

Section	Comment	Response
<b>Ministry of Environment – Environmental Approvals Branch</b>		
n/a	We are satisfied with the Environmental Assessment and we have no comments.	Comment noted.
<b>Ontario Power Generation</b>		
Figure 2.1	This figure is not representative of the latest green moves being considered as part of the Inspiration Lakeview Master Plan process. The existing alignment of Serson Creek is to generally remain, while the green corridor connecting Lakeshore Road to the lakefront is not planned to be as wide as shown. The width of Serson Creek corridor is anticipated to be between 30 metres and 40 metres at the greatest.	<p>This Figure came from the document “Inspiration Lakeview: A Vision” dated April 18, 2011. It is recognized that the Inspiration Lakeview Master Planning process is ongoing and the specific details of the plan for OPG lands will evolve through this process.</p> <p>Through discussions with the City of Mississauga and OPG as part of the Inspiration Lakeview Master Planning process, it was identified that a corridor that includes the hazard lands associated with the Serson Creek will be established on the OPG lands adjacent to the creek. The corridor width will be refined through future studies by a qualified professional (water resources engineer, fluvial geomorphologist, or similar) as the planning process progresses.</p>
Section 2.3.2	The Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Mississauga, the Province and OPG was extended to August 30, 2014 in order to address scheduling matters.	Comment noted.
Section 3.3.1.3 Future Land Use	This section provides a description on the visioning process undertaken by the City but does not provide further information updates on the Master Plan process that is indicative of the current vision for the future	Comment noted.

	<p>redevelopment of the Lakeview site. The Inspiration Lakeview vision has been further developed and refined through the Master Plan process. The Master Plan will be presented to the Council of the City of Mississauga on July 2, 2014 and to OPG's Board of Directors in August 2014 as the product of the shared vision for the future redevelopment of OPG's Lakeview site as set out in the MOU</p>	
<p><b>City of Toronto</b></p>		
<p>Section 5.1.3 (pg. 5-4)</p>	<p>During detailed design further investigations should be undertaken to reduce impacts to the sand beach in Marie Curtis Park Beach West.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Section 5.3.1.1 (pg. 5-30)</p>	<p>Ensure that public consultation is inclusive of City of Toronto residents and that the Community Liaison Committee is expanded to include representation from the City of Toronto.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Section 6.1.1 (pg. 6-1)</p>	<p>City of Toronto understands that there will be no expansion of the concept beyond the footprint currently being explored that will accommodate 1.5-2.0 M cubic metres of fill and more specifically impacts at Marie Curtis Park Beach West.</p>	<p>The maximum footprint for the LWC Project is 2.0 M cubic metres of fill. There will be no expansion of the footprint beyond this upper limit.</p>
<p>Section 6.1.1.2 (pg. 6-4)</p>	<p>Additional information requested through detailed design to show cross sections and grading of cobble beach as it transitions back to meet the existing Marie Curtis Park Beach West. Cross section and longitudinal grading needs to ensure beach areas and transitions from new land to existing are walkable.</p>	<p>Additional information will be provided through detailed design.</p>
<p>Section 6.1.1.4 (pg 6-7)</p>	<p>Additional information requested through detailed design to show proposed structural reinforcement treatment intended for Applewood Creek and the relationship to the outlet at the beach on Marie Curtis Park Beach West.</p>	<p>Additional information will be provided through detailed design.</p>

Section 6.1.1.5 (pg 6-7)	Additional information requested through detailed design to show cross section through beach and for grading from new beach to existing beach condition at Marie Curtis Park Beach West. Cross section and longitudinal grading needs to ensure beach areas and transitions from new land to existing are walkable.	Additional information will be provided through detailed design.
Section 6.2 (pg. 6-24 and 25)	<p>The City of Toronto does not undertake maintenance for Riparian Areas or Beach Shorelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removal of debris along streams and rivers</li> <li>• raking of cobble beaches</li> </ul> <p>The City of Toronto has limited capacity to undertake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removal of invasive species or animal species from naturalized or</li> <li>• wetland areas</li> <li>• periodic burning or removal of woody species from meadow areas</li> </ul> <p>A Memorandum of Understanding would be required between all landowners and park managers (including City of Toronto) regarding jurisdictional responsibility and maintenance of this new parkland.</p>	Comment noted.
Section 6.3.2 (pg. 6-28)	Consider options to minimize noise impacts that detract from the Marie Curtis Park experience.	Comment noted.
Section 6.3.2 (pg. 6-29)	The City of Toronto to participate in the development of the Communications Strategy and Protocol for managing communications between the cities, agencies and the public throughout detailed design and construction.	The City of Toronto will be invited to participate in the development of the Communications Strategy and Protocol for managing communications between the cities, agencies and the public throughout detailed design and construction.
Section 6.3.3 (pg. 6-29)	City of Toronto prefers that the construction access have no impacts to Marie Curtis Park, however, will	Comment noted. Upon completion full restoration of the area would be completed to the

