



## APPENDIX B

### Record of Consultation

**DRAFT**

**INDIVIDUAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
DRAFT RECORD OF CONSULTATION  
FOR THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

*Prepared for:*

**Toronto and Region Conservation Authority**

5 Shoreham Drive  
Downsview, Ontario  
M3N 1S4

*Prepared by:*

**Dillon Consulting Limited**

235 Yorkland Blvd., Suite 800  
Toronto, Ontario  
M2J 4Y8

March 2015

VERSION 1

## Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Consultation Mechanisms.....	2
2.1 Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications .....	2
2.2 E-Newsletter Project Updates .....	3
2.3 Information Sheets .....	4
2.4 Project Website and Contact Information.....	4
3. Public Consultation .....	5
3.1 Project Contact List.....	5
3.2 Stakeholder Committee.....	5
3.3 Public Information Centres.....	12
3.4 Landowners .....	15
3.5 Businesses and Utilities .....	15
3.6 Response to Stakeholder Committee Comments .....	16
3.7 Response to Public Comments .....	40
4. First Nations and Métis Consultation.....	65
4.1 First Nations and Métis Contact List.....	65
4.2 Correspondence with First Nations and Métis Communities.....	65
4.3 Summary of First Nations and Métis Comments.....	70
5. Agency Consultation .....	71
5.1 Agency Contact List .....	71
5.2 Technical Advisory Committee .....	72
5.3 Agency Meetings .....	72
5.3.1 Summary of Agency Comments.....	74
6. Next Steps .....	81

## Tables

- Table 1 – Terms of Reference Notification Publication Dates
- Table 2 – PIC Attendance
- Table 3 – Stakeholder Committee Input Received During the ToR Phase
- Table 4 – Public Input Received During the ToR Phase
- Table 5 – Summary of Correspondence with First Nations and Métis Communities
- Table 6 – Agencies Contacted During the ToR
- Table 7 – Final TAC Membership
- Table 8 – Communications with the MOECC
- Table 9 – Summary of Agency Comments

## Figures

- Figure 1 – Stakeholder Committee Involvement

## Appendix C: Consultation Materials

- Appendix C-1 – Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications
- Appendix C-2 – E-Newsletter Project Updates
- Appendix C-3 – Information Sheets
- Appendix C-4 – Stakeholder Committee Materials
- Appendix C-5 – Public Information Centre Materials
- Appendix C-6 – Public Input Received
- Appendix C-7 – First Nations and Métis Correspondence
- Appendix C-8 – Agency Consultation

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

AANDC	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Act
DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Dillon	Dillon Consulting Limited
EA	Environmental Assessment
EA Act	Environmental Assessment Act, 1990
ISMP	Integrated Shoreline Management Plan, 1996
km	Kilometres
MAA	Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs
MMAH	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
MNRF	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
MOECC	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
PIC	Public Information Centre
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRCA	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

# 1. Introduction

A Record of Consultation is an essential component of an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference (ToR). As required by Section 6(3) of the *Environmental Assessment Act*, during the preparation of the ToR for the Scarborough Waterfront Project, this Record of Consultation describes the consultation and engagement activities that were conducted and the results of those activities. As the Project proceeds, the Project Team will continue to engage with the public, agencies, First Nations and Métis communities and other stakeholders through a variety of mechanisms.

The Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) *Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Terms of Reference for Environmental Assessments in Ontario* (2014) states that the Record of Consultation will:

- Identify persons consulted during the ToR preparation and how they were identified;
- Describe the consultation activities which took place;
- Describe how interested Aboriginal communities were identified and how they were consulted;
- Clearly and accurately summarize the comments made by interested persons during the ToR;
- Describe the proponent's response and how concerns were considered in the development of the ToR;
- Describe outstanding concerns;
- Include minutes of meetings held with interested persons; and,
- Include copies of written comments received from interested persons.

Following this introduction, **Section 2** of this report provides an overview of the consultation mechanisms that were used as part of the Scarborough Waterfront Project consultation program. **Section 3** summarizes the outcome of the consultation activities that were undertaken with the public and provides the Project Team's responses to feedback. Consultation activities that occurred with First Nations and Métis communities are described in **Section 4**. Agency meetings and associated consultation activities are outlined in **Section 5**. The input received during consultation activities with the public, First Nations and Métis communities, agencies, and the Stakeholder Committee are summarized and documented within each of the sections noted. **Section 6** concludes the report by providing a brief summary of the next steps in the EA process. Materials used in the consultation activities, meeting summaries, and additional details on input received are included in Appendices to this document.

## 2. Consultation Mechanisms

This section provides an overview of the various notification procedures that were followed as part of the public consultation.

### 2.1 Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications

#### Notice of Commencement

The Notice of Commencement of the ToR for the Project was published on July 17, 2014. The notice was distributed to indicate that the ToR phase of the Project had begun, to provide an introduction to the Scarborough Waterfront Project and to provide contact information for questions or comments. The notice was placed in newspapers (see **Table 1** for publication dates and papers) and posted on the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) website. A hard copy was also posted at three library branches located in the Project Study Area (Morningside, Cliffcrest and Guildwood) on July 30, 2014.

#### Notice of Public Information Centre (PIC) #1

The notice for PIC #1, held on September 10, 2014 (see **Section 3.3** for further information), was published in two newspapers and posted on the Project website (see **Table 1** for publication dates and papers). An Eventbrite page was created to promote PIC #1 and included the event notification. A link to the Eventbrite page was included in the invitation and reminder emails sent to the Project e-newsletter mailing list (see **Section 2.2** for more information). There were 65 people that submitted an RSVP to attend the event via Eventbrite. A flyer containing information about PIC #1 was also distributed the week of September 2, 2014 through a Canada Post unaddressed ad mail drop to all houses (8522 flyers) located in the Forward Sortation Areas (FSAs) for postal codes M1M and M1E south of Kingston Road. An invitation to PIC #1 was sent to all members of the project e-newsletter mailing list on August 27, 2014 (64 subscribers) and a reminder email message about PIC #1 was sent to the project e-newsletter mailing list on September 9, 2014 (115 subscribers) (see **Section 2.2**). The invitation to PIC #1 was also distributed as follows: Shorelines e-newsletter on August 19, 2014 (445 subscribers), Highland Highlights Newsletter on August 7, 2014 (904 subscribers) and posted on the Highland Creek “Connect with the Creek” blog on August 7, 2014 (41 pageviews on the date posted). A hard copy of PIC #1 notice was also posted at three library branches located in the Study Area (Morningside, Cliffcrest and Guildwood) on the following dates: September 2, 2014 (Cliffcrest and Guildwood) and September 3, 2014 (Morningside).

#### Notification of PIC #2

The notice for PIC #2, held on February 24, 2015 (see **Section 3.3** for further information), was published in two newspapers and posted on the Project website (see **Table 1** for publication dates and papers). An Eventbrite page was created to promote PIC #2 and included the event notification. An email invitation that included a link to the Eventbrite page and reminder emails were sent to the Project e-newsletter mailing list (see **Section 2.2** for more information). There were 70 people that submitted an RSVP to attend the event via Eventbrite. A flyer containing information about PIC #2 was also distributed the week of February 16, 2015 through a Canada Post unaddressed ad mail drop to all houses, apartments/condominiums and businesses (16250 flyers) located in the Forward Sortation Areas (FSAs) for postal codes M1M and M1E south of Kingston Road. An invitation to PIC #2 was also sent to all members of the project e-newsletter on February 2, 2015 (276 subscribers) and a reminder e-mail message about PIC #2 was sent to the project e-newsletter



mailing list on February 20, 2015 (310 subscribers). A hard copy of the PIC #2 notice was also posted at three library branches located in the Study Area (Morningside, Cliffcrest and Guildwood) on the following dates: February 4, 2015 (Cliffcrest), February 7, 2015 (Guildwood), and February 17, 2015 (Morningside).

### Notice of Draft Submission

A Notice of Draft Submission and review period was posted along with the draft version of the ToR on the Project website on April 2, 2015, for the 30-day public and agency review period. The notice described the Project and directed the public to review locations where the draft ToR can be reviewed. Notification of this opportunity to review the draft ToR was published in two newspapers (see **Table 1**), and sent to agencies, First Nations and Métis communities and by email to the Project e-newsletter mailing list on April 2, 2015 (418 subscribers) (see **Section 2.2**).

### Notice of Final Submission

It is anticipated that a Notice of Submission for the final ToR will be posted on the Project website, emailed to the Project e-newsletter mailing list, published in local newspapers and publicized with a news release. The notice will also be sent to agencies, First Nations and Métis communities as well as businesses and utilities. The notice will describe the Project and direct the public to locations where the final ToR can be reviewed.

**Table 1 – Terms of Reference Notification Publication Dates**

Notifications	Media	Publication Dates
<b>Notice of Commencement</b>	Scarborough Mirror	July 17, 2014
	Scarborough SNAP	August 1, 2014
	Novae res Urbis (Toronto edition)	July 25, 2014
<b>PIC #1</b>	Scarborough Mirror	August 28, 2014
	Scarborough SNAP	September 1, 2014
<b>PIC #2</b>	Scarborough SNAP	February 1, 2015
	Scarborough Mirror	February 5, 2015
<b>Notice of Draft Submission</b>	Scarborough SNAP	April 1, 2015
	Scarborough Mirror	April 2, 2015
<b>Notice of Final Submission</b>	TBD	TBD

The mandatory notices, Eventbrite pages and additional flyers are provided in **Appendix C-1**.

## **2.2 E-Newsletter Project Updates**

An online project e-newsletter was created to distribute project updates and information to subscribers. Members of the public are able to sign up to receive the e-newsletter through the Project website (see **Section 2.4**). Individuals also signed up for the e-newsletter at PICs for the project. During the ToR Phase, 8 e-newsletter Project updates were distributed on the following dates: August 27, 2014; September 9, 2014; October 30, 2014; December 9, 2014; December 15, 2014; February 2, 2015; February 20, 2015 and April 2, 2015. Copies of e-newsletter Project updates are included in **Appendix C-2**.



## 2.3 Information Sheets

The Project Team started to develop a series of Information Sheets, titled *EA Info Sheets*, to help provide concise information about the project to the public. A Project Information Sheet was prepared addressing the following: Project Overview; Study Area; and Preliminary Project Vision and Objectives; EA and Planning Process; and Contact Information. This initial information sheet was made available through the website and a link was included in an e-newsletter update on December 9, 2014. Following consultation activities with the public and stakeholders, this information sheet was updated to reflect the revised project vision and objectives. This information sheet was made available through the website on February 26, 2015.

A second information sheet was prepared to provide additional detail on the EA process and consultation opportunities. This information sheet was made available through the website on February 26, 2015. Both information sheets can be accessed by visiting the “Resources” page on the Project website. As of March 20, 2015, the “Resources” page on the Project website was viewed by 294 people (unique pageviews) a total 396 times (pageviews). Hard copies of the revised *EA Info Sheet #1 – Project Overview* and *EA Info Sheet #2 – EA Process* were available as hand-outs at PIC #2 on February 24, 2015. Copies of *EA Info Sheet #1 – Project Overview* (initial and revised) and *EA Info Sheet #2 – EA Process* are included in **Appendix C-3**.

## 2.4 Project Website and Contact Information

A dedicated web landing page was created on the TRCA website to provide Project information to members of the public and other stakeholders. Background information including Project Information Sheets (see **Section 2.3**), Study Area maps, materials from the PICs (including presentations, display boards, blank comment sheets, and blank workbooks) as well as project documentation are available on the website. Contact information and meeting notices are also included on the website. Through the website, members of the public can subscribe to the Project e-newsletter to receive ongoing Project updates. The link to the Project-specific website is: [www.trca.on.ca/swp](http://www.trca.on.ca/swp). As of March 20, 2015, the website has been viewed by 3479 people (unique pageviews) a total of 4705 times (pageviews).

Contact information is provided on the website to facilitate exchange of information and questions with stakeholders and the Project Team.

## 3. Public Consultation

Early and ongoing consultation helps to develop a greater collective understanding of the Project and provides information and perspectives from the local community to the Project team helping to inform and improve the process outcome. The objectives of public consultation activities undertaken through the ToR were:

- To identify interested parties, including landowners, waterfront users, members of the public, and other key stakeholders;
- To inform people about the Project, and the associated planning process; and,
- To obtain input from interested parties in the development of the ToR.

### 3.1 Project Contact List

The contact list of interested members of the public was compiled by promoting the Project e-newsletter mailing list on mandatory notifications, flyers and the website. During sign in at PICs, participants were also asked if they wanted to subscribe to the Project e-newsletter mailing list. Individuals were also added to the list if they sent a request to the Project Team via e-mail or phone. As of March 20, 2015, the project e-newsletter mailing list had 415 subscribers.

### 3.2 Stakeholder Committee

The Stakeholder Committee for the Scarborough Waterfront Project is an important component of the overall consultation program for the Project. With a mix of voices and interests represented, the goal of the Stakeholder Committee is to help the Project Team better understand different perspectives and address the various opportunities and issues that arise. The Stakeholder Committee is a non-political advisory body.

Applications for Stakeholder Committee membership were made available during the first PIC and online application forms on the Project website were made available until September 22, 2014.

The applications were reviewed and sorted into the following categories:

- 1) Community groups (including local ratepayers);
- 2) Regional user groups;
- 3) Academia or institutions;
- 4) Local user groups (i.e. boat clubs, recreational user groups);
- 5) Local residents; and
- 6) Aboriginal Communities.

Applicants were selected for telephone interviews based on the following: a cross-section of male and female; various age groupings (working or retired), and postal code to achieve representation across the Project Study Area.

Telephone interviews were conducted over two weeks. Each interviewee was asked a number of open-ended questions over a period of 20-30 minutes. The questions were: 1) Why are you interested in participating on

a Stakeholder Committee? 2) What would you bring to the Stakeholder Committee? 3) How do you currently use the parks within the Study Area?

In an effort to obtain a broader perspective through the Stakeholder Committee, following PIC #1 additional members were invited to join the committee via email or phone. Local Councillors also provided suggestions for additional potentially suitable groups.

Representation on the Stakeholder Committee is illustrated in **Figure 1** and made is up of representatives from the following groups:

- Toronto Field Naturalists
- Waterfront Regeneration Trust
- Highland Creek Green Team
- Park People
- Bluffers Park Boating Federation
- Cathedral Bluffs Yacht Club
- Cycle Toronto
- Toronto Ornithological Club
- Bluffs Performance
- Guildwood Village Community Association
- Guild Renaissance Group
- Friends of the Guild Park & Gardens
- Centennial Community & Recreation Association
- Parkcrest Tenants Association
- Pine Ridge Residents Association
- Toronto Police Service
- Sir Wilfrid Laurier Collegiate Institute
- Centennial College
- Toronto District School Board
- Hiawatha First Nation
- Local residents
- Elected officials



**Figure 1 – Stakeholder Committee Involvement**

Due to personal reasons two members have withdrawn from the Stakeholder Committee. Alternate representatives from these groups have been sought. The Project Team may seek additional members through discussions with current Committee members and confirm membership prior to the commencement of the EA phase.

### Stakeholder Committee Workbooks

Prior to each Stakeholder Committee meeting and as a follow-up summary to each session, workbooks were distributed electronically to each Committee member. Pre-meeting workbooks included sections such as objectives for the upcoming meeting, an agenda, descriptions of the project or current project status, questions for discussion, and key Project Team contact information. Summary edition workbooks distributed following each meeting generally included a summary of the previous meeting's discussions and a description of next steps.

Stakeholder Committee workbooks, meeting summary workbooks, presentations and panels from the Stakeholder Committee meetings are included in **Appendix C-4**. The following sections summarize each Stakeholder Committee meeting.

### Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1

The Stakeholder Committee held its first meeting on October 8, 2014. The meeting provided the group with an opportunity to get to know each other, to learn about the Scarborough Waterfront Project, gain an understanding of the function of the Committee and its role, and to discuss opportunities and concerns within the community related to the project, including a discussion on feedback from the first PIC. At this meeting, a Terms of Reference for the Stakeholder Committee was discussed and reviewed by all members. Following the discussion, the purpose of the Committee was confirmed to be:

*To assist TRCA and the City of Toronto in obtaining additional public input concerning the planning process of the Scarborough Waterfront Project EA while staying consistent with the Project's purpose. The Stakeholder Committee will provide insights and perspectives to the Project Team in the preparation of the ToR and the EA. The Stakeholder Committee is a non-political advisory body. Final decisions will be the responsibility of the Project Team.*

Members also reviewed a Membership Agreement Form and agreed to the Stakeholder Committee Terms of Reference by providing their signatures. A copy of the Stakeholder Committee Terms of Reference and Membership Agreement Form can be found in **Appendix C-4**.

