



Lakeview Waterfront Connection Coordinated Environmental Assessment Project (LWC EA)

Public Information Centre #2 Meeting Summary Notes Environmental Assessment Phase

April 3, 2013
4:30 pm to 9:00 pm

Mississauga Senior Citizen's Centre
1389 Cawthra Road, Mississauga

1. ATTENDANCE

The LWC Project PIC#2 was held at the Mississauga Senior's Centre at 1389 Cawthra Road in Mississauga, Ontario. As participants arrived they signed-in (**Appendix D1.1**) and were provided with a workbook (**Appendix D1.2**) that included an agenda, a summary of the evaluation of alternative project configurations, the Preferred Alternative illustration, and questions to be addressed in break-out groups during the PIC. The LWC Project Newsletter Edition #4(**Appendix D1.3**) was also made available to participants.

The total attendance at the LWC Project PIC#2 was approximately 87 members of the public.

Project team in attendance included:

Janice Hatton (The Region of Peel)
Kate Hayes (Credit Valley Conservation)
Jon Macmull (Credit Valley Conservation)
Ken Dion (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)
Michael Charendoff (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)

Project consultants included:

Simon Strauss (SENES Consultants)
Dave Hardy (Hardy Stevenson and Associates Limited)
Andrzej Schreyer (Hardy Stevenson and Associates Limited)

Political representatives in attendance included:

M.P. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South)
Councillor Jim Tovey (Ward 1 Mississauga South)

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 D1.4**) and discuss the project with the LWC Project team.

3. OPENING REMARKS

The presentation began at approximately 7:00 pm with Dave Hardy as facilitator. The facilitator welcomed everyone to PIC#2 and explained his role as an independent third party facilitator. He also noted this is an exciting moment in the life of the EA because this is the moment where the Preferred Alternative is revealed and the public is given an opportunity to share their input.

The facilitator introduced M.P. Stella Ambler to provide words of welcome.

M.P. Ambler welcomed everyone to PIC #2 and on behalf of the Federal government thanked PIC participants, as well as all of those individuals who have been involved in the LWC Project for their dedication to the project and the community.

M.P. Ambler also noted that as part of the Environmental Committee in Ottawa she appreciated the appearance of Councillor Tovey and Ken Dion who spoke about the LWC Project. She also noted that one of the tasks of the Environmental Committee was to implement a National Conservation Plan for Canada, and that an important component of the Plan was to include an urban element as most Canadians live in cities. Finally, M.P. Ambler indicated that the Environmental Committee responded very well to Councillor Tovey's and Ken Dion's presentation and wished everyone good luck moving forward.

The facilitator introduced Councillor Tovey to provide words of welcome.

Councillor Tovey welcomed participants to PIC #2. He expressed his excitement about the LWC Project moving closer to fruition stating that the LWC project represents building 'heritage for the future'. He noted that construction is tentatively scheduled for the spring of 2014 with completion sometime in 2019. Councillor Tovey also highlighted the importance of 'excellence' when building cities, including parks and that he is delighted to have a highly competent project team led by Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and Credit Valley Conservation Authority. He also thanked participants for taking the time out of their schedules to attend PIC #2 and contribute to the project.

The facilitator introduced Kate Hayes of Credit Valley Conservation Authority to provide words of welcome.

Kate Hayes provided PIC participants with a temporal perspective for the LWC Project. She pointed out that it has taken 200 years for the shoreline to become degraded to its present condition; that it will take six months to prepare the Environmental Assessment; five years to construct the LWC Project; and, that once completed, the LWC project will be timeless. Kate also pointed out that the LWC Project will heal the shoreline and reconnect people to the lake, and that it will be a reflection of the countless time and effort of the public. Kate concluded her opening remarks by thanking everyone for attending PIC #2.

The facilitator introduced the project team as well as Region of Peel and City of Mississauga staff in attendance. He also addressed a number of procedural matters, including reviewing the agenda, ensuring that everyone had a workbook, and that everyone has signed-in.