	accommodate impacts at the municipal boundary to a maximum overlap of 5 m to provide tree protection if no other alternate is available. It is understood that upon completion full restoration of the area would be completed to the satisfaction of City of Toronto Parks Forestry and Recreation.	satisfaction of City of Toronto Parks Forestry and Recreation.
Section 6.3.3.4 (pg. 6-49)	All measures need to be taken to meet Ministry Standards if construction access across municipal landfill (50-60 m before reaching the lake) is required. The City of Toronto requests notification of all decisions and impacts in this area.	The preferred alternative for construction access will not impact the municipal landfill.
Table 7.3 (pg. 7-19)	Objective 1: Naturalization (Establishment/Post Establishment Effects) City of Toronto requests confirmation of how the new landform will transition to meet the existing beach ridge on the east side of Applewood Creek (within City of Toronto).	Additional information will be provided to the City of Toronto through the detailed design process.
Section 7.3.2 (pg. 7-32)	Objective 2: Access City of Toronto requests that signage regarding impacts to Waterfront Trail or trail re-routing be circulated and coordinated with City of Toronto in advance of communication with public or placement on site.	Signage regarding impacts to Waterfront Trail or trail re-routing will be circulated and coordinated with City of Toronto in advance of communication with public or placement on site.
Table 7.6 (pg. 7-32)	Objective 2: Access (Construction Effects) Through construction restricted public access at western end of Marie Curtis Park Beach West will need to be coordinated with City of Toronto and appropriate signage posted.	This will be coordinated with the City of Toronto.
(pg. 7-35)	Criterion: Potential for changes to use of waterfront for recreation Request for clarification of extent of impacts to Marie	Additional information will be provided to the City of Toronto through the detailed design process.

	Curtis Park Beach West within City of Toronto - in response to preference by some park users for sand beach vs. cobble beach.	
(pg. 7-36)	Criterion: Potential for public access to water's edge See comment under Table 7.6 (pg 7-35)	See applicable comment response.
Section 7.3.2.3 (pg. 7-41)	Summary of the Access Objective See comment under Table 7.3 & Table 7.6	See applicable comment response.
Pg 7-48 and 7-49	Criterion: Changes to parking capacity Due to recent upgrades in Marie Curtis Park parking in Marie Curtis Park West is at capacity. Parking counts as shown are low. Parking for the new parkland cannot be accommodate in Marie Curtis Park and need to be accommodated on City of Mississauga property.	Additional parking capacity is currently being considered by the City of Mississauga under parallel planning processes.
Pg 7-53	Criterion: Consistency with Marie Curtis Park Revitalization Plan The City of Toronto understands that the Waterfront Trail route will need to be re routed to create an alternative safe alternative route along Lake Shore Blvd. during the construction process. Coordination with City of Toronto required and appropriate signage posted in advance of closure and re routing.	This will be coordinated with the City of Toronto.
Pg 7-53	Remove duplication of "Criterion: Consistency with Marie Curtis Park Revitalization Plan	Comment noted.
Chapter 8 - general	The City of Toronto requests regular updates or results through the monitoring and evaluation of the new Lakefront Waterfront Connection Park and to be notified of impacts and results to inform on-going management and operations at Marie Curtis Park	Regular updates and results will be provided.
Chapter 9 - general	The City of Toronto requests notification if amendments and design modifications are required.	Notification will be provided.