At the first meeting, a high level overview presentation was given and the preliminary Project vision and objectives were introduced. The Stakeholder Committee expressed that emphasis on the protection and enhancement of the natural environment should be more clearly articulated in the objectives.

As part of the broader discussion, the Stakeholder Committee also provided some additional feedback on the key issues and opportunities along the Scarborough Waterfront, confirming and enhancing the feedback received at PIC #1. Additional opportunities and concerns raised included:

- The number of people visiting a new park;
- The goal to “protect” – protection of animals, protection zones/untouched areas;
- Capturing opportunity for businesses, improving Kingston road local business;
- Connectivity from water's edge to parks at top of bluffs;
- Silting within Bluffer's Park;
- Access;

- Unauthorized access;
- Garbage collection, park clean-up;
- Erosion at top of bluffs;
- Disturbed natural habitats;
- Use of public space as an education tool, natural history interpretation;
- Community garden/vineyard - do something different!;
- Signage, educational signage;
- Emergency services access;
- Parking, traffic;
- Viewpoints, deter unauthorized use by having dedicated spaces (e.g., fire pits); and
- Should learn from other similar projects.

Principles for guiding collaborative dialogue at future Stakeholder Committee meetings were discussed, including: encourage all ideas, respect other opinions, give everyone credibility and time, and avoid “groupthink.” Suggestions for additional members were provided during this session. TRCA reviewed all membership suggestions and provided responses to the suggestions as noted in the Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 Summary Edition (see **Appendix C-4**).

Stakeholder Committee comments and concerns received during meeting #1 and the Project Team responses to these issues are included in **Table 3** in **Section 3.6** of this report.

### **Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2**

A second Stakeholder Committee meeting was held on December 10, 2014, where discussion focused on Project objectives, draft evaluation criteria and a proposed process for developing alternatives as part of the EA. A presentation was delivered, followed by breakout table discussions, which reviewed the following components in detail:

- Vision and objectives of the Project;
- Process and approach;
- Development of alternatives; and
- Evaluation criteria.

Information on all of the above was circulated to the Stakeholder Committee prior to the meeting.

The Stakeholder Committee provided invaluable input at meeting #2 on the content and assisted the team in determining ways to modify the information to make it easier to understand. General themes that were raised at this meeting included:

- **Keep it Simple** - For ongoing work with the Stakeholder Committee, and especially for communications and consultation with the general public, it is essential to keep the information presented simple, clear and concise.
- **Prioritize Nature** - The fundamental and most important goal of this project, for many Stakeholder Committee members, is the protection of the natural environment and preservation of the unique natural character of the Bluffs.

- **Watch the Use of Jargon** - Much of the information presented was of a technical EA planning nature. Terms like “natural and cultural heritage” and “objectives based criteria” are not immediately understood or can be open to interpretation. Jargon should be avoided. Where it is required, an explanation or a glossary of terms should be included.
- **Demonstrate How You are Listening** - The Stakeholder Committee as well as members of the public will want to see examples of how the Project Team is listening to their concerns and incorporating feedback into the study process.

The presentation identified a number of “building blocks” that would form the foundation of alternatives. Generally, there was concern expressed that the building block approach as it was described could be confusing to the general public and that the term “building blocks” might lead people to think that there was going to be residential or commercial development. It was also noted that many participants would like to see the protection of the natural environment as a central theme. Others wondered if the “do nothing” option could somehow be captured. Feedback on the draft evaluation criteria included:

- Desire to have some objectives/criteria considered more important than others, particularly those related to protecting the natural environment;
- Overly technical language used in some of the criteria;
- Should be accompanied by a glossary of terms (natural heritage, greenspace, active/passive recreation, etc.);
- Have preservation of the natural environment as a common thread throughout all criteria;
- Too much of some criteria would be negative. Need to qualify how much is a good thing (e.g., “new or enhanced views and vistas” is only good up to a point - too many of these would compromise the natural character of the area);
- Consideration should be given to whether more public access is desirable;
- Some clarity needed on specific criteria (e.g., what would “effects on navigation” be?); and,
- Criteria on public transportation, active transportation (cycling friendly) were felt to be missing.

The Project Team refined the materials based on the input received and a third Stakeholder Committee meeting was scheduled to review the refinement in advance of PIC #2.

Stakeholder Committee comments and concerns received during meeting #2 and the Project Team responses to these issues are included in **Table 3** in **Section 3.6** of this report.

### **Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3**

A third Stakeholder Committee meeting was held on February 5, 2015. This meeting was a “dry-run” for PIC #2. Stakeholder Committee members were able to see how the presentation, panel displays and discussion materials were revised following their feedback at meeting #2 and provide comment on further revisions prior to public presentation.

In general Stakeholder Committee Members were very positive about the changes to the presentation and felt that TRCA had done a good job at simplifying the presentation and the discussion session. They expressed that the presentation provided listeners with a good understanding of the project and why it was being undertaken and that it was much easier to understand as most of the EA jargon had been

removed. They also expressed the importance of making sure that there was time at the PIC for both a question and answer session and small group discussions. This meeting was a collaborative effort between Stakeholder Committee members and the team to continue to improve the materials for the PIC and a number of additional comments were raised.

Feedback on the PIC materials and display boards included:

- There were a number of helpful suggested wording changes that will make the message clearer.
- The “Your Say” panel was too hard to read/too much information. Suggestion to divide this out into multiple panels. Other suggestions for the title of this panel: “What you said at the last meeting”; “What we heard at the last meeting”; “You told us”.
- Look into the possibility of having 2 sets of panels at the PIC.
- The “Existing Conditions” panel was especially problematic, with confusion about the message of this panel.
- Include a large map to illustrate that the project will only take place on public lands.
- Change out imagery that is obviously stock photography.
- Include captions, where possible, of where pictures were taken.
- Not clear what is meant by “Utilizing local water” under Objective 1.
- Appreciation of some of the new visuals, including the project segments map and the value for cost graphic.
- Under Objective 3 – “maintain water quality at the beaches” – is the focus only on areas deemed swimmable? Is it to create more beach areas?
- Under Objective 4 – the last two bullet points are very wordy; can this be made simpler, easier to read?
- Exclude Objective 5 – this is a decision or evaluation criteria not an objective.

A number of comments were shared on the PIC presentation, including:

- There is still too much we are trying to communicate in the presentation. There is too much text on some slides and the presenters were speaking too fast, trying to fit a lot of information in;
- “Elements of evaluation criteria” is confusing.
- Add more photos wherever possible. Either talk to the points on the slide or have an image—viewers cannot read and listen at the same time.
- Perhaps display an attractive photo during the presentation introduction. Include a slide show before the presentation begins.
- The Vision should be presented near the beginning to describe early on what this project is all about. A timeline near the beginning was also suggested, to situate where we are at in the process. Need to emphasize that we are at the beginning of the process—that this is a conversation more about establishing a process for getting to the alternatives and not about creating alternatives. This is the “blueprint”.
- There was discussion on the merit of including “Achieve value for cost” as a project objective, with opinions on both sides.
- Discussion about how we use the word “accessibility” was raised and there was a reminder not to confuse this with “access”.



- When mentioning a trail, it should be clarified that it could be continuous across the top and bottom; not necessarily all along the bottom.
- Need to explain in the broadest terms what an EA is.
- The overall goal of the public meeting is not necessarily clear.
- Need a bigger map of the Project Area.
- There is a feeling of inconsistency in formatting of slides.
- When introducing TRCA for the first time, use full name.
- What does “constraints mapping” mean? What is the MOECC?
- Can some preliminary discussion of cost be included?
- Trail is not explicitly mentioned in the presentation.
- Graphic showing EA process may be best separated into 3 different slides.
- Developing project alternatives – we are not there yet; the slide with the circle graphic is confusing.
- Need to explain what the objectives and criteria are. Then make it clear that we are going to make proposals. When we decide between Proposal A and Proposal B, these are criteria we will use. How can we ask people to listen and see if those are the right criteria?

Finally, the Committee members shared their thoughts on the proposed discussion activity and worksheet for PIC #2:

- There is concern that there won't be enough time for Q&A. The meeting agenda should remain flexible to allow the Q&A to go longer if required. Remove the times associated with the agenda items to allow for this flexibility. If there is too much left on the table by cutting the Q&A short, the discussion activity will not be fruitful.
- Worksheet is confusing as-is; too complicated. Need examples of how to fill it out. It also contains too much text as-is. The worksheet exercise needs to be simplified. What's the point of the exercise? We need to have a conversation, rather than get lost in the language. Don't want participants to be debating what they're supposed to be doing for the exercise.
- The “Elements of evaluation criteria” are confusing.
- Ask as an open-ended question. E.g.: How can you tell whether you are protecting and enhancing terrestrial and aquatic habitat? How can we tell if we are properly utilizing local water sources?
- People want to feel they had input. Ensure people have an avenue if they didn't get a say at the meeting.
- The PIC should be divided into two parts—Presentation/Q&A and Discussion.
- Get out in front of criticisms of the last PIC. Admit that an error was made in the first meeting by not holding a Q&A.
- Lay out the ground rules for the Q&A (ie. everyone gets one question).
- Table discussions are good as people feed off of each other's ideas.
- Concerns about not having Objective 5 as a discussion table; people may want to talk about it- could ask people what do they value?

This valuable feedback was used to improve the PIC #2 materials, presentation and meeting format. The materials presented at Stakeholder Committee meeting #3 are in **Appendix C-4**. The materials were updated based on Stakeholder Committee feedback and are in **Appendix C-5**.

### Stakeholder Committee Page-Turn Review of the Preliminary Draft Terms of Reference

An optional page-turn review of the preliminary Draft ToR document was held with the Stakeholder Committee on March 25, 2015 at the Scarborough Village Recreation Centre. The purpose of the meeting was to review sections of the preliminary Draft ToR and obtain comments from participating Stakeholder Committee members. The page-turn review of the preliminary Draft was held in advance of the draft submission so Stakeholder Committee members could assist the Project Team in identifying public points of interest in the document prior to its broader release. All members were provided an electronic version of the document prior to the meeting and written comments were also accepted via e-mail.

At the meeting, the Project Team welcomed all Stakeholder Committee members and started with a brief overview of the EA ToR process. The Project Team noted that the ToR is the guideline of how they intend to proceed with the EA and that it provides flexibility to address unforeseen circumstances that may arise as the EA study progresses, or input is received through the consultation process. Flexibility is not meant to allow for a significant change of the scope of the Project, but rather to allow for minor adjustments to the EA process without having to re-start the ToR/EA process. Following this introduction, the page-turn review of the ToR commenced where the preliminary draft ToR document was projected onto a screen and the Project Team presented a summary of each section and its purpose. Stakeholder Committee comments and concerns were recorded and reviewed following the meeting.

A main point of feedback received from Stakeholder Committee members was that they didn't think comments captured in the Record of Consultation were reflected well in the preliminary draft ToR. For example, it was noted that theme of prioritizing nature should be further emphasized. This prompted the addition of a summary section of comments received during the ToR to Section 10 of the ToR. The glossary was also highlighted and referred to as members had many questions about terminology.

Stakeholder Committee questions, comments and concerns received during the page-turn review of the preliminary Draft ToR and the Project Team responses to these issues are included in **Table 3** in **Section 3.6** of this report.

### 3.3 Public Information Centres

Two PICs were held during the EA Terms of Reference phase. **Table 2** provides an overview of PIC attendance. The information discussed and input received at each PIC is documented in the following subsections. PIC materials are included in **Appendix C-5**.

**Table 2 – PIC Attendance**

<b>Event</b>	<b>Date (Location)</b>	<b>Number of Attendees</b>
PIC #1	Wednesday, September 10, 2014 (Scarborough Village Recreation Centre)	150
PIC #2	Tuesday, February 24, 2015 (Qssis Banquet Halls)	147

### Public Information Centre #1

The first PIC for the Scarborough Waterfront Project ToR was held on Wednesday, September 10, 2014 at 7:00 pm at the Scarborough Village Recreation Centre. This location was chosen as it is central in the Project Study Area and accessible by public transit. Following the event, postal codes of attendees were reviewed and showed that people attending the event came from all parts of the Project Study Area, as well as from beyond the Project Study Area boundaries. The purpose of this PIC was to allow for interested stakeholders and members of the public to meet members of the Project Team, learn about the Project, ask questions and provide local knowledge about the issues and features that should be considered in Project planning.

The format for the PIC included an open house session and a formal presentation. The PIC presentation provided an overview of the Project including an introduction to the preliminary vision and objectives for the Project and the EA process, with a particular focus on consultation. The establishment of a Stakeholder Committee for the Project was also discussed and interest in membership was sought. The presentation described the history of the Project Area and the Toronto shoreline planning and erosion work that has taken place over the last 40 years. This presentation is available on the Project website and is included in **Appendix C-5**. Before and after the presentation, attendees were given the opportunity to talk informally with TRCA and City of Toronto Project staff, and were invited to provide feedback, local knowledge, comments and concerns directly onto maps of the Project Study Area posted in the room (see **Appendix C-5**).

### Summary of Public Information Centre #1 Input

Approximately 150 people attended the first PIC. Comments and feedback were collected using flip charts, maps and comment forms that all participants were asked to complete. Eighteen completed comment forms were received and 78% of those who responded generally agreed to the vision and objectives for the project.

Comments received at the PIC can be categorized within the following theme areas:

- Construction impacts;
- Public access and safety;
- Park features;
- Importance of natural features;
- Interest in trails and paths; and
- Concerns and questions about the process and consultation.

Within these themes we heard general agreement on these Waterfront opportunities:

- Improve safety;
- Trails to connect the waterfront areas are desired;
- Maintain the natural state with consideration of some amenities (e.g. benches, bike racks, lighting, signage, washrooms);
- Consider opportunity for local businesses;
- Build in environmental education & public art; and
- Access to the waterfront needs improvement.

The key areas of concern we heard:

- Potential for over-commercialization; and

- Parking and traffic impacts in the Bluff neighbourhoods.

Input on key issues and opportunities provided at the PIC are documented for consideration in the EA. Specifically the input was used during the ToR phase to help refine the Project vision and objectives, confirm problems and opportunities to be considered along the waterfront and develop the draft evaluation criteria to be used to make decisions on any changes to be made. The understanding of key issues and opportunities will continue to be refined as the EA process is initiated.

Public comments and concerns received during PIC #1 and the Project Team responses to these issues are included in **Table 4** in **Section 3.7** of this report. A compilation of verbatim comments received at PIC #1 can be found in **Appendix C-6**.

### **Public Information Centre #2**

A second PIC was originally scheduled for January 14, 2015. It was postponed based on feedback from the Stakeholder Committee and was rescheduled for February 24, 2015. The purpose of the second information centre was to present the revised Project vision and objectives, preliminary evaluation criteria and approach to developing alternatives, and for the public to provide comments and insight on the project.

The format for the PIC included an open house session with panel display information, a formal presentation followed by a question and answer period, and a facilitated round-table discussion activity. The round table discussion activity was led by several facilitators located at individual tables during the event. Facilitators and recorders were present to guide the group discussion. A facilitators' workbook was used to summarize the discussion at each table. The five project objectives and related draft evaluation criteria, outlined in the workbook, were used to organize the round table discussion. The event venue was divided into four areas and each area began by discussing a different set of evaluation criteria related to a project objective (each area contained three to five tables). Following the individual group discussions, each table elected a speaker to share a summary of the table discussion.

Attendees were also invited to provide their comments on the key themes and feedback received during PIC #1. At the close of the meeting, participants were also provided with a meeting evaluation form and invited to comment on the meeting format. The PIC panels, presentation (with speaker notes) and discussion workbook are all available on the Project website for download and are included in **Appendix C-5**. Following PIC#2, the Project Team accepted any additional comments on all PIC #2 materials until March 10, 2015.

### **Summary of Public Information Centre #2 Input**

Nearly 150 people attended the second PIC. Comments and feedback were collected from four sources: panel written comments, discussions recorded during the questions and answer period, individual workbook discussion and evaluation forms, and the discussion facilitators' workbooks.

