

APPENDIX L.6
Direct Community Engagement

DRAFT

Scarborough Waterfront Project

Shoreline Tour

September 12, 2015

9:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Guildwood Parkway and Meadowcliffe Drive Erosion Control Projects

SUMMARY

TRCA Project Team: Nancy Gaffney, Alexis Moxley

Expert Speakers: Janice Teichroeb (TRCA), historical shoreline and land uses; Katie Turnbull (TRCA), terrestrial ecology; Lionel Worrell (TRCA), terrestrial ecology; Adam Weir (TRCA), aquatic ecology; Karen McDonald (TRCA), terrestrial ecology; Alexander Winklemann (Terraprobe), geological processes; and Bruce Pinchin (Shoreplan Engineering Ltd.), coastal processes.

Attendees: 90 members of the public

The Scarborough Waterfront Project Team organized a free tour of the shoreline between Guildwood Parkway and the Meadowcliffe Drive Erosion Control Projects. The event was advertised in the Project Newsletter and participants were asked to register due to the limited number of seats. Participants arrived at the meeting place at Guildwood Community Presbyterian Church (140 Guildwood Parkway) to sign in and meet Project staff, and board vans to begin the tour.

Tour guides provided a high level overview of the Project Study Area, orienting attendees to the Central Segment where the tour took place. The van stopped at three pre-determined focal points along the shoreline: Guild Park and Gardens, Bellamy Ravine and the western end of the Meadowcliffe Shoreline Restoration Project where attendees disembarked and learned about various aspects of the Study Area from expert speakers. Topics covered included an overview of the historical shoreline and land uses over time, including Indigenous and early European periods; terrestrial habitats and some of the flora and fauna species recorded in the Study Area; aquatic habitats and fish communities within the Study Area; bluff geology and geological processes; and the coastal conditions and processes that influence the shoreline within the Study Area.

Attendees then returned to the registration area via van where they had the opportunity to discuss the Project with members of the Project Team and were invited to fill out comment cards about the tour and the Project. Overall feedback about the tour, the EA process and the Project were favourable.

Scarborough Waterfront Project

Shoreline Tour

May 14, 2016

9:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Guildwood Parkway and Meadowcliffe Drive Erosion Control Projects

SUMMARY

TRCA Project Team: Nancy Gaffney, Alexis Moxley

Expert Speakers: Janice Teichroeb (TRCA), historical shoreline and land uses; Lionel Worrell (TRCA), terrestrial ecology; Adam Weir (TRCA), aquatic ecology; Karen McDonald (TRCA), terrestrial ecology; Alexander Winklemann (Terraprobe), geological processes; and Milo Strum (Shoreplan Engineering Ltd.), coastal processes.

Attendees: 79 members of the public

Due to the popularity of the public Shoreline Tour held on September 12, 2015, the Scarborough Waterfront Project Team organized a second free tour of the shoreline between Guildwood Parkway and the Meadowcliffe Drive Erosion Control Projects. The event was advertised via the Project Newsletter and participants were asked to pre-register due to the limited number of seats. Participants arrived at the meeting location at St. Ursula Catholic School (215 Livingston Road) where they were greeted by members of the Project Team and asked to sign in, prior to boarding vans to begin the tour.

Tour guides provided a high level overview of the Project Study Area, orienting attendees to the Central Segment where the tour took place. The van stopped at three pre-determined focal points along the shoreline: Guild Park and Gardens, Bellamy Ravine and the western end of the Meadowcliffe Shoreline Restoration Project where attendees disembarked and learned about various aspects of the Study Area from expert speakers. Topics covered included an overview of the historical shoreline and land uses over time including Indigenous and early European periods; terrestrial habitats and some of the flora and fauna species observed in the Study Area; aquatic habitats and fish communities within the Study Area; bluff geology and geological processes; and the coastal conditions and processes that influence the shoreline within the Study Area.

Attendees then returned to the registration area via van where they had the opportunity to discuss the Project with members of the Project Team and were invited to fill out comment cards about the tour and the Project. Overall feedback about the tour, the EA process and the Project were positive.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Site Meeting

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

3:15 – 5:15 pm

Eastern Beach at Bluffer's Park

Attendees:

TRCA: Nancy Gaffney, Liz Trenton

Wild Bluffs: [REDACTED]

MEETING SUMMARY

On July 15, 2015, Nancy Gaffney and Liz Trenton, TRCA met with members of the community group The Wild Bluffs: [REDACTED] at Bluffer's Park to discuss the Scarborough Waterfront Project Environmental Assessment.

Key discussion points / questions & responses

Question: What is the intention or plan for the area at Bluffer's Park?

Answer: (Nancy Gaffney provided an overview of the project).