Before turning the floor over to Ken Dion, the facilitator 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; and, (iii) remaining on topic as much as possible.

The facilitator turned the meeting over to Ken Dion.

4. PRESENTATION

Ken Dion of Toronto and Region Conservation Authority gave a PowerPoint presentation (**Appendix D1.5**) that included an overview of:

1. Meeting purpose
2. EA Status and schedule
3. Alternative LWC Project configurations
4. How we dealt with your suggested revisions to the alternatives
5. Comparative evaluation criteria
6. LWC Project comparative evaluation
7. Comparative evaluation assumptions
8. Evaluation criteria used
9. Criteria screened from evaluation
10. How we dealt with your suggestions on criteria and the evaluation
11. Summary of evaluation:
 - i. Naturalization
 - ii. Access
 - iii. Coordination
 - iv. Fiscal viability
 - v. Summary of evaluation
12. Preferred Alternative Island C
13. Refinements to Preferred Alternative
14. CLC input to comparative evaluation
15. Next steps prior to draft EA submission
16. EA approval process
17. Post EA approval steps

5. FACILITATED QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Following the presentation, the Facilitator asked if there were any questions or clarifications required with respect to the presentation. The following questions were asked:

- a) Could you please show us where the boundary of Toronto is located?
 - Ken showed where the approximate city limit of Toronto is located relative to the LWC Project.
- b) Does the water current along the shoreline flow in a north-south direction?
 - Ken explained that the currents change depending on the season.
- c) Why is it that Marie Curtis still has a sandy beach?

- This area is much closer to the shoreline and the waves are much smaller due to lower water depths thereby reducing wave energy.
- d) Has a wave study been conducted?
- All of the proposed designs are based on coastal engineering studies.
- e) Could you please identify the OPG property line? Isn't there a risk of negotiating with neighbours? All five project alternatives are directly adjacent to the OPG land and the City of Toronto. Are they in agreement with this proposal?
- We have been in discussions with both the City of Toronto and OPG throughout the EA process. The City of Toronto is generally favorable of the Preferred Alternative and we are continuously meeting with the City as issues arise. OPG is also generally happy with the LWC Project and are supportive. However, the planning process for OPG's water lots is on a slightly different timeline, therefore in the refinement stage of the EA process we will need to have a phased approach to ensure we remain flexible with respect to where the southern portion of the LWC Project ties off, with our preference being next to the OPG pier.
- f) Will the waterfront trail be rooted through the proposed park?
- Yes. This is the ultimate intent.
- g) Will there be landscaping put into place to screen the Lakeview Plant from public view?
- As part of the EA process, we are taking viewsapes into consideration.
- h) I am concerned about the accumulation of organic materials which have been increasing over the past 10 years. Will this proposal increase the accumulation of organic materials along the shoreline?
- According to the coastal analysis thus far there will be no change in coastal circulation. This will be a detailed component of the EA and it will take into consideration water circulation effects beyond the immediate LWC Project Study Area.
- i) Is the access to the western edge of the park contingent upon the OPG lands?
- Yes.
- j) Will the trails in the proposed park be able to accommodate multiple users?

- Yes. The trails will have the appropriate separations to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians.
- k) How far into the lake will fill be added?
- The fill will extend approximately 200 m from the existing shoreline. The revetment area will extend approximately 300 m to 400 m into the lake.
- l) Would it be possible to reduce the extent of this fill by half the distance?
- It is possible; however the reuse of materials generated from the Hanlan Water Project and other regional and City of Mississauga projects would be reduced. This material is the resource which makes the LWC project possible.
- m) Where is the 2,000,000 m³ of fill coming from?
- The fill will primarily come from municipal and regional infrastructure projects. The majority of the fill will consist of till and bedrock material. There will be strict controls on the sites from which the fill is generated to ensure that the quality of the fill meets applicable guidelines. The TRCA has experience doing this in other parts of the GTA and we will ensure that there is both source and end of delivery controls.
 - This material would need to be moved and because we have the opportunity to reuse the fill locally it represents significant cost savings due to reduced travel distances and tipping fees.

