario Fish Community Goals	Consistency with MNR's Fish Community Goals and Objectives for Lake Ontario	This Joint Strategic Plan updated in 2012 between MNR and the State of New York outlines fish community goals and objectives for	Alternative has potential to meet 2 of the objectives for the Nearshore Zone and none of the objectives for the Offshore zone.	Alternative has potential to meet 3 of the objectives for the Nearshore Zone and 5 of the objectives for the Offshore zone.	Alternative has potential to meet 2 of the objectives for the Nearshore Zone and 5 of the objectives for the Offshore zone	Alternative has potential to meet 3 of the objectives for the Nearshore Zone and 5 of the objectives for the Offshore zone	Alternative has potential to meet 3 of the objectives for the Nearshore Zone and 5 of the objectives for the Offshore zone

Objective	Criteria	Indicator(s)	Rationale	Revetment	Headland	Island A	Island B	Island C
			nearshore, offshore and deep water communities in Lake Ontario. Alternatives will be ranked on their potential to meet objectives for the Nearshore and Offshore zones					
	<b>SUMMARY</b>			<b>Least Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>	<b>Most Preferred</b>

DRAFT