- Project Study Area: extends from Bluffer's Park in the west (Fishleigh shoreline), extends to Beechgrove Drive in the east at East Point Park and north to Kingston Rd. The Project Study Area will be considered in the assessment of potential project effects.
- Project Area is where work will be focused. The Project Area is along the shoreline area and includes the top and toe of the Bluffs.
- Options for a water's edge trail will be considered where achievable, but will be moved to streets/roads where it is not possible at the waterfront. In general, the project aims to provide safe viewing nodes in focused areas to allow people to get to the water's edge safely either at the top or toe.
- The Waterfront Regeneration Trust supports the project in putting a waterfront trail where it is achievable and this is part of their mandate and vision. They understand that along the water's edge may not be feasible and support the route going into residential streets and roads. The WRT participate on the Stakeholder Committee. Any routes considered will be fiscally responsible.

(Regarding the Plan for Bluffer's Park)

- It's very early in the planning process and no concrete plans for the Bluffer's have been determined; the Terms of Reference is the first step in the process which provides the framework for undertaking the Environmental Assessment. The Terms of Reference contains a vision and objectives for the project.

- The Terms of Reference was submitted and the public and agency review period closed on July 6, 2015
 - Comments were received from the Public, Government Agencies and Aboriginal Communities.
 - Comments submitted generally did not require an update to the document; commitments may be made to review items during the EA
- The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change is undergoing their review and will determine if the Terms of Reference is approved and whether the EA can move forward.
- The EA will collect the background information necessary to develop alternatives for Bluffer's Park that will be presented to the Stakeholder Committee and then to the Public at a Public Information Centre in the Fall.

Question: Erosion control projects to protect property have been undertaken in this area by TRCA in the past. Is erosion control part of the SWP?

Answer: As part of our consultant team, Terraprobe (geotechnical firm) has been retained to prepare hazard mapping of areas that may pose risk to the public. High and medium risk areas will be identified to inform the development of alternatives (i.e. where a trail or people may safely access and where no access is possible). Coastal studies will also be undertaken to assess areas of the shoreline that are safe to access. Protecting private property through erosion control is not a primary driver of this project.

Question: Past erosion control projects undertaken by TRCA had the intention of protecting houses and private property. How can current tax payers believe that TRCA will protect geology or wildlife with this project as they have done so previously? There are also issues with tax payer dollars being spent to protect a select group of homeowners living along the Bluffs.

Answer: Property owners living along the Bluffs had to give up their riparian rights when past shoreline protection work was done. Private properties at great risk have already been addressed. This project will not focus on protecting private property.

Question: In the case of the Meadowcliffe Erosion Control project, bank swallow habitat was destroyed, how could this have happened through the EA process?

Answer: An existing conditions report was completed for the Meadowcliffe project as part of the Class EA process. MNR was satisfied with the information in the report and in support of the project moving forward. The specific details can be provided to you.

Additional information as follow-up to the answer above: As part of the existing conditions report for the Meadowcliffe project bank swallows were noted as one of several bird species observed on the Scarborough Shoreline. To achieve the project objective of preserving or enhancing the biological conditions of the shoreline and slope, the following four biological evaluation criteria were considered as part of the evaluation of the alternatives:

- Ensure no net loss of aquatic habitat

- Preserve habitat linkages and corridors
 - Preserve unique aquatic and terrestrial habitats
 - Prevent or minimize negative impacts to existing vegetation
- With respect to unique aquatic/terrestrial habitats, the preferred alternative was evaluated to have “No significant impacts to ANSI-ES and ESA #123”.

Key concerns and suggestions indicated by members of The Wild Bluffs

Concerns

- Occasional weekend users (“Weekend Warriors”) vs. regular park users
 - Weekend users lack a respect for nature and acceptable noise levels; littering is also an issue with infrequent park users
- Providing more access will attract users from outside the area who will lack respect or etiquette for the park.
- Historically, the Bluffs have been unsafe and shoreline engineering was undertaken to protect housing/property instead of protecting geology and wildlife
- Trust issues with TRCA projects and protection of wildlife on past projects
 - Meadowcliffe project – destruction of bank swallow habitat
 - Chine Meadow public meeting – response that “animals will adapt” (i.e. return to the site once construction is complete)
- Regarding the ToR
 - No mention preserving geological features of the Bluffs; vegetation of the bluffs is not natural
 - No mention of brown bats in the area
- Parking should be limited, alternative modes of transportation to the park need to be explored if access is increased

Suggestions

- Interpretive signage to help educate unfamiliar/ignorant visitors. Ideas include:
 - history and preservation of the Bluffs
 - impacts of feeding animals / littering
- Viewfinder pointed towards areas of interest, such as bank swallow habitat on bluff face
- Cross walk across Brimley Road at

Commitments and Action Items

- ██████ to provide a species list with locations of wildlife in the area [Meeting to discuss natural environment background information scheduled for July 29, 2015]
- Wild Bluffs to be added to the SWP Stakeholder Committee and provided the Membership Agreement and meeting summaries; Tracy Horvath will act as the Wild Bluffs representative. [Completed July 17, 2015]

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Natural Environment Background Information Meeting**

Wednesday, July 29, 2015
Bluffer's Park

Attendees:

TRCA: Alexis Moxley, Karen McDonald

Wild Bluffs: [REDACTED]

MEETING SUMMARY

On July 29, 2015, Alexis Moxley and Karen McDonald, TRCA, met with members of the community group The Wild Bluffs, [REDACTED] at Bluffer's Park to discuss natural environment background information in support of the Scarborough Waterfront Project Environmental Assessment.