Section 10.4.3 (pg 10-10)	<p>Community Liaison Committee</p> <p>The City of Toronto requests that the Community Liaison Group be expanded to include representation from the City of Toronto.</p>	The CLC or its subsequent form following EA approvals will be expanded to include City of Toronto representation
Section 10.4.4 (pg. 10-13)	<p>Direct Community Engagement</p> <p>The City of Toronto requests that the ongoing consultation strategy through the finalization of the Environmental Assessment and through detailed design continue to use direct methods of Community Engagement. Notification of these events needs to be circulated to City of Toronto a minimum of 2 weeks in advance of the meetings. In addition, facilities for meeting locations need to be accessible and mindful of the fact that residents of the City of Toronto residents will attend.</p>	Direct Community Engagement will continue through the remainder of the EA process and into the detailed design process. City of Toronto will continue to be notified of any and all consultation events and will be provided an opportunity to review all proposed materials.
Table 11.1 (pg. 11-2)	<p>Advantages and Disadvantages:</p> <p>Project Objective: Access</p> <p>Expand description of alteration to Marie Curtis Park Beach West in City of Toronto:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing Condition: Marie Curtis Park Beach West (City of Toronto) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 395 m existing sand beach</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposed Concept: Marie Curtis Park Beach West (City of Toronto). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 240 m existing sand beach preserved</li> <li>○ 50 m sand/gravel (west of proposed groyne)</li> <li>○ 105 m transition to cobble beach</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	This information is detailed in Chapter 7 (Effects Assessment). Table 11.1 is provided as a high level overview that does not included detailed data.

	<p>The City of Mississauga supports this project and the proposed objectives align with the City of Mississauga Inspiration Lakeview vision and the emerging Master Plan that is currently underway. The City of Mississauga Inspiration Lakeview team will continue to work with the Region of Peel, Credit Valley Conservation, and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and to ensure the projects remain aligned.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>The proposed LWC lakefill project and the redevelopment of the Inspiration Lakeview site, forms an integral part of Mississauga's greater waterfront development strategy and will help create a new, natural waterfront park which will enhance the trail proposed at Mississauga's eastern shore.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>At this stage in the (Inspiration Lakeview) Master Plan process the City is not able to commit to a total number of designated parking spots for the new lakefill park, however there may be a number of parking options provided on the new Inspiration Lakeview site along with proposed connections that would allow transition from the Lakefront Promenade Park parking and street parking, in addition to proposed transit into the Inspiration Lakeview site.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>The City of Mississauga has been actively involved during the development of the 'Final Environmental Assessment for Lakeview Waterfront Connection' document and provided comments during the Public Review Period. Most of the concerns expressed have been addressed during this phase of the environmental assessment or through discussion with</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	<p>the proponents of the project. The consultation process with the surrounding landowners, key stakeholders and the community was involved and informative and as a result the feedback was very positive.</p>	
<p><b>Ministry of Natural Resources</b></p>		
<p>Figure 2.2</p>	<p>Overall Context - The Lakeview Waterfront Connection (LWC) EA is presented in the context of an overall vision for the waterfront of Lake Ontario in the western Greater Toronto Area. Figure 2.2 presents a “LWC Regional Study Area” and appears to identify the subject EA as a component of this broader project. At this point in time, however, there are no overarching strategic plans in order to evaluate the proposal against. By way of example, future use of adjacent land by Ontario Power Generation remains undecided. Further, MNR staff is not aware of any similar projects are currently being considered within the area identified as the LWC Regional Study Area. In the absence of a confirmed vision for the study area, the subject EA must be evaluated on its own merits.</p>	<p>It is important that some clarification is provided regarding the statements above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 2.2 was included to meet the requirements of the Individual EA process to show the broader geographic area in which elements of the environment may affect or be affected by the LWC EA during and after construction.</li> <li>• It is correct to state that no overarching strategic plan was completed for the lands associated with the Ontario Power Generation (OPG) site at Lakeview at the time of submission of the LWC EA. However, the LWC EA has been undertaken throughout its planning process in close collaboration with the City of Mississauga and OPG to ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the original Inspiration Lakeview vision plan completed in 2010, and throughout the development of the Inspiration Lakeview Master Plan that has recently been submitted to the City of Mississauga’s Planning and Development Committee (June 2014). This high level of integration is demonstrated by the letters of support received by both the City and OPG as part of their review of the final LWC EA, and the incorporation of key</li> </ul>



