



Lakeview Waterfront Connection Coordinated Environmental Assessment Project (LWC EA)

Public Information Centre #1 Meeting Summary Notes Environmental Assessment Phase

January 22, 2013
4:30 pm to 9:00 pm

Mississauga Senior Citizen's Centre
1389 Cawthra Road, Mississauga

1. ATTENDANCE

The LWC PIC#1 was held at the Mississauga Senior's Centre at 1389 Cawthra Road in Mississauga, Ontario. As participants arrived they signed-in ([Appendix B1.1](#)) and were provided with a workbook ([Appendix B1.2](#)) that included an agenda, proposed project alternatives, an evaluation criteria and indicators table, and questions to be addressed in break-out groups during the PIC. The Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project Newsletter, January 2013 ([Appendix B1.3](#)) was also available for participants.

The total attendance at the LWC PIC#1 was approximately 72 members of the public. Project staff in attendance included:

Janice Hatton (The Region of Peel)
Kate Hayes (Credit Valley Conservation)
Lorenzo Ruffini (City of Mississauga)
Beatta Palka (City of Mississauga)
Alexis Wood (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)
Michael Charendoff (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)
Ken Dion (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)
Brooke Erickson (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)

Project consultants included:

Kyle Hunt (SENES Consultants)
Dave Hardy (Hardy Stevenson and Associates Limited)
Andrzej Schreyer (Hardy Stevenson and Associates Limited)

Councillor Jim Tovey (Ward 1 Mississauga South) was also in attendance.

2. OPEN HOUSE

The meeting began with an Open House starting at 4:30 pm where members of the public were invited to learn from information boards (**Appendix B1.4**) and discuss the project with the LWC project staff.

3. OPENING REMARKS

The presentation began at approximately 7:00 pm with Dave Hardy as facilitator. The Facilitator welcomed everyone to PIC#1 and indicated that this is the first PIC as part of the EA phase of the LWC project.

Councillor Tovey welcomed everyone to PIC#1 and thanked people for their continued participation. Councillor Tovey expressed his excitement about the prospect of creating an 85 acre park along Mississauga's shoreline that restores habitat and provides public access to the water. He noted that the aim is to begin construction of the park in the spring of 2014 and that the fill that is required to construct the park will be sourced from capital works projects such as the Hanlan Feedermain.

Councillor Tovey concluded his remarks by thanking all participants for attending the PIC. He also reminded participants that their input is critical to the success of the project and encouraged people to continue their involvement.

Kate Hayes of Credit Valley Conservation welcomed everyone to PIC #1. She indicated that the LWC began several years ago as a community-based dream and has evolved into an exciting opportunity that has gained momentum in the community and further afield. Kate expressed her enthusiasm for being part of the LWC project which also aligns with the Lake Ontario Integrated Shoreline Strategy (LOISS). Kate then played a short video featuring Robert Bateman who discussed the importance of enhancing the Mississauga waterfront and the role of the public throughout the process.

The Facilitator introduced the Project Team and addressed a number of procedural matters, including ensuring that everyone had a workbook, that the workbooks be completed and submitted at the end of the evening. He also indicated that public comments are welcome after the meeting as well, so long as they are submitted to Brooke by Monday, January 28, 2013. The Facilitator also outlined ground rules for the meeting, including: (i) limiting the use of jargon; (ii) asking questions of clarification if someone doesn't understand a term or concept; (iii) build on comments of others by using the word 'and' rather than the word 'but' to acknowledge the input of others; (iv) and, limit the use of cell phones.

The Facilitator turned the meeting over to Ken Dion.