During the question and answer discussion period following the formal presentation at PIC #2, members of the public raised a number of questions. Those questions, and responses provided by the TRCA during the meeting, are captured in **Table 4** in **Section 3.7** of this report. Through the discussion activity, members of the public participated in round table discussions facilitated by a TRCA staff member, Stakeholder Committee member or a member of the Project Team. These discussions were guided by the workbook, included in

**Appendix C-5**, and centred on the draft evaluation criteria. A compendium of the public comments through these discussions and as recorded in the workbook is included in **Appendix C-6**.

Discussions related to each individual draft criteria during the round table activity were wide ranging. An overview of these discussions, which are recorded in greater detail in **Appendix C-6**, reveals a number of important themes:

- There was relative importance or “weighting” given to criteria that related to the natural environment;
- A number of specific measurements or considerations related to each criteria were suggested;
- How each criteria relates or interacts with other criteria and/or objectives should be recognized;
- It will be especially important to strike the appropriate balance between objectives and criteria related to the natural environment and human use;
- Caution that some of the criteria will be difficult to measure (for example, what is the definition of acceptable risk? Also, potential climate change impacts can be difficult to forecast); and
- Need to consider that meeting some criteria will lead to an increase in the number of visitors to the area, which will have a negative impact on other criteria.

The summary table provided in **Appendix C-6** offers a detailed review of the discussion related to draft evaluation criteria, including a number of suggestions about things to consider when measuring each criterion. The Project Team will take this feedback into account when further refining the draft evaluation criteria and applying the criteria during the EA phase.

Any comments received during PIC #2 that required an additional detailed response are included in **Table 4** in **Section 3.7** of this report. A compilation of verbatim comments received at PIC #2 can be found in **Appendix C-6**.

## 3.4 Landowners

The project works are to primarily occur at the top and toe of the Scarborough Bluffs. As part of the Scarborough Waterfront Project Acquisition Strategy, nine landowners were identified and contacted. Meetings were held with landowners who requested an in person meeting with members of the Project Team. An overview of the Project and EA process was provided.

It is anticipated that additional landowners may be engaged during the EA phase of the project as they are identified (i.e. landowners along proposed access routes).

## 3.5 Businesses and Utilities

### Businesses

Businesses located in the Project Study Area were sent a flyer containing information about PIC #2. They will be provided with the Notice of Submission for the ToR and an effort to engage these groups will continue throughout the EA as appropriate.

## Utilities

It is not anticipated that project works will impact any local utilities. Utilities with infrastructure within the Project Study Area have been identified. They will be provided with the Notice of Submission for the ToR and an effort to engage these groups will continue throughout the EA as appropriate.

## 3.6 Response to Stakeholder Committee Comments

**Table 3** provides a summary of the comments and concerns received to date from Stakeholder Committee members at meetings and via the project email. The table also provides an explanation of how the Project Team will be taking comments received and issues raised into consideration. All comments received have been analyzed and summarized; duplicate comments have been combined. Comments were then organized by the following topic areas:

- Public Consultation
- Trail Connections
- Trail Design
- Cyclist, Pedestrian and Vehicle Access
- Natural Environments
- Geological Environment
- Park Amenities
- Recreation
- Park Amenities – Management and Operations
- Public Safety
- EA Process and Approach to Developing Alternatives
- Cultural Heritage and Community Initiatives
- Infrastructure and Energy
- Project Vision
- Project Objectives
- Draft Evaluation Criteria
- General Comments
- Preliminary Draft ToR

**Table 3 – Stakeholder Committee Input Received During the ToR Phase**

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Public Consultation</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who will ultimately pay for this?</li> </ul>	City of Toronto Council directed TRCA to undertake an EA for the Scarborough Waterfront Project. Alternative funding sources for the project will be pursued, including public and private sources.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At PIC #1, people were not able to ask questions and did not feel able to voice their concerns.</li> </ul>	Based on feedback received at PIC#1, the meeting format for PIC #2 included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An agenda;</li> <li>A Question/Answer period, which followed the presentation;</li> <li>Opportunities available to provide comments on panels as part of the Open House and in workbooks, both as part of the round table session during the meeting and online or by fax following the PIC; and</li> <li>Clearly labeled maps with street names.</li> </ul>
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest using small group breakout tables at future PICs.</li> </ul>	Breakout table discussions were held as part of PIC#2. TRCA will use appropriate methods to engage with the audience and seek feedback as part of future PICs, including, but not limited to breakout table discussions.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will you be advertising PICs to those outside of the Study Area?</li> <li>Consider advertising outside of the Study Area.</li> </ul>	The Project Team will continue to seek opportunities to engage a broader audience as appropriate during the EA.



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Trail Connections</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A linkage between Bluffer’s Park Beach and Meadowcliffe would provide more public enjoyment of the natural landscape.</li> <li>• Is the objective to have a continuous trail?</li> <li>• Does not have to be linked, continuous trail.</li> <li>• Connectivity from water level to parks at top of Bluffs.</li> <li>• Create link between Bluffer’s Park Beach and Meadowcliffe.</li> <li>• Focus on connecting top and toe.</li> <li>• Consider breaks in trail instead of continuous loops/connections.</li> <li>• In segment 2, consider bridges in water (i.e. deck) instead of continuous path.</li> <li>• Desire for cycling connection between Grey Abbey and Bluffer’s Park.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access to and along the water’s edge (including the top and toe of the Bluffs) will be discussed in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there are trail connections between the top and toe of the Bluffs, it will accelerate erosion.</li> <li>• Connecting the top to toe would be very detrimental in this area because it is eroding already and cannot support extended passage of pedestrians via stairs, etc.</li> <li>• Addition of bike trails will damage the ecosystem.</li> <li>• Concern that increased human activity in the area will lead to more erosion of the Bluffs.</li> <li>• Fear that connectivity will ruin the natural landscape.</li> </ul>	Potential for impacts to all components of the environment will be considered in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to deal with private property ownership that creates disconnected shoreline?</li> </ul>	Landowners and residents within the Project Study Area are being provided with opportunities to be involved during the EA process. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
<b>TOPIC: Trail Design</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider unpaved trail.</li> <li>• Consider design options (i.e., separated bike trail) that create bike access to Segment 3.</li> <li>• Trail design needs to protect the following from cyclists:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrians;</li> <li>• Existing habitats, ecosystem; and</li> <li>• Wildlife.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Trail design specifications will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Cyclist, Pedestrian and Vehicle Access</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about parking and traffic.</li> <li>• Designate parking hubs at nearby GO Station Parking lots for use by park visitors; do not plan for additional parking lots at the waterfront.</li> <li>• Consider parking at Beach Grove and Port Union.</li> <li>• Enhance existing parking.</li> <li>• If available, use school parking lots during the summer.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access and the amenities required to support this access (i.e., parking) will be explored in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a shuttle service from GO Stations to the waterfront.</li> <li>• Improve transit to Bluffer’s Park and marina.</li> <li>• Improve transit to Bellamy Ravine.</li> <li>• Increase/improve public transit (consider shuttle buses).</li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to the shoreline.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the following to minimize potential traffic impacts:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce speed limits in the immediate area;</li> <li>• If possible make intersections in the study area 4-way stops or put in traffic lights; and</li> <li>• Limit traffic in Segment 2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The potential traffic impacts on the adjacent communities will be discussed in the evaluation of Alternatives (refer to Appendix A of the ToR), and an effects mitigation will be undertaken as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish safe cycling connections from created parking hubs to the waterfront.</li> <li>• Increase/improve cycling access.</li> <li>• Limit bicycle use in Segment 2.</li> <li>• Increase/improve pedestrian access.</li> <li>• Provide a pedestrian route option that is not developed for cyclists.</li> <li>• Keep Segment 3, a pedestrian only area (i.e., beach walk).</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access will be explored in the development of Alternatives, including opportunities for improved cycling linkages.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presupposed that increased public access is desirable. Not all people seem to agree.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to connect greenspaces, while providing some areas away from the new trail system will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrict use of ATVs/mopeds/motorized vehicles.</li> <li>• Consider a non-motorized area.</li> </ul>	ATV use is not currently permitted within the Project Area. It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erosion and rotting sewage pipes at Doris McCarthy Trail have rendered it unusable.</li> <li>Fix Bellamy Ravine entrance.</li> <li>Concerns about access to this trailhead.</li> </ul>	It is recognized that access to the Doris McCarthy Trail is limited due to existing conditions. TRCA and the City of Toronto are completing improvements to Bellamy Ravine as part of 2015 state of good repair works. Opportunities for further improvements may be considered in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we utilize existing parking (i.e., parking lots at St. Augustine Seminary or East Point Park) rather than creating new parking?</li> </ul>	Alternative parking opportunities may be explored in the EA and/or Detailed Design.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much of the land at the toe of the Bluffs will be used by parking? Prefer to not have any parking down there.</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer's Park and East Point Park. Opportunities to improve access, and the amenities required to support this access (i.e., parking) will be explored in the development and evaluation of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been neighbourhood complaints about truck traffic and its associated noise and disturbance. Will there be trucks associated with this Project? How will truck traffic be managed as part of this Project?</li> </ul>	Potential impacts from construction will be discussed in the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative, and an effects mitigation will be undertaken in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
<b>TOPIC: Natural Environments</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What's happening with fisheries and natural habitat?</li> <li>Consider the goal to "protect" – protection of animals, protection zones/untouched areas.</li> <li>Concerns about disturbing natural habitats.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic features will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will future water levels and changing storm intensities be considered?</li> <li>Consider how climate change (i.e., changes in water levels) may introduce new and/or invasive species.</li> </ul>	Climate change and the associated anticipated impacts from changing water levels and storm intensities is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Let nature take its course and allow for default growth of trees and weeds.</li> <li>Don't plant trees.</li> <li>Keep it natural, pastoral; not manicured.</li> <li>Consider beautification of area, in particular the rock walls are unsightly (i.e., plant trees).</li> <li>Possible medicine garde, use native plants to the area, use traditional medicinal plants such as sage, sweetgrass, cedar, and tobacco.</li> <li>Use native plants.</li> </ul>	Natural environment features will be developed at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase wetlands for migratory birds.</li> <li>Consider connections for the passage of deer.</li> <li>Create migratory routes, stop-over habitat.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to protect and enhance natural features will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been fire damage in vegetation already (i.e., trees, etc.) and mountain biking going on slopes which is damaging the site. This is a very fragile zone.</li> <li>Consider adding fencing to keep people on created trails/paths.</li> </ul>	It is recognized that the shoreline within the Project Area may be used for unauthorized purposes. At a conceptual level, the development of Alternatives may consider opportunities to discourage access to fragile zones through appropriate design measures.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep Segment 2 natural.</li> <li>Do not create new greenspace in Segment 2; focus on enhancing what is existing.</li> <li>Grey Abbey to East Point Park (Segment 3) is not easily accessible.</li> </ul>	Opportunities for improving access and enhancing natural features will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider and specify impacts to migratory birds.</li> <li>Don't want additional noise; may impact the natural environment.</li> </ul>	Potential for impacts on all components of the environment will be considered in the EA.
<b>TOPIC: Geological Environment</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider preservation of significant features.</li> </ul>	Potential impact on the dynamic nature of the Bluffs is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the increase in local development having an impact on erosion of the Bluffs?</li> <li>Concerns about erosion at top of Bluffs.</li> </ul>	A geotechnical study will be completed as part of the EA to assess slope condition.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create sand beach in Segment 3.</li> <li>• Preserve the sandy shore in Segment 3.</li> <li>• Increase sand/width of beach at Bluffer’s Park.</li> <li>• Keep beach areas natural.</li> </ul>	An existing sand beach extends between Grey Abbey and the mouth of the Highland Creek in segment 3. Potential changes to shoreline character is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
<b>TOPIC: Park Amenities</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider signage, educational signage.</li> <li>• Signage for “NO FIRE.”</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for viewpoints.</li> <li>• Consider options for cameras, etc. at top of Bluffs.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide views and vistas will be considered during the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signage: let people know First Nations were here in the area, and they still are!</li> <li>• Signage: indicate generally that First Nations occupied the area.</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No expansion of marinas or houseboats in Segment 1.</li> <li>• Allow expansion of marinas or houseboats in Segment 1.</li> </ul>	The development of Alternatives will coordinate with City of Toronto plans/infrastructure regarding Bluffer’s Park marina.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider installation of bird blinds.</li> </ul>	The installation of bird blinds for observational purposes may be considered at a conceptual level in the development of Alternatives, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
<b>TOPIC: Recreation</b>		

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the following recreation opportunities, but restrict to already developed area designated to recreation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• kayak rentals and other water sports; and</li> <li>• non-motorized water sports.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reconsider focus on active recreation at Bluffer’s Park Beach (i.e., volleyball nets).</li> <li>• Add recreation in Segment 2 only.</li> <li>• Segment 3:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider recreation in moderation; and</li> <li>• Include quiet areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add options to integrate recreation into greenspace.</li> <li>• No more “organized activities.”</li> </ul>	Active recreation will be pursued in areas where it currently exists (Bluffer’s Park, East Point Park). Operations and management considerations regarding equipment rentals is outside the scope of the EA; however, infrastructure and/or design requirements which may be required to support these activities (i.e., launch areas) may be developed at a conceptual level in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will park use be defined?</li> <li>• How will space be rented and administered?</li> <li>• Consider overcrowding/overuse/misuse associated with the following activities:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Picnics;</li> <li>• Weddings;</li> <li>• War games;</li> <li>• Para-military practice;</li> <li>• Family reunions; and</li> <li>• Funerals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	These are operations and management considerations and are outside the scope of the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about nude beaches in Segment 3.</li> </ul>	No formal nude beaches exist within the Project Study Area. It is not anticipated that nude sunbathing will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
<b>TOPIC: Park Amenities – Management and Operations</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the number of people visiting a new park.</li> <li>• Concerns about reaching carrying capacity at peak times.</li> <li>• Aim to match “development” with carrying capacity of the community.</li> </ul>	Potential user volumes will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garbage collection, park clean-up.</li> <li>• Concerns that increased volume of visitors will increase garbage.</li> </ul>	Garbage collection is an operations and management consideration and is outside the scope of the EA.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider waste discharges from houseboats in marinas.</li> </ul>	Available water quality monitoring data will be considered in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor bluff garbage dump.</li> <li>Assess potential impacts associated with leachates/contamination arising from the former Brimley Road Landfill site.</li> <li>The Brimley Dump is a critical issue for the EA.</li> </ul>	The former Brimley Road landfill site will be discussed with the City of Toronto early in the EA phase.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about development at Guildwood.</li> <li>Suggest coordinated approach with other planning processes in the study area (i.e., Guild Park and Gardens Management Plan, Cultural Precinct Plan).</li> <li>Better connection between Guild Park and Gardens site and the water's edge.</li> </ul>	TRCA is working with the City of Toronto to coordinate between the Project and the Guild Park and Gardens Management.
<b>TOPIC: Public Safety</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about unauthorized access.</li> <li>Deter unauthorized use by having dedicated spaces (i.e., fire pits).</li> <li>Concerns about illegal activities (i.e., bonfires) currently taking place at the site.</li> <li>Ability to enforce bylaw in response to improper use (i.e., BMX, bonfires, motorized vehicles, etc.).</li> <li>Remind citizens of bylaws.</li> </ul>	It is recognized that the shoreline within the Project Area may be used for unauthorized purposes. At a conceptual level, the development of Alternatives may consider opportunities to discourage this use through appropriate design measures.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider the "Do Nothing" approach but post signage indicating risks.</li> <li>At Segment 3, concerns of danger of falling from the top; thought that the probability of this increases in this area.</li> <li>"Complete elimination of risk of erosion may not be feasible". But what %? 5%? 10%? We need to agree on that percentage, otherwise it's too vague and residents are the ones at risk.</li> </ul>	Opportunities for improving access and enhancing natural features will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Try to avoid having trails at water's edge where uprush may be an issue.</li> </ul>	Geotechnical and coastal studies will be completed in the EA to assess risk and identify opportunities to mitigate risk and provide formal public access, where feasible.