		<p>features of the LWC Project into the Inspiration Lakeview Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the other considerations within the LWC Regional Study Area include the effects of the project on coastal processes such as regional sediment transport and water quality, habitat diversity and connectivity, and transportation routes to and away from the site during construction. Much of the applicable data for the LWC Regional Study Area has benefited from multi-disciplinary and multi-year studies conducted under CVC's Lake Ontario Integrated Shoreline Strategy including: coastal processes, fluvial geomorphology, aquatic and terrestrial natural heritage, water quality, hydrology and hydraulics, and geomorphology. While LOISS is not yet finalized, annual updates are provided to the Technical Steering Committee and input is sought on addressing any outstanding research gaps. In 2013 and 2014, the LWC project was included as part of the presentation to the Technical Steering Committee.</li> <li>• Thus, it is important to consider the effects and benefits of the LWC Project at the local scale but also in the context at the defined Regional scale, which was found to have significant and widespread impairment of terrestrial and aquatic habitats.</li> </ul>
<p>Identification and Assessment of Alternative.</p>	<p>The volume of fill required for the undertaking has been a source of considerable discussion throughout the preconsultation process. MNR understands that it is the position of the proponents that the proposed</p>	<p>The LWC project assessed alternatives against their ability to meet 5 project objectives. Only one of those objectives dealt with the use of fill material. As discussed in Section 4.2.4, the creation of new land</p>

	<p>undertaking can only occur if the entire volume of excess fill available is incorporated into the creation of the proposed landform. Notwithstanding the forgoing, MNR staff notes that all of the alternatives presented are linked directly to the amount of available excess fill (i.e., -1.5 million- 2.0 million m<sup>3</sup>) with options for less fill not explored in the EA document. The three "long list" alternatives selected were "do nothing", "enhance existing shoreline" and &gt;30ha lake fill. As a result, five similar alternatives with fill options ranging from 30.7 ha to 34.8 ha are advanced. These alternatives, in many respects, are very similar variations on a specific type of shoreline treatment.</p>	<p>through lake filling was chosen as the preferred alternative as there is no potential to create the full range of terrestrial and aquatic habitat types that would have existed within the area and the public linkages on the existing land base with the other alternatives. Section 5.1 outlines how we established the footprint of the new land created. Some of the "common functional assumptions" built into the development of Alternatives included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum habitat area targets for the range of appropriate terrestrial heritage features with reference to the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study that has for its foundation MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide;</li> <li>• the need to incorporate flows from Applewood Creek and Serson Creek to contribute to the proper functioning of the proposed coastal wetlands;</li> <li>• the establishment of an appropriate range of coastal wetland sizes based on historical information and similar watershed systems along the north shore of Lake Ontario;</li> <li>• the need to provide public connections and passive recreational uses;</li> <li>• when developing a more natural shoreline, shoreline orientation in relation to the prevailing winds and currents is critical in determining its success; and</li> <li>• an upset limit of 2M cubic metres of fill was established to set the maximum fill volume for consideration of the Project.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above "common functional assumptions" the majority of the evaluation of Alternatives was</p>
--	---	--

		<p>based on the intrinsic differences between the alternative shoreline configurations. The more compact and cost-effective alternatives were deemed inappropriate given their much heavier reliance on armourstone revetments that provided limited ecological value.</p> <p>Through the refinement of the Preferred Alternative, it was determined that all of the key “functional” assumptions and the features provided by the preferred alternative could be provided using between 1.5M and 2M cubic metres of fill. Reducing this fill volume further was explored, but resulted in an inability to accommodate flows from Applewood Creek and its receiving coastal wetland, while still providing the requisite public access to the new natural waterfront park.</p>
<p>Identification and Assessment of Alternative (continued)</p>	<p>MNR staff notes that the "alternatives to" consideration for land-based disposal could have included a discussion of the potential to manage excess fill through current pathways in the Region or beyond. Alternately, an examination of the integration of excess fill into transportation related projects in the Region could have been examined.</p>	<p>The Alternatives To were addressed as part of the approved ToR and the evaluation is provided again in the EA for completeness. As noted previously, the goal of the project was not to consider land based disposal options for fill. The goal is to create a new natural waterfront park that will establish ecological and public linkages on the eastern Mississauga waterfront and the fill is an opportunity considered in meeting that goal. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for the EA to consider land based disposal alternatives.</p> <p>Ultimately, each of the contributing projects that would access the Lakeview site are required to assess the effects of excessive fill generation and management as part of their individual planning processes. The Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project simply provides a local sustainable alternative</p>