4. PRESENTATION

Ken Dion of Toronto and Region Conservation Authority gave a PowerPoint presentation (**Appendix B1.5**) that included an overview of:

- The purpose of the meeting and agenda
- The status of the Environmental Assessment
- LWC goal and objectives
- Revised Project Study Area
- LWC EA steps
- Ecological building blocks
- Serson Creek building blocks
- Target wetland habitats
- Design parameters for wetland habitats
- Wetland habitat precedent images
- Target terrestrial habitat
- Design parameters of terrestrial habitat
- Terrestrial habitat precedent images
- Recreation building blocks
- Five project alternatives
 - Revetment
 - Headlands Beach
 - Island Beach A
 - Island Beach B
 - Island Beach C
- LWC comparative evaluation of alternatives
- LWC comparative evaluation
- Sample evaluation table
- Comparative evaluation assumptions
- Input to comparative evaluation

5. POST PRESENTATION FACILITATED QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Following the presentation, the Facilitator asked if there were any questions or clarifications required with respect to the presentation, and in particular the shoreline concepts (five alternatives). The following questions were asked:

- a) Based on what is being proposed, what will happen at the interface of Applewood Creek and the Lake Ontario?
 - The creek would be diverted into the wetlands being proposed as part of the options and tied in with the lagoon levee system.
- b) What is the current construction of the shoreline near the water treatment plant?
 - It is mainly comprised of armor stone rocks with a steep grade. The shoreline at this location is characterized by poor habitat conditions.
- c) Are you proposing to replace the existing armor stone with more armor stone?

- In some areas yes. However, the intention is to create an environment with a more natural beach system in some area. There are five alternatives being considered with various shoreline conditions. Some alternative include more armor stone and others contain less.
 - Through the evaluation process we want to identify an option that performs the best from an ecological and public access perspective, but be cognizant of costs and sustainability.
- d) Is there anyone who can comment on the project that was constructed near the Humber Bay shores? Has the approach taken there been considered as a potential approach for the LWC project?
- The conditions at Humber Bay shores are different from than conditions along the LWC shoreline. At Humber Bay shores there are two large headlands bound by a larger stream. The intent at Humber Bay Shores was to provide a sheltered marina and public open space on the waterfront. For the LWC, we are looking to establish a more natural shoreline with passive recreation opportunities, while incorporating two smaller creeks in the naturalization design.
- e) Have you considered the impact of the OPG land piers on the shoreline?
- Yes there has been a coastal analysis completed. The shoreline has been hardened significantly over the years resulting in very little sediment drift along the coast areas.
- f) Why are you only considering the Project Study Area as identified in the presentation? Why are you not looking at the shoreline outside of the Project Study Area?
- The Project Study Area includes where potential construction will occur, including the required transportation access routes from Lakeshore Road. The main project works are largely limited to the shoreline area.
- g) Is there any kind of disparity in construction costs between the five alternatives currently under consideration?
- There will be material purchase cost differences between the various alternatives. The shoreline alternatives that have a smaller footprint would cost less, while some of the larger shoreline alternatives (e.g., shoreline island options) would result in a higher cost.
 -
- h) Will the Region of Peel be charged market value rates for the cost of transporting the fill to the LWC project area?

- This arrangement has yet to be worked out. What we do know is that the savings resulting from the reduction in travel times to transport the fill will be the primary source of funding allowing the project to be constructed.

6. POST PRESENTATION FACILITATED QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION (GROUP WORK)

Following the question and answer session, the Facilitator gave instructions for the “facilitated break-out group discussion”. Meeting participants broke-out into groups to respond to, and discuss the following four questions:

- 1) Do the alternatives seem reasonable? Do you have any concerns regarding the alternatives or aspects of the alternatives? Are there any alternatives missing?
- 2) Do you understand the approach for evaluating the alternatives (objectives based evaluation)? Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the approach?
- 3) Do the criteria and indicators for the objectives seem reasonable? Are any critical criteria or indicators missing?
- 4) Do you have any other comments regarding the project and process to date?

Each group had a facilitator to assist group members in working through the workbook. The workbook provided space for meeting participants to provide answers to each question. Completed workbooks were submitted to the project team at the end of the session.

Groups had approximately 45 minutes to respond to their assigned question and the remaining questions in the workbook. After the 45 minute period, groups were invited to report in on their answers to the questions (See [Appendix B2](#) for individually completed workbooks; see [Appendix B3](#) for workbooks completed by groups).

- **QUESTION 1:**

Do the alternatives seem reasonable?

- Overall, the groups thought that the alternatives presented were reasonable. The groups liked that there were a range of configurations that offer various opportunities.
- There was general agreement that Alternative #1 (Revetment) includes too much hard surface and no opportunity for public access to the water. Therefore Alternative #1 was the least preferred.