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emergency services access.</li> <li>A linkage between Bluffer’s Park Beach and Meadowcliffe could provide necessary access to first responders and police to monitor area for crime.</li> <li>Consider addition of alternative roadways (i.e., access in an emergency).</li> </ul>	Emergency vehicle access only will be provided at appropriate access points along the shoreline, and will be identified in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about an increased number of non-community members entering residential areas and this resulting in crime.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that an absence of lighting on paths will lead to more crime.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Area.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider adjacent industrial property.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
<b>TOPIC: EA Process and Approach to Developing Alternatives</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will it be determined which concepts will be adopted/will the stakeholder committee make the decisions?</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 6.1 of the ToR for the proposed approach to developing and evaluating the Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the EA look at the “Do Nothing” option?</li> <li>Suggest adding a “Do Nothing” block.</li> <li>To what extent has the “Do Nothing” option been studied?</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 5.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to clarify what is meant by the “Study Area” and the “Project Area.”</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 4.2 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the proposed approach to developing Alternatives:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value of nature is higher. Add it as a central building block.</li> <li>• Straightforward.</li> <li>• Building block approach: concern how objectives connect (habitat vs. greenspace); concern with siloing of the different building blocks; too fuzzy.</li> <li>• Wildlife, natural habitat and habitat corridors. Consider mobility for wildlife and not just people.</li> <li>• “Attributes” instead of “building blocks.”</li> <li>• Framework needs to be rejigged.</li> <li>• Need more blunt language.</li> <li>• Add building block for beach – can you enhance the beach?</li> <li>• I agree with the approach and have no additional comments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the proposed approach to developing Alternatives has been refined. Refer to Section 6.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adding the following building block: “Create an educational resource for the natural geological history of the formation of the Bluffs.”</li> <li>• The Bluffs are a unique geological formation and can serve as a resource into the geological history of Toronto and natural history. Having some sort of resource for elementary and high schools could lead to further interest in and conservation of the Bluffs.</li> <li>• Educate about history.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide natural and cultural education and appreciation will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a building block that says “Keep, protect, and enhance the natural habitat” and apply to major chunks of the Bluffs and allow people very limited and guarded (as in fenced) access to these areas.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural environment features will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If something outside of the scope comes up who decides how and if it is considered?</li> </ul>	The ToR provides flexibility to accommodate anticipated issues or requests as they may emerge in the EA. Refer to Section 3.1 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who does the EA? Who is gathering information?</li> </ul>	TRCA is the proponent of the Project and is being support by a consulting team led by Dillon Consulting Limited. Refer to Section 1.1 of the ToR.
<b>TOPIC: Cultural Heritage and Community Initiatives</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider capturing opportunity for businesses, improving Kingston road local businesses.</li> </ul>	The Project Area focuses on the top and toe of the Bluffs from Bluffer’s Park in the west, to the mouth of Highland Creek in the east. Refer to Section 4.2 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of public space as an education tool, natural history interpretation.</li> <li>Community garden/vineyard. Do something different.</li> </ul>	Potential opportunities to provide locations for community gardens and natural history interpretation may be considered at a conceptual level in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider cultural interests.</li> </ul>	Cultural interests will be considered in the EA and are included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Section 7.3.5 and Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cathedral Bluffs Park is the most scenic and fragile part of the area under study on the erosion front. It is the highest in elevation and the one with the most value in terms of heritage.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Segment 1 would be the best location for an education component as the Bluffs are quite impressive in this zone and also have easy access via Brimley.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide natural and cultural education and appreciation will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information on:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stonehooking;</li> <li>Archaeological resource; and</li> <li>Geologic history – core samples.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	A preliminary overview description of the existing environment is provided in Section 7 of the ToR. Where appropriate, historical conditions are also provided (i.e., history of stonehooking). The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by shoreline segment, as appropriate.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not do anything to indicate where exactly the archaeological resources are. Do not want to promote looting of the sites.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Infrastructure and Energy</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is shoreline protection needed at East Point Park and Bluffer’s Park?</li> </ul>	A geotechnical study will be undertaken in the EA to assess slope conditions along the shoreline within the Project Area.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project consider Dunker’s Flow Balancing System (stormwater management system)?</li> </ul>	Considerations regarding this stormwater management facility is outside the scope of the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine water runoff from neighbourhood streets in the study area as many do not have storm sewers.</li> </ul>	A hydrogeological study will be undertaken as part of the EA to identify local sources of water (i.e., groundwater discharge, surface water), including flows. Opportunities to use these local sources of water will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note that the shoreline protection is not complete.</li> </ul>	All high risk priority erosion areas related to private properties between Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park have been addressed through previous shoreline works. The Bluffs will continue to erode until they reach a stable condition. Geotechnical studies will be undertaken in the EA to assess risk to the public and risk to public property (i.e., loss of tablelands).
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Ability to integrate with existing shoreline infrastructure” - Does this preclude further lake filling activities that would improve connectivity (i.e., Meadowcliffe to Bluffer’s)?</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that any new land base creation along the shoreline would be modest in scale and be consistent with the Project Vision and Objectives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High concerns regarding the resilience of shoreline protection works to potential climate change impacts as it relates to shoreline and Bluffs risk mitigation.</li> </ul>	Climate change, as it relates to shoreline protection works, is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to see Appendix A of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Project Vision</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add “natural and recreational”: “A system of linked natural and recreational public spaces...”</li> <li>• Add “natural public spaces...”</li> <li>• Consider the natural environment.</li> <li>• Move “protect and restore, relax and reflect, and learn about and appreciate the natural and cultural heritage of the Bluffs” up to have more prominence.</li> <li>• Use “natural habitat” or “environment” rather than “heritage.”</li> <li>• Unique feature protection is paramount.</li> <li>• More prominence on natural habitat.</li> <li>• Does it have to be linked?</li> <li>• Public spaces – open space? Greenspace?</li> <li>• Note the fragility of the Bluffs.</li> <li>• You are not stressing the protection of the natural environment.</li> <li>• Add habitat, wildlife.</li> <li>• Attract the right type of visitor – respectful of the natural habitat.</li> <li>• “A system of linked public spaces along the Lake Ontario shoreline where possible...”</li> <li>• Make “protect and restore” first.</li> <li>• Waterfront as a means of better connecting the communities in Scarborough.</li> <li>• Move protecting/respecting natural habitat to the first line.</li> <li>• Natural is getting lost at the end – make it a priority.</li> <li>• Protect and restore is not clear. Think its nature, but not sure. Middle not the best place.</li> <li>• Not sure why relax and reflect is in the Vision statement – it’s an outcome.</li> <li>• There is no mention of beautification.</li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Vision has been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Project Objectives</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the objective “Manage public and property risk”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage development on top of Bluffs.</li> <li>• Add “where possible” to objectives 1-4.</li> <li>• “Enter at your own risk.”</li> <li>• Need to include definitions for all objectives where necessary; reword using simpler language.</li> <li>• Manage bluff erosion.</li> <li>• Manage risks to public safety separate from property risk.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Objectives have been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the objective “Protect, connect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural heritage features and linkages.”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should they be connected?</li> <li>• “Connect” covers “linkages”. No need to include linkages.</li> <li>• Suggested rewording: “Protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural habitat and wildlife.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Objectives have been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the objective “Provide new connected shoreline greenspace, while enhancing and connecting existing greenspace and providing opportunities for recreation and user experiences”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide opportunities for recreation and use experiences if possible/where possible.</li> <li>• Recreation: passive/active?</li> <li>• Suggested rewording: “Provide natural connections between manufactured green spaces and existing habitat in a way that does not endanger the public or the ecosystem and its wildlife.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Objectives have been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the objective “Address community interests while protecting and enhancing cultural heritage resources”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are cultural heritage resources? Please clarify or replace with “ecosystem” or “habitat.”</li> <li>• What does “community interests” mean?</li> <li>• Potentially might be worth incorporating into this objective that the new public space should also serve as an educational resource. The Bluffs are a unique geological formation and can serve as a resource into the geological history of Toronto and natural history. Part of the Vision statement is to “learn about and appreciate the natural...heritage of the Bluffs”. Having some sort of resource for elementary and high schools could lead to further interest in and conservation of the Bluffs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Objectives have been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the objective “Achieve value for cost”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My only concern is that the lowest cost option not be the primary guiding principal for any of the work done. In many cases it pays to spend more for a lasting result than go with the cheapest option. Cheap is not always best.</li> <li>• This objective should be specified, since it can be used to make or break any of the above objectives.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Project Objectives have been refined. Refer to Section 4.1 of the ToR.
<b>TOPIC: Draft Evaluation Criteria</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Ability to address existing risks to life and property due to shoreline and bluff erosion”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguish between public and private properties.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Ability to address risk to public safety related to coastal processes”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify language in definition</li> <li>• Change wording to include “avoid” (i.e., “Design Alternatives that minimize or avoid such risks...”)</li> <li>• Consider weighting this less than risk of bluff erosion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Ability to manage potential for change to coastal processes to allow a balance between natural processes and infrastructure stability”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very technical language.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Extent of aquatic habitat and linkages enhanced, created or lost”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The integration between greenspace and habitat needs to be more obvious.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Opportunity to use local sources of water for habitat enhancements/creation”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In definition, distinguish between water types (i.e., “Local sources of ground and surface water...”)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Resilience and adaptability of new habitat features to potential climate change impacts”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider adding reference to stormwater management and Lake levels.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the objective “Protect, connect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural heritage features and linkages” consider the following additional criteria:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Migratory routes.</li> <li>Endangered species.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Extent of connected greenspace system created along the shoreline and top of Bluffs.”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine points/”Nodes” you want connected, then measure how much those areas are connected.</li> <li>Greenspaces should be connected in an ecofriendly way. Include natural habitat connections.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Comments noted.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Level of public access provided”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What does this mean?</li> <li>Include parking/bikes/AODA in definition.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the criteria “Extent of new or enhanced views and vistas of the Bluffs and Lake Ontario created”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wording in the definition “Alternatives that enhance these experiences are preferred.” Danger in this. Don’t want 1,000 different paths to give 1,000 views.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Extent of new recreation opportunities (active and/or passive) created including potential for multi-season use”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide definitions for “active” and “passive”, or consider other terms.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria Potential for effects on navigation”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not entirely clear how navigation will be affected.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Opportunities to provide natural and cultural appreciation and learning”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand on what is meant by “natural and cultural appreciation”.</li> <li>• Should “historical” be added, or is that captured under cultural?</li> <li>• Does “cultural” also mean new cultures?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Ability to integrate with existing shoreline infrastructure”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't agree with the last statement in the definition. Let's not restrict the study to doing as little as possible.</li> <li>• Consider alternatives that may cost more than doing nothing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Potential to address existing and future traffic conditions”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider adding reference to Public Transit and bicycles.</li> <li>• Good criterion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to the shoreline.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the objective “Address community interests while protecting and enhancing cultural heritage resources” considering adding a new criterion related to public transit and active transportation.</li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to the shoreline.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Ability to accommodate potential parking impacts and demands”                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we include reference to public transportation in this criterion?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to the shoreline.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Potential to incorporate aboriginal history and culture”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somehow to indicate that Aboriginal people will be involved in this process.</li> <li>• Include First Nation people in looking at ways to accommodate/promote these opportunities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The Project Team will continue to engage with interested parties, including First Nations and Metis communities throughout the Project. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Potential impact on archaeological resources”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes to objective.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Based on public and agency input, the Draft Evaluation Criteria have been refined. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Estimated capital cost”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limiting ourselves to the lowest cost options may not be the best Alternative.</li> <li>• It will cost a lot less in the long term to spend more money now than less money only to find we have to spend a whole bunch more money later.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Comments noted.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Potential for project phasing”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What if you build the middle section first; how do you manage the east and west segments? Construction approach and phasing are important to community. Flexibility in construction phasing.</li> <li>• Agree with this criterion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Opportunities for project phasing will be considered in the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the criteria “Maintenance and operations costs”:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency services costs; there would be specifications that are required.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Comment noted.
<b>TOPIC: General Comments</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1 October 8, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about silting within Bluffer’s Park.</li> </ul>	The potential for changes in sediment transport along the shoreline will be considered in the EA, as appropriate depending on the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about dredging at Bluffer’s Park; silt being dumped at Dunker’s flow area.</li> </ul>	The potential for changes in sediment transport along the shoreline will be considered in the EA, as appropriate depending on the development of Alternatives.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a way to preserve the view of the Bluffs.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide views and viewsapes to Lake Ontario, and the Bluffs, are to be considered in the EA and are included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2 December 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that this project is a predecessor for development, worries expressed about condo development at the top of the Bluffs.</li> </ul>	There will be no private residential development on public lands along the Project Area (top and toe of the Bluffs).
<b>TOPIC: Preliminary Draft ToR</b>		
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a weighting in favour of nature.</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that the Draft Evaluation Criteria will be refined as part of the EA, and different levels of relative importance may be assigned to the criteria. Refer to Section 3.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 7.2 notes the presence of lots of flora and fauna. How do we avoid disturbing flora and fauna?</li> <li>There are many species existing in the Project Area; this almost warrants not going to conduct work in the area as not to disturb them.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to enhance the natural environment will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives. Potential impacts on the natural environment is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ISMP is from 1996. Some of the priorities may not be current now. As well, environmental priorities may not have been as prominent.</li> </ul>	There are several other planning initiatives that have been developed, or are currently ongoing, that are relevant to this section of the waterfront in the City of Toronto, and which support the purpose of the Project. Refer to Section 2.1.1 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With respect to previous work or possible future work along the shoreline, what is the quality of the fill used? Is there no rebar in the fill?</li> </ul>	Materials used in the creation of waterfront parks are subject to fill quality guidelines and will be discussed in further detail in the EA, if required.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What types of archaeological resources are you expecting to find within the Project Study Area?</li> </ul>	A Stage 1 archaeological assessment is being undertaken in the EA. Refer to Section 7.3.5 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 3.4 suggest adding the Highland Creek Treatment Plant to the list of activities and plans proceeding to coordinate with.</li> </ul>	TRCA is coordinating with Toronto Water regarding plans and projects associated with public infrastructure located within the Project Study Area.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the division of the Project Study Area, are we locked into these segments for the EA?</li> </ul>	The EA will be focused on the Project Study Area as defined in the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are several references to creating linkages and connections (i.e. Paths on top and bottom of the Bluffs). Can we strive to have areas such as neighbourhood pockets that are isolated for people and off of the main pathway?</li> </ul>	Opportunities to connect greenspaces, while providing some areas away from the new trail system will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With respect to existing development in the Project Study Area (i.e. Bluffer’s Park) and other sections of the Waterfront Trail are there reports that could be referenced that discuss the following impacts to local communities:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased parking demands; and</li> <li>Environmental impacts of the waterfront.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Are there any monitoring reports related to similar projects such as Port Union Waterfront Park that can be shared or referenced in the report?</li> <li>At Port Union Waterfront Park are there studies about the enhanced habitat and the success of them?</li> </ul>	The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by Shoreline Segment and consider additional sources of information. Refer to Section 7 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 7.2.2, Figure 4 showing Vegetation Communities of Concern is not on the same page as its associated content.</li> <li>Regarding the flora and fauna maps included in Section 7.2, it’s very difficult to see the details. Suggest removing.</li> </ul>	The maps will be provided with additional detail in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 7.1.2 there is a statement that notes the Scarborough Clays at the base of the Bluffs are the oldest exposed deposits. Aren’t the oldest exposed deposits located at the Brickworks?</li> </ul>	Wording has been revised. Refer to Section 7.1.2 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to information in Section 7, all of the plants and animals located in sensitive areas are primarily on the top of the Bluffs. Therefore anything happening at the bottom of the Bluffs will not impact them. Trails at the top may have an impact on them.</li> </ul>	Potential impact on the natural environment is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External nature and wildlife groups have noted natural habitats at the bottom of the Bluffs that have been impacted by other shoreline work done in the area (e.g. clover nesting site just east of Bluffer’s Park and a snake den at the bottom of Bellamy ravine). Will external nature and wildlife groups be consulted with to identify these habitats prior to further construction along the shoreline?</li> </ul>	The Project Team is open to receiving input regarding locations of wildlife and wildlife habitat.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 7.1.3 is not detailed enough.</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 7.1.3 for revised wording.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be helpful to have some narrative on how much of the existing toe is manmade to provide context for geology of the area.</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 7.1.5 of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the status of the marina that was previous planned for in 1988?</li> </ul>	A marina at East Point Park will be discussed in the development of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest considering fish compensation early.</li> </ul>	The need to fish compensation is dependent upon the Alternatives developed in the EA. The potential for impacts on aquatic habitat and the need for compensation will be considered in the evaluation of Alternatives.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 7.1.7 should combined sewer outfalls be classified as point sources?</li> </ul>	Combined sewer outfalls are considered point sources of contaminants, as referenced in Section 7.1.7 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will monitoring as part of this project looking at the existing marinas in the Project Study Area and their impacts?</li> <li>Is there any monitoring that is conducted related to the existing marinas in the Project Study Area (i.e., impacts from boats on fish habitats etc.)?</li> </ul>	Available water quality monitoring data will be considered in the EA.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TRCA is the proponent of the project and also providing the monitoring data? Is that a conflict of interest?</li> <li>Suggest framing that the public and community are evaluators of the project alternatives when marketing the project to the public.</li> </ul>	TRCA has been actively collecting monitoring data along the shoreline for 30 years, which provides valuable baseline data for the Project Study Area. This information is publically available for review. Use of this data is not a conflict of interest.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reviewing the landfill at the toe of Brimley Road (i.e., fill material on slope of Brimley Road).</li> </ul>	The former Brimley Road landfill site will be discussed with the City of Toronto early in the EA phase.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stabilizing the base changes the formation of what is behind it.</li> </ul>	Potential impact on the dynamic nature of the Bluffs is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pleased that the vision statement takes out reference to a continuous trail. Happy that it's clear that the feasibility of this will be determined in the EA phase.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 7.3.7 it's mentioned that there are no noise sources along the shoreline. What about noise from trains passing through?</li> </ul>	There are no significant sources of noise along the base of the Bluffs. It is recognized that within the broader Project Study Area, additional sources of noise exist (i.e., trains).
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Section 7.3.6 an air quality study will be completed. Are you also looking at water quality coming in from Highland Creek or the Rouge River?</li> <li>Interested in the water quality of what entering Highland Creek from the treatment plant? Is this being considered?</li> </ul>	TRCA has been actively collecting water quality monitoring data along the shoreline for 30 years, which provides valuable baseline data for the Project Study Area.
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The document seems to be comprehensive, addressing the issues and process to date.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Draft ToR Page-Turn Review March 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="632 233 1356 354">• Have Emergency Medical Services and Fire Services been involved in the Project and/or are they aware that the study is underway? I didn't see them specifically mentioned in the Record of Consultation.</li></ul>	These agencies are being consulted with as part of the ToR, and will continue to be consulted with as part of the EA.