		for receiving this excess fill from these various projects while providing substantive improvements for the environment and communities that is consistent with other broader planning initiatives within the area.
Identification and Assessment of Alternative (continued)	MNR staff also note that options for the short-listed alternatives could have included variations in the amount of fill or variation on the amount of encroachment into Lake Ontario. By way of example, following options could have been examined: a) minor encroachment into Lake Ontario with 250,000m <sup>3</sup> of fill and shoreline restoration, b) moderate encroachment into Lake Ontario with 500,000m <sup>3</sup> of fill and shoreline restoration.	As noted above, Section 5.1 of the EA provides a detailed discussion of the need for the larger footprint in order to meet all 5 project objectives. The smaller footprints suggested by MNR would create a smaller “linear park” that could not fully meet the naturalization and access objectives established for the Project, nor meet the fiscal viability objective. These smaller footprints could have allowed for improvements to the near shore conditions, and provide some limited public access to and along the shore, but would not have provided the space necessary for the restoration of diverse terrestrial and wetland habitats and uses that were identified as desired for the LWC Project. In addition, the costs for purchased shoreline materials in these smaller footprint options would greatly exceed the fiscal benefits of providing for a local place to manage the resulting small volume of fill.
Aquatic Habitat Modeling	The HAAT model forms part of the basis of decision making regarding the size of the infill in the plan and the resulting compensation required due to fish habitat alternation / destruction. Through use of this model, compensation estimates in the EA document range between 4.7 ha and 7.2 ha, depending on the type of alignment of shoreline treatment and the degree of lake fill. It should be noted that MNR was not consulted on the development of the HAAT model (e.g. species input, weighting of variables, etc.) MNR are of the opinion that the requirements of the	The Habitat Alteration Assessment Tool (HAAT) is a web-based software tool that quantifies the suitability to fish of an aquatic site and calculates a weighted habitat supply for one or more scenarios (Tymoshuk 2013). Operation of the HAAT model was conducted in close collaboration with DFO scientists. The HAAT model measures the change of four variables: area; depth; substrate; and cover, in relation to a habitat suitability index for a list of fish species associated with the waterbody. The model output is considered a surrogate measure of total productivity of the habitats affected at a development site (Minns et al. 2001).

	<p>dominant fish community at the proposed location were not adequately considered and, subsequently, the impacts and the required compensation may be underestimated. MNR is prepared to work with the proponent to address this issue.</p>	<p>For the LWC EA, the HAAT model was utilized to determine the amount of area lost and which alternatives are better able to self-compensate by minimizing the net loss of habitat. It should be noted that HAAT model runs were undertaken at the coarse level of information available at this stage of the EA.</p> <p>HAAT analysis was also conducted on two build-out scenarios for the preferred alternative, 1.5M cubic metres and 2.0M cubic metres. For the assessment, the specific assumptions made in setting up the HAAT model are provided in summary form on Pages 7-6 and 7-7 of the LWC EA, and more comprehensively, in Section 4.2.3.2 of the Ecology Technical Report Appendix G.</p> <p>TRCA and CVC staff would be pleased to discuss the model input and process in more detail with MNR staff. Further analysis will be conducted during the detailed design process as well.</p>
<p>Consistency with the Lake Ontario Fish Community Objectives</p>	<p>Responsibility for Lake Ontario fisheries management is shared by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) for the Province of Ontario and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) for the State of New York. To facilitate effective management of a common resource, fish community objectives (FCO) for the Lake Ontario fish community have been developed by both agencies in accordance with A JOINT STRATEGIC PLAN for the Management of Great Lakes Fisheries (Joint Strategic Plan) (Great Lakes Fishery Commission 1997).</p>	<p>The LWC EA has been undertaken on the basis of considering a broader, more fulsome suite of ecological considerations, including the provision of habitats for cold, warm and cool water fish species.</p> <p>In referencing MNR's specific question on coldwater habitat restoration, it is the Project Team's professional opinion that in selecting the most natural-like shoreline conditions provided by the Preferred Alternative, the Alternative that provides the greatest opportunities for restoring coldwater habitat was selected. The Preferred Alternative provides the greatest extent of rocky beach conditions, and</p>