6. BREAK-OUT 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 questions:

- 1) Do the results of the evaluation seem reasonable? Please elaborate.
- 2) Do the refinements to the Preferred Alternative seem reasonable? Would you like to add anything to the refinements?

Each group had a facilitator to assist group members to discuss and respond to their assigned question (either question #1 or question #2). 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 reported on their answers to

the assigned question (See [Appendix D2](#) for individually completed workbooks; see [Appendix D3](#) for workbooks completed by groups).

This is a summary of group responses provided during the report-back portion of the PIC:

- QUESTION #1:

Do the results of the evaluation seem reasonable? Please elaborate.

- In general, groups agreed with the evaluation outcomes and in particular the Preferred Alternative Island C.
- Elements of the Preferred Alternative Island C that were highlighted as positive included:
 - The abundance of natural linkages;
 - The re-naturalization of the shoreline;
 - The creation of amenity space for the public; and,
 - The aesthetics of the proposed configuration with the three islands

- QUESTION #2:

Do the refinements to the Preferred Alternative seem reasonable? Would you like to add anything to the refinements?

- The preservation of existing beaches should be given more emphasis as well as screening the G.E. Booth wastewater treatment plant.
- Access to the area over the next several years and during construction should be given consideration.
- Access for small boats should be given consideration.
- Consider the human element (access) to the park in addition to naturalization.
- Consider mosquito proliferation due to proposed wetlands.
- Consider accessibility to the park to ensure everyone can enjoy it.
- Consider including more sand as part of the Preferred Alternative.
- Consider emergency services, accessibility and safety in the area, including good lighting.

- Consider opportunities for canoeing and kayaking, as well as the incorporation of a racing facility as a potential revenue stream.
- Consider parking access.
- Consider effect on roads and local area due to the transportation of the fill and during construction.
- Consider the possibility of the G.E. Booth wastewater treatment plant overflowing during storm events.
- Consider a contingency plan in the event there isn't sufficient fill generated so that the configuration/land mass of the park can be adapted.
- Consider separating the fill into piles based on quality to ensure that low-quality fill is not mixed with high-quality fill.

The facilitator asked if there were any other comments or questions before the meeting comes to a close.

The following comments were provided:

- When evaluating the Alternatives, because the criteria were given equal weight, this may represent a bias since the public might find some criteria more important than others.

The following questions were asked:

- Consider avoiding using the word 'beach' when describing the Alternatives because most people associate this word with sand and this is not being proposed in the majority of the Alternatives. I suggest using more appropriate terminology such as 'rock face', 'pebbles' or 'small rocks'. This is more accurate and avoids false expectations.
- Will you be taking the suggestions you hear today into consideration and informing us if the recommendations were indeed applied?
 - o Response: We will be taking all of the comments into consideration and indicate where we accepted the recommendations and where we did not and provide a rationale.
- Could you please identify the transition area between the cobbles and the sand on the Preferred Alternative Island C display board?
 - o Response: The transition area was identified.

7. CLOSING REMARKS

The facilitator introduced Janice Hatton to provide closing remarks. Janice thanked everyone for attending the PIC. She also reiterated the objective of PIC #2 as a moment to receive input on the evaluation of the LWC Project Alternatives. Janice thanked everyone for the input and hard work and concluded the meeting with a quote: *“There is no one giant step that does it; it’s a lot of small steps”*. She also encouraged everyone to continue providing excellent feedback.

Meeting Adjourned: 9:00 pm

Facilitator: Dave Hardy, HSAL

Meeting summary notes prepared by: Andrzej Schreyer, HSAL