## 3.7 Response to Public Comments

**Table 4** provides a summary of the comments and concerns received to date through the PICs and through other forums, including via the project email. The table also provides an explanation of how the Project Team will be taking comments received and issues raised into consideration. All comments received have been analyzed and summarized; duplicate comments have been combined. Comments were then organized by the following topic areas:

- Public Consultation
- Construction and Implementation
- Trail Locations and Connections
- Access Points and Types of Access
- Trail Surfaces, Signage and Plantings
- Trail Users
- Existing Trails and Access
- Environmental Impacts due to Trails and Access
- Geological and Natural Environments
- Park Amenities
- Public Safety
- EA Process and Approach to Developing Alternatives
- Existing Conditions
- Cultural Heritage and Community Initiatives
- Infrastructure and Energy
- General Comments

As described earlier, PIC #2 included a group discussion activity to review and comment specifically on the draft evaluation criteria associated with each project objective. A separate table presenting these comments in summary (including additional comments on criteria received after the PIC), is included in **Appendix C-6**. The Project Team will take this feedback into account when developing Indicators (please refer to Section 6.1 of the ToR for further information on the proposed approach to developing and evaluating the Alternatives) as part of the further refinement of the Draft Criteria during the EA. Any comments made during the PIC #2 discussion activity that were more related to the general discussion topics are included in **Table 4** below. Other additional public input details are included in **Appendix C-6**.

Table 4 – Public Input Received During the ToR Phase

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Public Consultation</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than 2 PIC's are needed.</li> </ul>	PICs are held at key milestone dates for the Project. The number of PICs to be held as part of the EA phase will be determined as the project progresses. Refer to Section 10.2 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The public should be heard and included in decision making before a plan is decided on.</li> </ul>	Public consultation as part of the ToR and EA considers input from interested parties, including stakeholder, agencies and the public. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ad mail should be sent to all residents of Scarborough because so many people use this Park.</li> </ul>	Mandatory notices are published in the Scarborough Mirror, which is distributed across Scarborough. The Project Team will continue to seek opportunities to engage with the broader community as appropriate during the EA. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about who initiated the project and how this is being funded.</li> <li>Inclined elevator cars and public parking can provide revenue streams.</li> </ul>	City of Toronto Council directed TRCA to undertake an EA for the Scarborough Waterfront Project. Alternative funding sources for the project will be pursued, including public and private sources.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will the Waterfront Regeneration Fund influence the Waterfront development?</li> </ul>	Public consultation as part of the ToR and EA considers input from interested parties, including stakeholder, agencies and the public. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is concern that the other communities who use the park will be left out (e.g. communities northwest of Kingston Road).</li> </ul>	The Project Team will continue to seek opportunities to engage a broader audience as appropriate during the EA. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is meant by "cultural heritage"?</li> </ul>	Cultural heritage refers to archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes. Refer to Section 7.3.5 of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important to provide a clear agenda and public forum for questions and answers</li> <li>Concerned that questions from the public and neighbours are not being heard</li> <li>Label maps with street names</li> </ul>	Based on feedback received at PIC#1, the meeting format for PIC #2 included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An agenda;</li> <li>A Question/Answer period, which followed the presentation;</li> <li>Opportunities available to provide comments on panels as part of the Open House and in workbooks, both as part of the round table session during the meeting and online or by fax following the PIC; and</li> <li>Clearly labeled maps with street names.</li> </ul>

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very pleased to see that this project is in progress.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the TRCA intend to deal with the riparian rights situation, given the sizeable number of property owners who will be impacted by public access to the proposed lakefront trail?</li> </ul>	Landowners and residents within the Project Study Area are being provided with opportunities to be involved during the EA process. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the current Ontario government funding commitment for the Project versus their prior commitment, and what is the timeline for these funds? Who will make up any shortfall?</li> </ul>	The City of Toronto Council directed TRCA to undertake the EA with funding from the City. Alternative funding sources for the project will be pursued, including public and private sources.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding secondary damage to homes and decreased property values.</li> </ul>	A detailed effects assessment will be undertaken for the Preferred Alternative as part of the EA. Refer to Section 8 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is the EA being funded and how will future changes be funded if they occur?</li> <li>Is there an approach to go after corporate funding?</li> <li>Can sustainable funding from maintenance and operating costs be built into the project plan?</li> </ul>	City of Toronto Council directed TRCA to undertake an EA for the Scarborough Waterfront Project. Alternative funding sources for the project will be pursued, including public and private sources.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the benefit for the government to fund this?</li> </ul>	The Project is looking at opportunities to improve public lands which have historically been impacted through resource extraction uses (i.e., stonehooking activities). The Vision of the Project is to improve the natural environment and public access to these public lands.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much money is spent on parks in Scarborough vs. the rest of the City of Toronto?</li> </ul>	<p>City of Toronto Parks, Forestry and Recreation is committed to providing their customers with exceptional services that are key contributors to the quality of life for all Torontonians. They provide a variety of greenspaces and services that are safe, attractive, well maintained, cost-effective, ecologically healthy, and which promote personal and social health and wellness while meeting community needs. Parks are maintained based on the applicable maintenance standards for the type of park and maintenance standards for Scarborough are consistent with other parts of the City. The Parks, Forestry and Recreation budget is used to deliver programs and service to all of the City of Toronto stakeholders in a harmonized manner with existing resources. Further to this goal the Parks Plan provides guidance to decision making, so that all districts receive consistent funding towards their parks programs enabling them to achieve high standards. The Parks plan is available to the public at the following link: <a href="http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/parks_forestry_recreation/community_involvement/files/pdf/parksplan.pdf">http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/parks_forestry_recreation/community_involvement/files/pdf/parksplan.pdf</a></p>
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be good to have panels available on the website for review prior to the public meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>The panels and other meeting material are developed to a high level, and benefit from the additional context and information provided at the meeting. Immediately following PIC#2, the panels were provided online along with the presentation and speaking notes.</p>
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The publicly available information does not include enough material from prior to TRCA's "shoreline erosion works" photos, wind and water, current data, detailed documentation of flora and fauna, both aquatic and terrestrial at that time.</li> <li>The first step of determining "existing conditions" is not reflective of the significant changes undergone at East Point Park. The draft approach steps should start with "historical conditions".</li> </ul>	<p>A preliminary overview description of the existing environment is provided in Section 7 of the ToR. Where appropriate, historical conditions are also provided. The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by shoreline segment as necessary.</p>

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire access to all environmental studies done on the area (including potential climate change impacts and erosion monitoring rates).</li> <li>• Is there info to show environmental outcomes on other areas of Bluffs pre and post mitigation to whether or not there has been a positive outcome (i.e. increase in fish, insects, wildlife etc.)?</li> </ul>	Data collected and used for the EA may be made available to the public. It is anticipated that studies undertaken in support of the EA may be available as appendices to the report.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate meeting regarding impacts on fish habitat and terrain and wildlife studies is required.</li> </ul>	As part of the evaluation of Alternatives during the EA, it is anticipated that a PIC will include a discussion of potential impacts on these components of the environment.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are Lakehill Crescent waterlot owners being addressed?</li> </ul>	Landowners and residents within the Project Study Area are being provided with opportunities to be involved during the EA process. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is TRCA doing to ensure that special interests groups do not hijack the project?</li> </ul>	Public consultation as part of the ToR and EA considers input from interested parties, including stakeholder, agencies and the public. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> February 25, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very much appreciated the opportunity to be involved in the plans for the development of the waterfront.</li> <li>• Congratulations to the Project Team on a well-organized and informative event.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> March 3, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project looks like a fabulous initiative.</li> <li>• Making the waterfront safe and integrating access along the shoreline from Bluffers Park to East Point Park will be fantastic!</li> </ul>	Comments noted.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> March 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information in the Discussion Workbook for PIC #2 shows that comments are being considered and included as part of the EA ToR.</li> <li>• Pleased to see previous comments were included as part of the support material presented at PIC #2.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Construction and Implementation</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Start construction and stop studying the area so that work can get started.</li> </ul>	The EA is a required process which provides the necessary studies to ensure an informed decision is made, and potential impacts on the environment are understood and addressed, if necessary. Pending a decision on the EA, it is anticipated that project construction may begin as early as 2017.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less construction is preferred in the Scarborough Waterfront Area.</li> </ul>	The construction effects on the local community will be considered as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative as part of the EA.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the length of time for implementation (i.e., 12 years spent to implement the trail at Port Union).</li> <li>Desire to complete the section where the existing construction access road is located, as this would expedite implementation</li> </ul>	The EA is a required process which provides the necessary studies to ensure an informed decision is made, and all potential impacts on the environment are understood and addressed if necessary. Pending a decision on the EA, it is anticipated that construction may begin as early as 2017. Opportunities for project phasing will be considered as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What protection will be afforded to Guildwood Parkway homeowners to ensure that TRCA/subcontractor trucks will not use the eastern portion of Guildwood Parkway to reach the construction access road?</li> </ul>	Landowners and residents within the Project Study Area are being provided with opportunities to be involved during the EA process. Refer to Section 10 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit discussions and begin implementation.</li> <li>Ensure phased access during construction.</li> </ul>	The EA provides the necessary studies to ensure an informed decision is made, and all potential impacts on the environment are understood and addressed if necessary. It is anticipated that construction may begin as early as 2017. Opportunities for project phasing will be considered as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> March 22, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any idea on the ETA or is this going to take years still?</li> </ul>	The EA is a required process which provides the necessary studies to ensure an informed decision is made, and all potential impacts on the environment are understood and addressed if necessary. Pending a decision on the EA, it is anticipated that construction may begin as early as 2017. Opportunities for project phasing will be considered as part of the detailed assessment of the Preferred Alternative.
<b>TOPIC: Trail Locations and Connections</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The walking/hiking trail located east and west of Bluffer's Park should be connected.</li> <li>Extend the trails behind the beach.</li> </ul>	These will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connect the east end of the beach to the new pathway at the bottom of the bluffs.</li> <li>• Put a trail right of way along the top of the Bluffs to the Waterfront Trail, with suggested bike and trail pathways at Sylvan Park, and Guild Park &amp; Gardens.</li> <li>• The Waterfront Trail can go along Copperfield Drive to Beechgrove Road.</li> <li>• Focus studies on the walking connections from Cudia Park to Sylvan Park, across the Doris McCarthy Trail, and connections from the GO Guild/Rouge Station.</li> </ul>	further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create an art path from old Guild to Doris McCarthy's Cottage.</li> </ul>	At a conceptual level, opportunities to improve pedestrian linkages between the Guild Inn and Gardens site and Doris McCarthy's property may be considered in the development of Alternatives. The creation of an art path is an operations and maintenance consideration, and may be discussed with the City of Toronto as part of the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When is the water's edge trail from Highland Creek Park to the Rouge River going to be finished?</li> </ul>	The trail from Highland Creek Park to the Rouge River was completed in 2012 through the Port Union Waterfront Improvement Project.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the likely implications of the Guildwood to East Point Park section of the trail on the recently signed agreement by Dynamic Entertainment to upgrade and operate the Guild Inn under lease from the City of Toronto?</li> </ul>	TRCA and City of Toronto are coordinating efforts between the Project and the Guild Inn and Gardens Management Plan.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve East Point Park through the construction of a water's edge trail, marina, and additional sports facilities. Preserving the park's bluff top area and shoreline would be an unnecessary mistake and disservice to the community.</li> <li>• Desire for existing bluff top trails to be developed through the East Point Park area.</li> <li>• Desire for attractive, safe, access to the shoreline along the water's edge at East Point Park.</li> </ul>	These will be discussed as part of the development of Alternatives during the EA.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider public access to the waterfront via the construction access road.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide formal access along the existing construction access road at the base of the bluffs will be considered as part of the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trails should be at the base of the bluffs.</li> <li>Suggestions to have connections that have visitors exit the waterfront trail and detour to local streets prevents opportunities to have views of the bluffs.</li> </ul>	These will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
<b>TOPIC: Access Points and Types of Access</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding limited public access to the headlands compared to the Sylvan sector headlands, which provide access and shade.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to provide access to the headlands will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over the addition of new access points.</li> <li>Improve existing access points.</li> <li>Create more access points from different parks, 4 is not enough.</li> </ul>	Opportunities for improved access to the shoreline will be discussed in the development of Alternatives during the EA.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in a zip-line to Guild Park &amp; Gardens because this is less intrusive.</li> <li>Improve access from Guild Park &amp; Gardens to the shoreline.</li> <li>Restore the foot pathway from the Guild Park &amp; Gardens to the Lake</li> </ul>	Active recreation will continue in areas where it currently exists (Bluffer's Park, East Point Park). TRCA and City of Toronto are coordinating efforts between the Project and the Guild Inn and Gardens Management Plan.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Place a funicular every kilometer.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the SWP Project Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer's Park or East Point Park, alternative forms of access to the shoreline may be discussed.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is insufficient parking at Brimley.</li> <li>Desire for additional parking and/or rotunda for Drop Off.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access and the amenities required to support this access (i.e., parking) will be explored in developing the Alternatives.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus routes from Go Rail Train stations to parts of the shoreline west of Guildwood.</li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to Bluffer's Park.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve access and use of the beach areas (i.e.. wheelchair access to waterfront and water).</li> </ul>	Opportunities for improved access to and along the shoreline will be discussed in the development of Alternatives. TRCA is working with the City of Toronto to coordinate between the Project and the Toronto Beaches Plan (i.e., wheelchair access to the water).