	<p>The FCO's are not only meant to guide provincial and state agency activities / decisions, but were also developed to ensure that the activities of other management agencies, interest groups and the general public are consistent with lake-wide goals when developing localized specific fisheries, habitat and management plans.</p> <p>To manage a large and diverse ecosystem, fourteen fish community objectives have been jointly developed to guide activities lake-wide. Depending on the undertaking and the location, some objectives will be more relevant than others. The dominant fish community present in any one location is a key consideration of the FCOs. Therefore, it is important to match the activity with the needs of the presiding fish community in order to achieve consistency with the Lake Ontario Fish Community Objectives.</p> <p>The project as outlined in the EA states that it will result in an overall improvement of aquatic habitat conditions. The planning and design, however, place more emphasis on satisfying warm water and cool water fisheries objectives. MNR's Lake Ontario Management Unit characterizes this section of open coast shoreline as primarily cold water fish habitat. This classification is supported through fish community and water temperature sampling. Given the proposed project has the potential to impact 40 plus hectares of cold water habitat, MNR is interested in ensuring greater importance is placed on efforts to</p>	<p>provides the most diverse open coast habitat from a wave and current perspective of all alternatives. Therefore, the LWC Project would provide excellent opportunities for restoring coldwater habitat for the fish species themselves and the fish they feed on, over a range of life stages.</p> <p>On this basis, the Project Team commits to providing habitat structure along the base the revetment areas in the westernmost portion of the Project, as well as additional rocky structure in relation to the proposed islands. The specific volume, size, orientation and structure will be confirmed during detailed design in consultation with DFO, MNR, and other specialists, and targeted to specific coldwater fish species. It is anticipated that the rocky beach face areas themselves will not require additional structure incorporated into the design.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>rehabilitate habitat for cold water species in the EA document. In this regard, MNR would like to see project design features that emphasize more appropriate cold water fish community objectives to help guide restoration and management in these open coast habitats. One objective of the FCOs in particular focusses on improving the status of native Lake Trout. Lake Trout is a species that has received considerable bi-national restoration effort (40 years) with only a limited degree of success. MNR staff are of the opinion that potential impacts to Lake Trout has not been adequately addressed nor has the potential for enhancements directed at Lake Trout been adequately considered.</p>	
<p>The Description of the Preferred Alternative with details of the Lake/infill Interface (Section 6)</p>	<p>When reviewing the aquatic habitats being proposed, and the slopes and rock size being recommended, naturalization of the lakebed may be difficult. By way of example, descriptions of the revetment portions of the infill with the random placement of 4 to 8 tonne stone would not create a naturalized shoreline. While MNR recognizes the importance of stability and the engineering required to achieve it, there may be additional opportunities that exist along these sections for naturalization in front of the revetments. MNR notes that the Toronto Waterfront Aquatic Habitat Restoration Strategy (TW AHRS) contains a number of examples of how these hardened structures can be naturalized by surcharging the structures with stones of smaller sizes that will eventually form nearshore shoals. Such</p>	<p>Agreed. Rock placed along the toe of the revetment and island portions of the Project for the purposes of fish habitat will be included in the detailed designs.</p>

	enhancements will enhance productivity and provide the beneficial habitats for cold water species.	
Species At Risk	The document provides confirmation that there are a number of Species at Risk within the study area including butternut, two species of bats, barn swallow, bank swallow, bobolink and eastern meadowlark (Table B8). Through the analysis of impact of the construction access, the EA states that there are no anticipated impacts to Species at Risk. There is, however, no documentation (mapping) of the regulated habitat for Species at Risk in the area, nor is there documentation from MNR confirming the Species at Risk and delineating regulated habitats that may fall within the study area. MNR is prepared to work with the proponents to address this issue and identify any authorizations that may be required pursuant to the Endangered Species Act.	It is noted that while the location of species at risk are not to be noted publically, we will work with MNR to address this issue and identify any authorizations that may be required pursuant to the <i>Endangered Species Act</i> .
Shoreline Treatments	Table 7.3 provides a summary of the proposed changes in shoreline types in relation to the existing condition. The table refers to "lee rocky island shoreline" as a shoreline type that differs from revetment". Based on the description provided in section 6.1.1.3, the offshore islands appear to be similar to the standard revetment. Based on the information proposed, the scenario differs little from the existing condition in terms of hardened shoreline (revetment).	There is flexibility, within limits, in the design of the back size of the islands. A key design consideration is to allow the islands to be regularly overtopped by wave activity to inhibit the establishment of large shrubs and trees, in order to avoid the establishment of a large permanent cormorant colony on the islands. In instances where islands and other hard points are designed to be overtopped tend to suffer damage on the top of the back side where overtopping wave push the protection layers. However, there is flexibility during detailed design to consider a reduction in material size on the hind portions of the islands as compared to the outer side of the islands.  In addition to the potential reduction in rock size on