Do you have any concerns regarding the alternatives or aspects of the alternatives?

- The following concerns were raised:
 - o Limited access to water based on the configuration of Alternative #1.
 - o Alternative #1 provides limited access to the water.
 - o Alternative #1 does not provide a good ecological habitat
 - o Aesthetics of the islands.
 - o Island could result in a safety hazard.
 - o Algae growth in the embayment area.
 - o Alternative #1 is generic and occurs in other areas along Lake Ontario. The preference would be to construct a park that is unique and has something new to offer.
 - o More opportunity for sand in the terrestrial areas of the park.
 - o Is fill appropriate in this area at all?
 - o The safety and circulation of trail users, including pedestrians, cyclists, in-line skaters, joggers etc.
 - o The impact of the alternatives on Marie Curtis beach.
 - o Safety concerns with respect to boats accessing the embayment.
 - o Flooding in the wetland area near the water treatment plant due to Applewood Creek flows and how this might impact the plant.
 - o Water quality in the embayment.
 - o Water currents associated with Alternative #5 due to the islands.
 - o Would there be sufficient parking, restaurants, and washroom facilities?
 - o Would there be swimming permitted in the embayment area?
 - o The public experience in the park will be critical.
 - o Flooding concerns with all alternatives.
 - o The definition of 'beach' needs to be more precise with respect to the material that will be used (cobbles vs sand).
 - o The definition of 'trail' also needs to be more precise (width, length, material).
 - o There is a great deal of focus on the environment and ecological habitat as part of the park, but not a lot on the recreational opportunities and the public experience in the park.

Are any other alternatives missing?

- Consider a hybrid of the embayment and island alternatives with a break through option to create water flow to minimize algae growth concerns.
- Consider opportunities to provide views out into water, but also into the land.
- More sandy areas to enjoy the park.
- Alternatives presented provided sufficient choices.

- QUESTION 2:

Do you understand the approach for evaluating the alternatives (objectives based evaluation)?

- In general groups understood and agreed with the proposed objectives based evaluation approach.
- Like that the evaluation was tied to broader objectives for the park.
- Agreed with the objectives that are being used to evaluate the alternatives.

Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the approach?

- Will the criteria be weighted?

- QUESTION 3:

Do the criteria and indicators for the objectives seem reasonable?

- In general the groups indicated that the criteria and indicators are reasonable.

Are any critical criteria or indicators missing?

- Consider using an indicator to measure fiscal viability of the alternatives.
- Consider the use of an indicator to measure the amount of time people spend in the park.
- Consider using criteria with respect to identifying the infrastructure required to support the transportation requirements.
- Consider using criteria to measure extent of active recreation, not just passive recreation.
- Consider using criteria to measure interpretive activity opportunities for each alternative.
- Consider using criteria to measure the extent that odour is minimized from the water treatment plant.
- Consider using criteria to measure the extent to which each alternative might attract undesirable species (cormorants) that may degrade the public experience within the park.
- Consider using criteria to measure the extent to which each alternative provides public recreation opportunities.
- Consider using criteria to measure the extent to which each alternative provides a revenue stream (through food/beverage sales) that might be diverted to operation and maintenance costs of the park.
- Consider using criteria to measure safety and programming.
- Consider using criteria to measure the extent to which each alternative provides view corridors toward the lake and other key landmarks.

- QUESTION 4: Do you have any other comments regarding the project and process to date?
 - No other comments were provided.

7. CLOSING REMARKS

Before introducing Janice Hatton to provide closing remarks, the Facilitator reminded participants that they can submit more input via e-mail to Brooke so long as it is submitted before January 28, 2013. He also encouraged participants to visit the website to review more LWC project information.

Janice closed the evening session by thanking everyone for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in PIC#1. She also referenced a John F. Kennedy quote: *“Things do not happen, things are made to happen”* as an appropriate reference for the purpose of PIC#1 – to move the vision for the LWC project toward achieving a real goal. Janice also encouraged everyone to contact the project team with any questions, ideas, and comments.

Meeting Adjourned: 9:00 pm

Facilitator: Dave Hardy, HSAL
Meeting summary notes prepared by: Andrzej Schreyer, HSAL