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no Sunday service on Coronation for TTC.</li> <li>Consider water shuttle to downtown Toronto.</li> <li>Desire for access (all year round) via transit.</li> </ul>	TRCA and TTC are coordinating regarding potential opportunities to improve transit access to the shoreline.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desire for access (if possible, all year round) via car and Foot / Wheelchairs / bicycles / skates etc.</li> </ul>	Opportunities for improved access to and along the water's edge will be discussed in the development of Alternatives. It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer's Park and East Point Park.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access points are "closed" with signage, does TRCA see these areas closed now and over the next 10 years?</li> </ul>	It is recognized that access to the Doris McCarthy Trail is limited due to existing conditions. TRCA and the City of Toronto are completing improvements to Bellamy Ravine as part of 2015 state of good repair works. Opportunities for further improvements may be considered in the EA.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desire for more access points to the Waterfront Trail for pedestrian and bikes. In particular, walking access to the Waterfront Trail from the west side of the Bellamy Ravine (i.e., from Pine Ridge Drive, Ledge Road and/or Meadowcliffe Drive, possibly through the Doris McCarthy Trail). Bike access would also be favoured.</li> <li>A bike path along the Waterfront Trail (similar to the one in Ajax and Pickering).</li> </ul>	Opportunities to connect with the existing Waterfront Trail will be discussed in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking facilities need to be provided so people are not parking on, and blocking, residential streets. Where appropriate, a 2 or 3 level parking garage could be considered to reduce the land requirement.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access and the amenities required to support this access (i.e., parking) will be explored in the development of Alternatives. The potential traffic impacts on the adjacent communities will be discussed as part of the evaluation of Alternatives (refer to Appendix A of the ToR), and an effects mitigation will be undertaken as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
Email to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> March 22, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are you planning a continuous bicycle trail as part of the Scarborough Waterfront Project?</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access to and along the water's edge (including the top and toe of the bluffs) will be discussed in the development of Alternatives.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Trail Surfaces, Signage, and Plantings</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not pave existing paths and trails,</li> <li>• All hiking trails should be natural,</li> <li>• Bridges would help keep shoreline in natural state,</li> </ul> Concern that the East Point Park path may be replaced with cobble and a hard surface path. Provide all weather and easy access to trails and paths because some trails are closed. Maintain places that provide seclusion for both humans and animals; do not make the entire waterfront readily accessible to humans.	At a conceptual level, trail location and design will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Further details may be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve signage on all trails.</li> <li>• Introduce a way finding process to connect local communities to the waterfront.</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for paved multipurpose trail along the water's edge across the Project Study Area.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access to and along the water's edge (including the top and toe of the bluffs) will be discussed in the development of Alternatives. Trail design specifications will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for the following paths:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycle (Paved and Dirt);</li> <li>• Pedestrian (Boardwalk and Paved); and</li> <li>• Running/In-line Skating/Hiking Trail.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Trail design will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map of a path to go down to shoreline, particularly at East Point Park.</li> </ul>	At a conceptual level, way finding will be considered in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Further details may be developed through the detailed design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enjoyment of the trail and education of the Bluffs and the habitats would be enhanced with appropriate signage along the trail.</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details (i.e., design specifications, locations, sign details) to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Trail Users</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that walkers, cyclists, joggers and service vehicles can co-exist along the trails and waterfront.</li> <li>Separate paths for cyclists and pedestrians.</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park. Trail design will be considered at a conceptual level in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for fishing pier(s).</li> <li>Desire for a pier, extending far enough to allow fishing.</li> </ul>	The EA is being coordinate with, and informed by, the Urban Recreational Fisheries Plan (i.e., improved fishing opportunities within the Project Area). Refer to section 2.1.1 of the ToR.
<b>TOPIC: Existing Trails and Access</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bike path that currently exists has potholes and should be improved.</li> </ul>	The access road along the base of the Bluffs is for construction purposes only. Opportunities to provide formal access along the existing construction access road at the base of the bluffs will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve access, upgrade Doris McCarthy Trail.</li> <li>The Doris McCarthy Trail should be better accessed for hikers and cyclists.</li> </ul>	It is recognized that access to the Doris McCarthy Trail is limited due to existing conditions. TRCA and the City of Toronto are completing improvements to Bellamy Ravine as part of 2015 state of good repair works. Opportunities for further improvements may be considered in the EA.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking and biking down Brimley to Scarborough Bluffs Park is dangerous and needs improvement.</li> <li>Access should be less steep.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve pedestrian/cycling access to Bluffer’s Park will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doris McCarthy Trail (Bellamy Ravine) is in severe state of disrepair –no water flow from stream in summer, just sewage per diversion of Bellamy Creek.</li> </ul>	It is recognized that access to the Doris McCarthy Trail is limited due to existing conditions. TRCA and the City of Toronto are completing improvements to Bellamy Ravine as part of 2015 state of good repair works. Opportunities for further improvements may be considered in the EA.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> March 3, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the plans/ideas for public access at Bellamy Ravine?</li> </ul>	It is recognized that access to the Doris McCarthy Trail is limited due to existing conditions. TRCA and the City of Toronto are completing improvements to Bellamy Ravine as part of 2015 state of good repair works. Opportunities for further improvements may be considered in the EA.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Environmental Impacts due to Trails and Access</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over added stormwater runoff into the lake due to the addition of new trails.</li> </ul>	The ability to manage and use local sources of water (i.e., stormwater) is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If access is too easy, the area will lose its wild, natural feel.</li> <li>Greater access and pedestrian traffic will exacerbate erosion and degradation of the bluff.</li> <li>Provide access to ascend the bluffs to view the bluffs, while preserving beach areas in a naturalized state.</li> <li>Prevent new roads from ruining the natural park beauty.</li> </ul>	Potential for impacts to all components of the environment will be considered as part of the EA.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People want to be able to see the terrestrial and aquatic habitats, but care must be taken to ensure that people cannot walk through and potentially destroy those habitats (i.e., the nesting areas of migrating birds, or butterfly habitat).</li> <li>East Point Park is an important stop for bird migration and contains a lot of wildlife. What is planned to protect these from being destroyed by the influx of people into that area?</li> </ul>	At a conceptual level, this will be considered in the detailed effects assessment of the Preferred Alternative, and an effects mitigation will be undertaken as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. Further details may be developed a part of the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the details of the important geological features in the Project Study Area and the plans for protecting them?</li> </ul>	A preliminary overview description of the existing environment, including significant natural areas, is provided in Section 7 of the ToR. The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by shoreline segment, as necessary. Potential impacts on the natural environment and dynamic nature of the bluffs is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Geological and Natural Environments</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve a few sections of the Bluffs in their original appearance.</li> <li>• Preserve the natural ecology and natural wonder of the area.</li> </ul>	The potential impact on the dynamic nature of the bluffs is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave the beach alone in the trail area behind Grey Abbey Park to Copperfield.</li> <li>• Protect the sandy shoreline west of East Point for bird and wildlife habitat.</li> </ul>	The potential impact on the existing shoreline character is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect migratory habitats (e.g., Monarch butterflies and birds).</li> </ul>	The potential to enhance the natural environment is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire to have an area developed to enhance and celebrate the geology of the bluff face and natural beaches.</li> <li>• Don't destroy the unique character of the bluffs just to provide recreational facilities. Instead, educate people about the bluffs themselves, and allow them to enjoy the natural experience.</li> </ul>	This will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives. The impact of the Alternatives on the existing sand beach and dynamic nature of the bluffs; and the ability of the Alternatives to provide opportunities for natural and cultural education and interpretation are included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop any dumping of Toronto waste-leave the Park and Beach as it is.</li> </ul>	Municipal waste is not used to create waterfront parks. Materials used in the creation of waterfront parks are subject to fill quality guidelines and will be discussed in further detail as part of the EA, if required.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the Bluffs are disappearing because of erosion.</li> </ul>	A geotechnical study will be completed as required as part of the EA to assess slope condition.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over the future of Chine Drive and that the meadow in this area will change.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to enhance the Chine Drive meadows may be discussed in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control silt for the Bluffer's Channel</li> <li>• Concern about siltation in the waterfront.</li> </ul>	The Draft Evaluation Criteria considers the ability of the Alternatives to integrate with other City infrastructure and plans. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Point Park has the potential to be a world class birding and wildlife area/preserve.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to enhance the natural habitat at East Point Park will be discussed as part of the development of Alternatives.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fix the destroyed beach east of Doris McCarthy Trail.</li> </ul>	<p>The shoreline erosion protection works located east of the Doris McCarthy Trail were the subject of the Meadowcliffe Drive Erosion Projection Project Environmental Study Report completed in 2010. The Draft Evaluation Criteria consider the extent of change to the existing shoreline and bluff character. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve a few sections of the Bluffs in their original appearance.</li> <li>• Concern over the language being used at the public meeting and the lack of regard for geology. Erosion control and geology is at risk. The area is a place of global significance, and erosion control has not addressed conservation of geology.</li> <li>• Preserve natural features of the park.</li> <li>• There should be no change to the Bluffs. They should be left in their natural state.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential impacts on the dynamic nature of the Bluffs is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point on Cathedral Bluffs park used to be a prairie setting. Too much filming – commercial activity, now invasive species – dog strangling vine.</li> </ul>	<p>Filming permits are a management and operations consideration and is outside the scope of the Project. However, opportunities to protect and enhance the natural habitat at Cathedral Bluffs Park will be explored in the development of Alternatives.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring back the meadows and also the meadows behind the seminary</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunities to enhance the Chine Drive meadows may be discussed as part of the development of Alternatives.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep Lake Ontario shoreline as natural as possible.</li> <li>• Keep the natural sandy beach shoreline from the bottom of Morningside Avenue east to the mouth of Highland Creek preserved. It would be unfortunate to replace it with pavement.</li> </ul>	<p>Potential impacts on the existing shoreline and bluff character is to be considered in the EA and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance transient animal access and the bird sanctuary.</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunities to protect and enhance natural features will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.</p>

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wave erosion attenuation, a panoramic public viewing of the Bluffs, and an on-the-water experience for the public could be provided through offshore spits from access points, in the shallow water east of Guildwood. This can provide for enhanced fish habitat, and a safe protected area for small boat use.</li> </ul>	Wave erosion, view and vistas, access to the water and enhancement to aquatic habitat will be considered in the development and evaluation of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing shoreline erosion work has destroyed aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Do we have historic info for this study</li> </ul>	TRCA has undertaken coastal monitoring of this area for 30 years. Refer to Section 7.2.6 of the ToR for baseline aquatic habitat conditions.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The shoreline changes at the Port Union waterfront trail is an example of how filling in along the shoreline can look “natural” with the large rocks protecting the shoreline.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.
<b>TOPIC: Park Amenities – Land Use</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about commercialization of the area and real estate development (e.g., Yacht Clubs, Casino’s, Ferris Wheels).</li> <li>Stop any development in the Park and the Beach.</li> <li>Concern that future interventions or new cafes or amenities will destroy the natural beauty and existing wildlife habitat of this area.</li> <li>InGround amphitheater for entertainers/concerts.</li> </ul>	There will be no private residential development on public lands within the Project Area. Commercial activities currently exist at Bluffer’s Park (i.e., restaurant, yacht club). No large scale commercial activities, such as casinos, are envisioned for the Project Study Area.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Marina for East Point Park should be built.</li> <li>Few marinas provide for safe use of smaller boats. Support for the marina at East Point Park with focus on small boat activities in the protected waters between any new public spits and the shoreline.</li> </ul>	A marina at East Point Park will be discussed in the development of Alternatives during the EA.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desire for construction of a marina at East Point Park.</li> </ul>	A marina at East Point Park will be discussed in the development of Alternatives during the EA.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balance between need for access &amp; enjoyment vs. commercial development. Commercial development should be on top of the Bluffs, rather than at the delicate waterfront</li> </ul>	There will be no private residential development on public lands within the Project Area. Commercial activities currently exist at Bluffer's Park (i.e., restaurant, yacht club).
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is TRCA considering the Marina at East Point Park that was approved by Metro Government (specifically for East Point Park)?</li> <li>• Desire for boat Slips and a place for Boat/Floating Houses.</li> </ul>	A marina at East Point Park will be discussed in the development of Alternatives during the EA.
<b>TOPIC: Park Amenities</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding garbage.</li> <li>• Concern over the way the park areas will be managed over the weekends.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the number of dogs in the park area.</li> </ul>	These are park management and operations considerations and are outside the scope of the EA.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interested in using the idea of a butterfly "gardens" to create a sheltered look-out for educational purposes.</li> <li>• Incorporate teaching stations or outlook points.</li> <li>• Interested in pirate treasure idea as an educational feature.</li> </ul>	Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, and the Preferred Alternative may not specify this level of use. As such, these design elements may be considered further during the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about lack of cell phone reception at the foot of the bluffs.</li> <li>• Concerned and do not want wifi and pay phones in the park.</li> <li>• Interested in pay phones and Wi-Fi.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Area. Cell reception, wifi and pay phones are operations and maintenance considerations and are outside the scope of the EA.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install benches for places to rest.</li> <li>• The need for areas to stop and eat.</li> <li>• Interested in bike racks and better signage.</li> <li>• More places for recreational wading and swimming in the Lake.</li> <li>• Tree plantings along the waterfront for more shade and greenery.</li> </ul>	These will be considered as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for amenities like washrooms, a café.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Study Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer’s Park or East Point Park, additional serviced washroom facilities may be considered in the development of Alternatives. Without servicing, commercial activities along the waterfront may not be feasible. No large scale commercial activities are envisioned for the Project Study Area.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> October 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for washrooms at East Point Park.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer’s Park or East Point Park, additional serviced washroom facilities may be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More swimming beaches, if possible</li> <li>• Desire for the following amenities:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Space;</li> <li>• Shade Trees or Wind Breaks;</li> <li>• Garden (To attract wildlife);</li> <li>• Beaches;</li> <li>• Seating Area; and</li> <li>• Fire and BBQ Pits.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Picnic Area.</li> <li>• Designated Dog Park/Area.</li> <li>• Areas of the shoreline west of Guildwood are suitable for further development as attractive picnic and cycling areas.</li> </ul>	At a conceptual level, these design elements will be considered in the development of Alternatives during the EA. Further details will be developed as part of the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for amenities for families such as splash pads, playgrounds, washrooms, and skating rinks (as they have in Ajax and Pickering).</li> <li>• Rest Stops / Bathrooms (well lit/eco-Toilets).</li> <li>• Drinking Fountains.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the SWP Project Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer’s Park or East Point Park, these amenities may be considered in the development of Alternatives. Opportunities for compostable toilets may be explored further as part of detailed design following EA completion.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volleyball;</li> <li>• Tanning;</li> <li>• Paddle Boats;</li> <li>• Skating (winter months);</li> <li>• X-Country Skiing &amp; Snow Shoeing (Winter Months);</li> <li>• Running &amp; Sport Events;</li> <li>• Water Events / Races;</li> <li>• Canoe/Kayak Rentals (lessons);</li> <li>• Monitored swimming area; and</li> <li>• Fishing tournaments.</li> </ul>	<p>Management and operations considerations for these elements are outside the scope of the EA. Infrastructure and/or design elements required to support these recreational opportunities (i.e., lifeguard stations, fishing piers) may be considered at a conceptual level in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. Further details may be developed in the Detailed Design process following EA completion.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concession Stands; and</li> <li>• Food Trucks.</li> </ul>	<p>It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Study Area. Without servicing, commercial activities along the waterfront may not be feasible. No large scale commercial activities are envisioned for the Project Study Area. It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer's Park and East Point Park.</p>
IC#2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum two nights beach camping;</li> <li>• Fireworks;</li> <li>• In-Line Skating Races;</li> <li>• Concerts;</li> <li>• Polar Bear Swim/Dips; and</li> <li>• Kite Festival.</li> </ul>	<p>These are operations and management considerations and outside the scope of the Project.</p>
PIC#2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tobogganing (from the top of the escarpment with tow hitch).</li> </ul>	<p>Recognizing the existing safety hazards and potential for slope instability, it is not anticipated that opportunities for tobogganing from the top of the escarpment will be considered as part of the EA.</p>
PIC#2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional sports facilities (i.e. soccer fields) at East Point Park;</li> <li>• Water Craft Ramps; and</li> <li>• Skateboard Park.</li> </ul>	<p>Active recreation will be pursued in areas where it currently exists (Bluffer's Park, East Point Park). Facilities to be provide these opportunities may be discussed in the development of Alternatives and/or the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.</p>
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interested in views of "Heathfield" path from the beach.</li> </ul>	<p>Views and vistas will be considered in the development and evaluation of Alternatives.</p>