		<p>the backside of the islands, the sheltering effect of the islands do produce different wave and current conditions than on the outside of the islands. Opportunities for placing smaller rocky material on the toe of the leese side of the islands will also be explored during detailed design. Combined with the toe of the rocky beach materials on the leese side of the islands, there will be more diverse habitat than compared to the outside of the islands.</p>
<p>Shoreline Treatments (continued)</p>	<p>Descriptions of cobble beaches include rock size ranges and proposed slopes. Slopes appear to be very high (6: 1 and 9.3:1) depending on rock size range. It is unclear if cobble beaches designed for target fish species or were designed solely to address engineering interests. It is also unclear if the proposed cobble beaches are comparable in terms of slope, structural diversity and extent to existing natural cobble beaches elsewhere in Lake Ontario. Further, the proposed design may not provide for coldwater spawning habitat (e.g., Lake Trout, Whitefish).</p>	<p>The material on the cobble beaches are designed to move vertically and horizontally within each beach cell. As such, the slope of the above water portion of the beaches will be established and governed by the waves themselves. For given wave conditions, only a range of cobble sizes will be stable and the slope of the cobble is fixed given the size of the material and wave conditions. There is a different slope below water and above water. Below water is flatter than above water. The flatter below water slope extends to a specific depth, given the wave conditions and cobble size, and below this point it can stabilize at a much steeper slope. This may be as steep as angle of repose for the cobble material. Even if the material is placed on a flatter slope the waves will adjust the slope over time unless the actual size of the material makes it statically stable (ie. designed not to move). The three south beaches were designed to have cobble in the smaller size range of possible sizes based on site wave conditions. The D50 size is 150 mm. The most northerly cell is designed to have cobble starting at the 150 mm range and gradually reduce in size as the waves reduce closer to shore and reaching gravel size at the existing shore. The gravel is expected to be intermixed with natural sand in the area during the</p>

		<p>calm periods in the summer.</p> <p>In summary, it is the wave conditions that govern the size and slope of the cobble beach. The size selected in the EA is in the smaller range of possible sizes. The three south beach cells are located in depths where natural cobble beaches do not normally occur so direct comparison to natural beaches is not possible.</p>
Wetlands Creation	<p>Applewood Creek wetland creation includes the proposed use of a carp control structure (Figure 6.12). MNR is concerned that a permanent control structure will result in compromising of the fish community expected to benefit from the wetland feature. Further, it is not clear to what degree does this structure influence the HAAT model assumptions.</p>	<p>The proposed control structure has not influenced the HAAT model.</p> <p>The carp control structure will have the ability to exclude carp and control water levels within the wetlands if deemed necessary. These structures will as a default, remain open, allowing full access for fish into and out of the wetlands. However, if wetland vegetation appears to be disappearing through prolonged high lake levels, excessive carp biomass and subsequent disturbance of substrates, ice plucking or some other mechanism, CVC will have the ability to implement more active management measures to allow wetland vegetation communities to re-establish. In less aggressive cases, gates can be installed to restrict mature carp from accessing the wetland while allowing most other species (based on girth) access to the wetland. Preliminary results from an acoustic telemetry study in a coastal embayment at Tommy Thompson Park (Cell One) indicate that carp exclusion gates have been effective while allowing for the passage of other warmwater and coolwater species. In severe cases, the gates may be closed entirely, and the water drawn down for a growing season to maximize vegetative regeneration.</p>
Wetlands	<p>Figures 6.13 and 6.14 depict slopes that are not found</p>	<p>Comment noted. The figures shown are for illustrative</p>

Creation (continued)	naturally in coastal wetlands. Should coastal wetlands become part of the accepted project, MNR recommends that slopes within the wetlands should be consistent with other wetlands within the area (e.g., Rattray Marshes, Humber Marshes). It should be noted that most of the local wetlands in the area have shallow slopes less than 20:1 for emergent and submergent zones.	purposes only. Slopes will be based on local reference areas but will also have some added flexibility to adapt to possible changes in water levels due to climate change. These will be more specifically determined during detailed design.
-------------------------	---	---