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Public Safety</b>		
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waterfront Trail is extremely isolated; lamp posts, security cameras, medical emergency stations, paved pathways telephone and Wi-Fi, drinking water fountains are needed.</li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer’s Park or East Point Park, these amenities may be considered in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. Some design elements will be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address how parking, traffic, &amp; residential streets will be affected, including the potential for vehicular accidents.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to improve access and the amenities required to support this access (ie parking) will be explored in the development of Alternatives. The potential traffic impacts on the adjacent communities will be discussed as part of the evaluation of Alternatives (see Appendix A of the ToR), and an effects mitigation will be undertaken as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members of the public traverse the edge of the Bluffs and this is a safety concern.</li> </ul>	The opportunities to provide safe viewing nodes along the top of the Bluffs will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sanitation of day use parks is a concern.</li> </ul>	Sanitation is an operations and maintenance consideration and is outside the scope of the project. Opportunities to provide additional washroom facilities, if required, may be discussed for Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict access to emergency vehicles down Doris McCarthy Trail.</li> <li>Minimize motorized access.</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that vehicle access will continue to only be available at Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park; as such vehicle access to Doris McCarthy Trail will remain restricted. Emergency vehicle access only will be provided at appropriate access points along the shoreline, and will be identified in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Move buildings away from the Bluffs.</li> </ul>	All high risk priority erosion areas related to private properties have been addressed through previous shoreline works. The Bluffs will continue to erode until they reach a stable condition.
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve top drainage to slow slumping and run water away from the face.</li> </ul>	Geotechnical and hydrogeological studies will be undertaken as part of the EA to assess slope conditions and identify local sources of water (i.e., groundwater discharge, surface water), including flows. Opportunities to use these local sources of water will be considered in the development and assessment of Alternatives.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #1 September 10, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better speed limit signage for cyclists (better than East Point).</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> November 22, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install vandal resistant posts with location information so emergency services can easily locate park visitors in case of emergency.</li> </ul>	Signage will be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative during the EA, with further details (i.e., design specifications, locations, sign details) to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to waterfront from Doris McCarthy trail at Ravine/Kingston already very busy/dangerous.</li> </ul>	This will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To get to East Point Park two railway crossings have to be crossed (mainline to Montreal as well as GO traffic).</li> </ul>	This rail line and crossing is the subject of a current Project underway with Metrolinx. The Project is working with Metrolinx to coordinate with the Guildwood to Pickering Transit Project Assessment Process.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for the following features that relate to life &amp; safety:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emergency Phone Service;</li> <li>• Floatation Devices;</li> <li>• Camera/Video Surveillance; and</li> <li>• Lighting (Solar/Wind powered).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	It is not anticipated that any new servicing can be provided to the shoreline within the Project Area. Where opportunities exist at Bluffer's Park or East Point Park, these features may be considered in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. Some design elements may be provided at a conceptual level in the EA, with further details to be developed through the Detailed Design process following EA completion.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of erosion to table land falling and the public properties at the top land, will this be considered?</li> <li>• Head of Bluffs erosion needs to be addressed &amp; mitigated as erosion control along shoreline is insufficient (some sections eroding at 1-3’ per year).</li> <li>• Public safety is certainly a critical aspect when developing the plans for the waterfront. There has always been an erosion factor related to the Bluffs, and plans for a trail along the waterfront should ensure that it is located a safe distance from the bottom of the Bluffs in the event of a slide or collapse.</li> <li>• The potential danger to people if the path is located along the very base of the Bluffs is recognized. Suggest that the path be built further out from shore to remove the threat from erosion and collapse. The offshore path would also slow erosion from wave action along the beach.</li> </ul>	<p>All high risk priority erosion areas related to private properties between Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park have been addressed through previous shoreline works. The Bluffs will continue to erode until they reach a stable condition. Geotechnical studies will be undertaken as part of the EA to assess risk to the public and risk to public property (i.e., loss of tablelands).</p>
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterfront improvements have the potential to increase the number of visitors; concerns that this may cause additional congestion and safety issues in the neighbourhood south of Kingston Road and east of Brimley Road.</li> </ul>	<p>The potential traffic impacts on the adjacent communities will be considered in the evaluation of Alternatives (Refer to Appendix A of the ToR), and an effects mitigation will be undertaken as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.</p>
<p>PIC #2 February 24, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess if additional access points will resolve congestion and safety issues at Bluffer’s Park.</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunities to improve access and the amenities required to support this access (i.e., parking) will be explored in the development of Alternatives, including opportunities for improved transit access and pedestrian linkages to Bluffer’s Park.</p>
<p><b>TOPIC: EA Process and Approach to Developing Alternatives</b></p>		
<p>PIC #1 September 10, 2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are studies missing (e.g., traffic, noise , barrier free access, transit)</li> </ul>	<p>Additional studies will be undertaken in support of the development of Alternatives. Refer to Section 7 of the ToR for a list of anticipated studies to be completed.</p>
<p>E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> February 6, 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the eastern boundary of the Project Study Area? All of East Point Park should be considered as part of the EA.</li> </ul>	<p>The Project Study Area extends from Bluffer’s Park in the west, to the mouth of Highland Creek in the east. Refer to Section 4.2 of the ToR.</p>

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where the Alternatives are compiled and brought forward for discussion/assessment is not clear. Do the Alternatives get scoped at the end of 2016 (end of Phase 2) or is it an intermediate step?</li> <li>What are the proposed Alternatives? This is not clear. Is there a choice of A, B, or C?</li> </ul>	The ToR is the first step in the EA Process and lays out the “roadmap” for the EA (i.e., how the EA will be undertaken). The development of Alternatives will occur early in the EA process, anticipated to be in the Fall of 2015. Refer to Section 3.1 of the ToR for the proposed approach to developing Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The three zones should be considered for different purposes. Perhaps some areas remain completely protected natural habitat with no access for humans.</li> <li>Like the idea of different zones.</li> </ul>	This will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is disturbance of wildlife by potential long haul flights (ie Billy Bishop) included in the EA process?</li> <li>How will plans be meshed together when they all are on different timelines?</li> <li>How can distinct neighbourhoods be captured?</li> <li>The coordination of this project with other projects and programs is essential to ensure that conflicts, overlaps or duplication are resolved in the early stages of the Project.</li> </ul>	The Project is coordinating with and considering other activities and plans located in and adjacent to the Project Study Area. It is not anticipated that Billy Bishop airport activities will have an impact on the Project Study Area.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is the environment being monitored?</li> </ul>	A construction and post-construction monitoring plan will be developed and included in the EA Report. Refer to Section 9.2 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the proposed approach to developing Alternatives.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the Draft Evaluation Criteria, “Estimated capital cost”, how do you measure value? What is the measurement tool?</li> </ul>	As part of the EA, it is anticipated that the Draft Evaluation Criteria will be refined, and indicators, or ways to measure the criteria, will be developed with input from stakeholders and the public. Refer to Section 6.1 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there be a plan for maintenance?</li> </ul>	At a conceptual level, maintenance may be considered as part of the refinement of the Preferred Alternative. Operation and maintenance details may be further discussed with the City as part of the Detailed Design process.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What steps will be taken so that there is ongoing collaboration for the studies along the 11 km shoreline. (e.g., Guild Park &amp; Gardens MP). How will City departments and members of the public stay informed of all of the reports/studies?</li> </ul>	TRCA is working with the City of Toronto to coordinate between the project and the Guild Park and Gardens Management.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The descriptions for the following Project Objectives are excellent:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural features and linkages; and</li> <li>• Provide an enjoyable waterfront experience.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Comments noted.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Included in the plans for the Scarborough Waterfront Project should be the responsibility for the control and monitoring of the Waterfront Trail. It was mentioned at PIC #2 that Parks Canada might be the organization that could assume this responsibility.</li> </ul>	A construction and post-construction monitoring plan will be developed and included in the EA Report. Refer to Section 9 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest to review findings from studies for other parts of the waterfront associated with the following topics:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal processes;</li> <li>• Existing infrastructure;</li> <li>• Climate change impacts;</li> <li>• Public access;</li> <li>• Recreation;</li> <li>• Change to shoreline and bluff character;</li> <li>• Beach water quality; and</li> <li>• Natural and cultural education opportunities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Are there studies about how existing areas with bike paths have been impacted or how the wildlife has been impacted?</li> </ul>	The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by Shoreline Segment, as necessary, and consider additional sources of information. Refer to Section 7 of the ToR.

Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
<b>TOPIC: Existing Conditions</b>		
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creek that goes under Bennett Road &amp; connects with Highland Creek – the bridge/culvert is washed out. What is going into Highland Creek here? Access to the waterfront?</li> </ul>	The bridge at Bennett Road is outside the scope of the Project. The Project Area focuses on the top and toe of the bluffs between Bluffer’s Park and East Point Park. Refer to Section 4.2 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overflow pond at East Point Park is disgusting and unsafe.</li> </ul>	Opportunities regarding the overflow pond at East Point Park may be discussed in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over water coming down – is it stormwater? Has it been treated?</li> <li>What do water environmental studies say?</li> </ul>	Hydrogeological studies will be undertaken as part of the EA to identify local sources of water (i.e., groundwater discharge, surface water) and assess flows.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gas station 3 way intersection would become even more challenging to navigate for pedestrians and bicyclists.</li> <li>Pioneer gas station should be expropriated.</li> </ul>	This is outside the scope of the EA.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Point Park is underutilized (i.e., services, baseball fields etc.). 15 acres of greenspace was lost here.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
<b>TOPIC: Cultural Heritage and Community Initiatives</b>		
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the bluffs become a UNESCO heritage site?</li> </ul>	This is outside the scope of the EA.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any known archaeological sites? If so, they should be protected by law.</li> </ul>	A Stage 1 archaeological assessment is being undertaken as part of the EA. Refer to Section 7.3.5 of the ToR.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use water runoff from the top of the Bluffs where possible for community market gardens.</li> </ul>	Opportunities to use local sources of water will be considered in the development of Alternatives.
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Through community market gardens engage youth in nature, personal learning and accomplishment.</li> </ul>	Potential opportunities to provide locations for community gardens may be considered at a conceptual level in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative.
<b>TOPIC: Infrastructure and Energy</b>		
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the combined sewage overflows and drainage into Lake Ontario be kept or diverted?</li> </ul>	The only Combined Sewer Outfall within the Project Area is west of Bluffer’s Park and is treated by a stormwater management facility. Considerations regarding this stormwater management facility are outside the scope of the EA.



Event	Comments and Concerns Received	Consideration of Comments and Concerns
PIC #2 February 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider Alternative energy power sources as part of the project such as tidal, solar and wind.</li> </ul>	The Project will not consider large scale power generation. If an Alternative requires some form of power, appropriate green energy sources may be considered as part of the detailed effects assessment of the Preferred Alternative.
<b>TOPIC: General Comments</b>		
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> November 22, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To inform homeowners of potential property risks, realtors could provide information brochures or the City of Toronto could e-mail information to new homeowners purchasing property adjacent to sensitive areas.</li> </ul>	This is outside the scope of the EA.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 9, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SWP aims and objectives are laudable and will certainly be welcomed by all those who wish to see the Scarborough waterfront preserved, protected and universally enjoyed.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.
E-mail to <a href="mailto:waterfront@trca.on.ca">waterfront@trca.on.ca</a> December 12, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess potential impacts associated with leachates / contamination arising from the former Brimley Road Landfill site.</li> </ul>	The former Brimley Road landfill site will be discussed with the City of Toronto early in the EA phase.

## 4. First Nations and Métis Consultation

First Nations and Métis communities were engaged for the Scarborough Waterfront Project in order to provide opportunities to comment on and participate in the EA. Engagement with communities with an existing or historical interest in the Project Study Area allows the proponent to identify First Nations and Métis interests or concerns related to Aboriginal or Treaty Rights or interests. Consultation also provides First Nations and Métis communities with opportunities for meaningful input in the decision-making process throughout the course of the EA. By identifying concerns, interests, and opportunities raised by First Nations and Métis communities, the proponent can ensure to address how potential adverse effects will be managed, mitigated, and/or avoided.

### 4.1 First Nations and Métis Contact List

Prior to the delivery of any notifications, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) and the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) were contacted for advice and information on the Aboriginal communities that should be contacted during the Aboriginal Consultation process. Additional Aboriginal community contact lists were also considered, including the lists held by the City of Toronto and TRCA. Confirmation of the suggested community contacts was completed with the MOECC. Communities that were contacted had established or asserted rights and/or interests in the Project Study Area, and are listed below.

- Beausoleil First Nation;
- Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation;
- Chippewas of Rama-Mnjikaning First Nation;
- Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat;
- Coordinator of the Williams Treaty First Nations;
- Curve Lake First Nation;
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council c/o Haudenosaunee Development Institute;
- Hiawatha First Nation;
- Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation;
- Metis Nation of Ontario;
- Mississaugas of Alderville First Nation;
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation; and
- Six Nations of the Grand River.

### 4.2 Correspondence with First Nations and Métis Communities

A notification letter was sent on July 21, 2014 to the identified First Nations and Métis communities to inform them of the initiation of the Terms of Reference for the Scarborough Waterfront Project Environmental Assessment. Interested communities were invited to contact Margie Kenedy, Archaeologist at TRCA. Enclosed with the notification letter was: a Study Area map, the Project background, and the Notice of Commencement.

Limited responses were received, so TRCA conducted follow up phone calls or emails beginning on September 2, 2014 to ensure each community received the notification package, and to answer any questions that could help evaluate interest in the project. Additionally, an invitation to the first PIC was sent via email. A number of communities were reached who indicated their communities had no current concerns with the project, and requested regular updates. Several communities requested greater involvement in the project process. Responses are described in **Table 5**.

An invitation to join the Scarborough Waterfront Project Stakeholder Committee was emailed on September 16, 2014. While a number of communities initially expressed interest in joining the committee, only one community had a representative commit to join.

A second notification was sent on February 5, 2015 to provide a project update to First Nations and Métis communities. The notification included a project status update and next steps, the project vision and objectives, and a summary of the public consultation conducted to date. Additionally, an invitation to the second PIC was included within the notification.

A third notification was sent on April 1, 2015 that included a link to the Draft ToR and provided communities with an opportunity to review and comment on the document.

The Notice of Filing of the ToR will be circulated to all of the communities at a future date. Documentation of First Nations and Métis correspondence is provided in **Appendix C-7**.

**Table 5** details a summary of correspondence with First Nations and Métis communities during the course of the Scarborough Waterfront Project.

**Table 5 – Summary of Correspondence with First Nations and Métis Communities**

Aboriginal Community	Consultation
<b>Beausoleil First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u>  <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.  <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email.  <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u>  <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u>  <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u>  <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.  <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, spoke with representative who indicated she would review package in more detail and contact TRCA at a later date.  <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p>

Aboriginal Community	Consultation
	<p><i>September 23, 2014:</i> Georgina Island representative requested to join Stakeholder Committee; TRCA sent a link to the online application.</p> <p><i>October 6, 2014:</i> TRCA left voice mail to indicate the application had not been received and to confirm interest.</p> <p><i>November 3, 2014:</i> TRCA sent email to confirm interest in joining the Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Chippewas of Rama-Mnjikaning First Nation</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>September 2, 2014:</i> Contacted Coordinator of Williams Treaty Nations, as per the previous request by Rama.</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Huron-Wendat indicated they would like to be involved in the project, and asked for information about archaeology site within the Project Study Area.</p> <p><i>July 22, 2014:</i> TRCA provided archaeological site data to the Huron-Wendat.</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> TRCA emailed additional project information to the community including proposed engagement schedule and invitation to join Stakeholder Committee. Huron-Wendat indicated interest in joining the Stakeholder Committee, and asked if there was available participant funding. TRCA replied that there was no available funding to join the committee, and offered alternatives that did not involve travel. No response was received.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Coordinator Williams Treaty First Nations</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email.</p>

Aboriginal Community	Consultation
	<p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee. <u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package. <u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Curve Lake First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>August 15, 2014:</i> Curve Lake requested statement regarding environmental impacts to Curve Lake's traditional and treaty territory, including impacts drinking water, animals and plant life, heritage and cultural values, etc; indicated Curve Lake must be contacted should burials or archaeological sites be identified. <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call; Curve Lake requested regular updates; TRCA indicated that much of the information requested in the letter date August 15, 2014 will be determined during the course of the EA, and updates will be provided; Curve Lake acknowledged that this would be sufficient over a summary statement at this time; TRCA committed to sending Curve Lake PIC and Stakeholder Committee meeting information, and indicated that engagement outside of the public is an option as well. <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee. <i>September 19, 2014:</i> Curve Lake indicated a representative could not join the committee. <u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package. <u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council c/o Haudenosaunee Development Institute</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>September 9, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, phone did not ring to an answering machine, sent follow up email. <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee. <u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package. <u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Hiawatha First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call; spoke with community representative who indicated an interest in greater and sent follow up email.</p>

Aboriginal Community	Consultation
	<p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Hiawatha requested to be included in the stakeholder committee, but cannot attend first meeting.</p> <p><i>November 3, 2014:</i> TRCA circulated materials from the first Stakeholder Committee meeting, offered a phone conversation to discuss materials and the meeting.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email.</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Metis Nation of Ontario</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>September 9, 2014:</i> Sent follow up email.</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p> <p><i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<p><b>Mississaugas of Alderville First Nation</b></p>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u></p> <p><i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package.</p> <p><i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email.</p> <p><i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><i>November 5, 2014:</i> Alderville indicated no current concerns with the project, requested project updates, and requested to be notified if archaeological sites, burials, or environmental impacts were identified.</p> <p><i>November 11, 2014:</i> Alderville requested project updates.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u></p> <p><i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u></p>

Aboriginal Community	Consultation
	<i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.
<b>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email. <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, left voice mail and sent follow up email. <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>
<b>Six Nations of the Grand River</b>	<p><u>Notification #1:</u> <i>July 21, 2014:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #1 package. <i>September 2, 2014:</i> Follow up phone call, spoke with community representative who indicated he would contact TRCA at a later date if there was interest in the project, and sent follow up email. <i>September 16, 2014:</i> Emailed invitation to join Stakeholder Committee.</p> <p><u>Notification #2:</u> <i>February 5, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #2 package.</p> <p><u>Notification #3:</u> <i>April 1, 2015:</i> Couriered and emailed Notification #3 package.</p>

### 4.3 Summary of First Nations and Métis Comments

To date, no project specific comments have been raised by any of the contacted First Nations and Métis communities.

## 5. Agency Consultation

Throughout the ToR, regulatory bodies and interested agencies at the municipal, provincial, and federal level were invited to participate in a comprehensive agency consultation program. The objectives of the ToR agency consultation were to consult with all potentially interested agencies about the ToR, including the draft approach to developing alternatives and the proposed evaluation framework, such that there would be agency buy in as to how the EA would be conducted, and to ensure that all necessary approvals/authorizations for the Project are understood.

### 5.1 Agency Contact List

The Project Team endeavoured to consult with any and all interested agencies during the development of the ToR. As such, a contact list of regulatory and interested agencies was developed through an identification of all applicable provincial and federal regulatory agencies, other provincial and federal agencies, as well as municipal and regional departments with a potential or stated interest in the Project and/or the Project Study Area. Additional contacts may be added to the list through attendance at agency meetings, requests to be added, and by attending and signing in at PICs. New government agency contacts may be added to the agency contact list as the Project progresses through the EA process and new information becomes available. **Table 6** documents those agencies contacted during the ToR.

**Table 6 – Agencies Contacted During the ToR**

Agency	Departments
City of Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> <li>• Toronto Water</li> <li>• Transportation Services</li> <li>• City Planning/Waterfront Secretariat</li> </ul>
GO Transit/Metrolinx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Projects Group</li> </ul>
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch</li> <li>• Technical Support Section</li> </ul>
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aurora District</li> </ul>
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture Division</li> </ul>
Toronto Transit Commission	
Transport Canada	

Consultation during the ToR included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and individual meetings with key agencies, including the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). A variety of consultation mechanisms were utilized to keep an open line of communication with all agencies, including updates to external working groups (i.e. Aquatic Habitat Toronto), email correspondence, invitations to PICs, in-person meetings and teleconferences. The TAC and the consultation activities with individual agencies are described in greater detail below.



## 5.2 Technical Advisory Committee

The TAC was established to provide a forum for agency consultation during the ToR and EA stages. All identified regulatory and interested agencies were invited to participate on the TAC, and members were asked to recommend additional agency departments to participate if they believed key members were missing. The final TAC membership for the ToR phase is provided in **Table 7**.

**Table 7 – Final TAC Membership**

Agency	Department(s)
City of Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parks, Forestry and Recreation</li> <li>• Toronto Water</li> <li>• Transportation Services</li> <li>• Waterfront Secretariat</li> </ul>
GO Transit/Metrolinx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital Projects Group</li> </ul>
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aurora District</li> </ul>
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture Division</li> </ul>
Toronto and Region Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration and Infrastructure Division</li> <li>• Planning, Greenspace and Communications Division</li> </ul>
Toronto Transit Commission	

One TAC meeting was held on February 12, 2015 as part of the ToR phase of the EA. The objectives of the meeting were to introduce the TAC members to the project and to present the proposed approach to developing alternatives. Feedback on the draft evaluation criteria was sought following the meeting via email. There were 16 members in attendance at the TAC meeting. **Appendix C-8** documents the meeting agenda and presentation. We will continue to incorporate ways to engage agencies as part of the TAC as appropriate through the EA phase.

## 5.3 Agency Meetings

Where participation on the TAC was not possible, agencies were consulted through auxiliary technical consultation meetings. In addition to participating on the TAC, some agencies were also contacted to offer individual meetings, which were held at their request. It is anticipated that auxiliary technical consultation meetings with agencies will continue through the EA phase of the Project.

### Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)

The Project Team initiated communication with the MOECC regarding the Project at the commencement of the Project. Communication mechanisms included e-mail status updates, teleconferences and in-person meetings. **Table 8** provides an overview of consultation activities with MOECC.

The agenda and presentation for the teleconference held on December 5, 2014 are documented in **Appendix C-8**.

**Table 8 – Communications with the MOECC**

Date	Purpose
June 10, 2014	Introduce the direction of the Project
July 23, 2014 (Email correspondence)	Confirm list of Aboriginal Communities to be contacted
December 5, 2014 (Teleconference)	Provide an update regarding the Project status, including consultation activities and proposed approach to developing alternatives
March 20, 2015 (Email correspondence)	Provide anticipated date of submission of the Draft ToR and update to contact list for Aboriginal Communities

### Aquatic Habitat Toronto (AHT)

The Project Team provided an update to the AHT external working group in an attempt to further engage with their agency partners, which include Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), Environment Canada and MNRF. On October 16, 2014, the Project Team delivered a presentation outlining the timelines and scope of the project. It was determined that during the EA and Detailed Design phases, the Project Team will invite AHT to participate at technical workshops and offer their input into the development of alternatives including developing restoration opportunities in the Project Study Area. **Appendix C-8** documents the presentation.

### City of Toronto

In addition to participating as part of the TAC, staff from City of Toronto’s Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Transportation Services and Toronto Water departments were initially briefed at an introductory meeting for the project held on June 24, 2014. Following this, to ensure continued coordination with City of Toronto initiatives, City of Toronto staff have participated in internal technical workshops for the Project. Three technical workshops were held during the ToR phase to help further refine information relating to the Project vision and objectives, the draft approach to developing alternatives and the draft evaluation criteria. It is anticipated that City of Toronto staff will continue to provide their input at internal technical workshops as required during the EA phase of the Project. City of Toronto staff representatives also sit on the Stakeholder Committee. Individual meetings with departments may occur as of the EA as more information becomes known.

City Councillors for the three wards located in the Project Study Area have received briefings on the Project on an on-going basis and this will continue through the EA phase. The Councillors and/or their staff have also participated at Stakeholder Committee meetings.

### Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

In addition to participating as part of the TAC, the Project Team sought to engage with the MNRF to seek input into the Project. One meeting with MNRF staff was held on January 27, 2015. The objectives of the meeting were to introduce MNRF staff to the project and present the proposed approach to developing alternatives. The draft evaluation criteria were circulated following the meeting for review and input. MNRF staff will be invited to technical workshops for the Project to provide a forum for coordination and consideration of MNRF interests through the development of alternatives and the EA process. **Appendix C-8** documents the meeting agenda and presentation.

### 5.3.1 Summary of Agency Comments

**Table 9** summarizes the agency comments that were received regarding the Project, in addition to considerations by the Project Team.

Table 9 – Summary of Agency Comments

Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
MOECC	June 10, 2014	With respect to focusing the EA, you must be very specific about why the “Do Nothing” option is the only other ‘Alternative To’ the undertaking.	Refer to Section 5 of the ToR.
MOECC	June 10, 2014	Be sure to clearly show how disadvantages and advantages (i.e. net effects after mitigation) will be included.	Refer to Section 8 of the ToR.
MOECC	June 10, 2014	Ensure compliance monitoring is covered in the ToR.	Refer to Section 9.2 of the ToR.
MOECC	June 10, 2014	Ensure Climate Change is considered.	The draft evaluation criteria include the consideration of climate change as it relates to habitat features and shoreline protection works. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
MOECC	June 10, 2014	Ensure Source Water Protection is explicitly mentioned.	The ability to use local sources of storm and ground water is to be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
MOECC	June 10, 2014	Ensure cumulative effects are mentioned.	The ToR includes a reference to the consideration of potential cumulative impacts of the project.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure that the rationale is detailed in the ToR. Each previous study and/or plan must be thoroughly explained in terms of consultation undertaken, how the plan/study came about, and how they will be followed for this particular project.	All studies and plans used to provide the planning context have been described in detail in the ToR (refer to Section 1.4).
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure to build flexibility into the ToR.	Refer to Section 3.1 of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Developing Alternatives for the ToR is not necessarily required. It’s acceptable to describe the process which will be undertaken during the EA to develop the Alternatives.	The approach to developing Alternatives is described in Section 6 of the ToR.

Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure the criteria meet the broad definition of Environment (i.e. Social, Economic, Natural Environment) and make it very clear how these are all considered.	The Draft Evaluation Criteria consider the broad definition of the Environment. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure that effects during both the construction and establishment phases are considered.	Effects during project construction and establishment phases will be considered in the detailed effects assessment of the Preferred Alternative, as part of the EA. Refer to section 8 of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Proposed Approach to Developing Alternatives seems reasonable given the nature of the project.	Based on public and agency input, the proposed approach to developing Alternatives has been refined. Refer to Section 6.1 of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Consider a minimum of 30-days between the end of the Draft review period and the submission of the final ToR to allow for sufficient time to revise ToR to reflect comments received, and finalize the Record of Consultation.	Comment noted.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Recommend engaging with agencies early and often in the process.	Agencies were consulted during the development of the ToR. Refer to the Record of Consultation. The Project Team will actively engage with agencies as per the consultation plan (refer to Section 10 of the ToR).
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure compliance monitoring is covered in the ToR.	Refer to Section 9.2 of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure Climate Change is considered.	Climate change as it relates to habitat features and shoreline protection works will be considered in the EA, and is included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure Source Water Protection is explicitly mentioned.	A reference to source water protection has been included in the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure mitigation and net-effects are covered.	Refer to Section 8 of the ToR.

Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
MOECC (Teleconference)	December 5, 2014	Ensure all items in section 6.1(2) are covered off.	Refer to Section 3.1 of the ToR.
MNR	January 27, 2015	If you're talking about creating more land along the shoreline, that is something MNRF would have an interest in	Refer to Section 6 of the ToR for the proposed approach to developing Alternative Methods as part of the EA. It is anticipated that any new land base creation along the shoreline would be modest in scale and be consistent with the Project Vision and Objectives.
MNR	January 27, 2015	In terms of treatment of the base of the Bluffs, what do you envision there?	The treatment of the base of the Bluffs will be determined in the EA phase in the development of Alternatives. Refer to Section 6 of the ToR for the proposed approach to developing Alternative Methods. Where necessary, a geotechnical study will be undertaken to determine risk and identify areas where public access may be achievable.
MNR	January 27, 2015	Would the erosion protection works be mainly on public or private property lands?	All erosion priorities to private properties have been addressed along this section of the waterfront. The Project Vision seeks a connection and public access to the Bluffs and shoreline, if possible.
MNR	January 27, 2015	What agencies will be engaged?	Refer to Section 5 of the Record of Consultation (Appendix A of the ToR).
MNR	January 27, 2015	It would be helpful when you do the analysis, to flag what exists on the ground today versus what it is you are proposing to do. Generally, where is the existing footprint?	A preliminary overview description of the existing environment is provided in Section 7 of the ToR. The EA will include a more detailed description of baseline conditions by shoreline segment, including the existing footprint. This will be considered in the development and evaluation of Alternatives.

Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
MNR	January 27, 2015	Is there consideration for altering or working on some of the existing shore protection?	Existing shoreline protection structures will be assessed as part of the EA. Depending on the shoreline segment and the priorities for that segment, there may be a small amount of retrofit to these structures as needed.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Will this project be considering the operational impacts from other current and/or proposed projects in the area?	Operation impacts will be considered and evaluated as part of the development of Alternatives.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	How will the project have regard for archaeological assessment and heritage assessment work, such as disturbances or construction around built heritage resources? What is the scope of work or plans for the archaeological components?	A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment will be completed as part of the EA, as well as a study of built heritage features. Pending the results of the Stage 1 Assessment, further Stage 2 work may be required. Refer to Section 7.3.5 of the ToR.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport traditionally insist that if there is a need for a Stage 2, it is done as part of the EA stage, and this information is considered as part of the evaluation and development of Alternative Methods.	Following the completion of the Stage 1 Archeological Assessment, and as part of the development of Alternatives, the SWP Project Team will discuss with the MTSC regarding the need for a stage 2 assessment as part of the EA.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	The Ontario EA Act requires that both the archaeological, built heritage, and cultural landscapes are evaluated and incorporated into the decision making process. The Ministry wants those studies conducted as part of the EA.	Archaeological, built heritage, and cultural landscapes are considered as part of the Draft Evaluation Criteria. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Will park use estimates and assessments be completed?	Park use estimates will be collected as part of the EA.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Ensure coordination with the Guildwood to Pickering Rail Expansion Transit Project Assessment Process (Metrolinx).	The Project Team will continue discussions with Metrolinx for coordination and integration with the Guildwood to Pickering Transit Project Assessment Process.

Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Will a visual impact assessment be completed as part of the EA, in terms of the aesthetic impact of the various Alternatives, rather than just the scientific and qualitative perspective?	A qualitative assessment of views and viewsapes will be assessed as part of the evaluation of Alternatives. Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Along the shoreline, how much is City of Toronto, TRCA, and/or private property?	Approximately 90% of the shoreline within the Project Study Area is publically owned.
TAC Meeting #1	February 12, 2015	Is the Archaeological Assessment being completed by in-house staff?	TRCA Archaeology staff will be completing the Stage 1 Archeological Assessment for the land-based areas. A Stage 1 Marine Archaeological Assessment will be conducted by an external firm. The need for a Stage 2 archaeological assessment will be determined as part of the development of Alternatives, and in discussions with MTSC.
<b>Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport</b>			
E-mail Correspondence	March 10, 2015	Approve of the criterion “Potential impact on archaeological resources” (pending development of indicators) as long as the ToR includes the archaeological work plan.	Refer to Section 7.3.5 of the ToR.
E-mail Correspondence	March 10, 2015	Prefer specific reference to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the draft evaluation criteria included in the ToR. During the EA process, these are viewed alongside archaeological resources.	Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
<b>City of Toronto</b>			
E-mail Correspondence	March 11, 2015	With respect to the criterion, "Ability to integrate with community plans", the rationale may need to be more open ended to allow for other policy's plans, not specifically mentioned to be included in the evaluation.	Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.
E-mail Correspondence	March 9, 2015	Under the objective for “Consistency and coordination with other initiatives”, there is a need for coordination and collaboration on project initiatives that might impact other stakeholder's infrastructure initiatives. Suggest to add the	Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.



Agency / Event	Date	Concerns and Comments Received	Consideration of Concerns and Comments
		criterion of “Ability to manage potential impacts on other City of Toronto infrastructure projects”.	
<b>Metrolinx</b>			
E-mail Correspondence	March 13, 2015	The “Ability to integrate with community plans” the definition should reflect that the Project needs to be consistent with, and coordinate with other initiatives including agencies such as Metrolinx. Ensuring that the objectives of the SWP EA and the TPAP from Guildwood to Pickering are not conflicting, but rather aligned with one another is key to the success of both projects.	Refer to Appendix A of the ToR.

## 6. Next Steps

As described throughout this report, a combination of public, stakeholder, First Nations and Métis and agency input was used to assist the Project Team in preparing the ToR for the Project. The ToR will be reviewed by the MOECC during a formal 30-day review period. During this time, the ToR will be available for public review both electronically on the Project website and in hard copy at local library branches.

If the ToR is approved by the MOECC, the Project Team will proceed with the Individual EA. The Consultation Plan for the EA is provided in the ToR.