[REDACTED] provided an overview of wildlife observations within Bluffer's Park. The following observations were noted:

- Snapping turtles are nesting at Bluffer's Park Marina and Dunker's Flow. Karen noted that there may be opportunities to enhance and protect these nesting areas.
- Red headed woodpecker spotted near Guild Park and Gardens and Rosetta McClain Gardens (near the fall season).
- Mink and/or snapping turtles may have impacted the swan population.
- Swans are known to nest on the floating platform in the boat club embayment.
- A pair of Trumpeter Swans is located in Dunker's Flow, which have been tagged by the Ontario Trumpeter Swans.

ACTION: [REDACTED] to confirm locations and share with TRCA's Ecology Team to inform proposed placement of bird boxes, and other habitat features.

ACTION: Karen McDonald (TRCA) to check the bird box inventory and look into installing additional tree swallow boxes.

ACTION: Wild Bluffs group to continue data collection of wildlife sightings recording date, time, location and species. [REDACTED] to provide Karen with a full list of wildlife observations within the SWP Study Area, including any additional information which is available regarding timelines and locations of the sightings.

Concerns

- Cell phone tagging of Canada Geese.
- Relocation of Canada Geese to northern communities.

ACTION: Danny Moro (TRCA) to follow-up with Tracy regarding the Canada Goose Management Program at Bluffer's Park.

Suggestions

- People are using the trail right beside the Needles feature to access the beach. Should consider opportunities to safely connect the community at the top of the Bluffs in this area with Brimley Road – this would also mitigate potential impacts on the Bluffs.
- Wild Bluffs would support top of bluffs connections between Bluffer's Park and Meadowcliffe.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Community Stakeholders**

Friday February 19, 2016
10 am – 12 pm

Fox Room, Toronto Hunt Club
1355 Kingston Road, Scarborough

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants

Alexis Moxley Toronto and Region Conservation
Nancy Gaffney..... Toronto and Region Conservation
[REDACTED] Local Resident
[REDACTED] Local Resident
[REDACTED] Lake Ontario Waterkeeper

Project Overview and EA Process

N. Gaffney provided an overview of the project and what stage the Project is currently at. The Project is being undertaken in 3 phases:

1. The Terms of Reference
2. The Environmental Assessment
3. Detailed Design and Construction

The Project is currently in the Environmental Assessment phase and undergoing the development of Alternatives by segment and Evaluation Criteria step of the EA process.

EA Public Information Centre #1 (PIC)

N. Gaffney stated the purpose of the last PIC was to present to the public the wide range of Draft Alternatives (options) developed for the three Project Segments. The purpose of the public meeting was not for the public to pick an Alternative, but for the public to review the draft Alternatives and determine if anything was missing, and to provide the public with an opportunity to comment on these Alternatives.

These Draft Alternatives were developed by pulling together all the information about existing conditions, problems and opportunities of the Project Study Area, and input from a broad range of stakeholders, including technical experts, agencies, the Project Stakeholder Committee, and the public.

Natural Environment

N. Gaffney stated that the protection and enhancement of the natural environment is a very important part of the Scarborough Waterfront Project and is one of the five Project Objectives.

The Project Objectives are:

- Protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic features and linkages;
- Manage public safety and property risk;
- Provide an enjoyable waterfront experience;
- Consistency and coordination with other initiatives; and,
- Achieve value for cost.

The Terms of Reference identifies guiding documents that have been developed, or are currently ongoing, which support the purpose of the Project including, but not limited to, the City of Toronto's Official Plan and Scarborough Shoreline Terrestrial Biological Inventory and Assessment.

Follow up comment – [REDACTED]:

- The project objectives, goals and alternatives need to be governed by the pre-existing principles and policy documents pertinent to the Scarborough shore. Specifically, to *The City of Toronto Official Plan, 2002* (consolidated in 2010), the *Scarborough Shoreline: Terrestrial Biological Inventory and Assessment, February, 2012*, and the various ANSIs and ESAs that pertain to the subject area

Private Property

N. Gaffney discussed the extent of private property ownership in the East Segment, and liability considerations as increasing numbers of the public are using the private shoreline.

Water Quality Modelling

N. Gaffney mentioned that water quality modelling is currently being undertaken as part of the evaluation of the Alternatives. The results of this modelling will be available as a technical report in the EA document.

Stormwater Management

N. Gaffney mentioned the Project will look at opportunities to capture and reuse flows from the stormwater outfalls located along the shoreline the Project Study Area. The Project is seeking to contribute to improved water quality through these opportunities.

Project Next Steps

N. Gaffney stated the next step in the process is to identify the preferred Alternatives per shoreline segment by running the Alternatives through the Evaluation Criteria. The Evaluation Criteria will measure the Alternatives ability to meet the Project Vision and Objectives. The Project Vision and Objectives, as well as the Evaluation Criteria were developed through extensive public consultation in the Terms of Reference and Environmental Assessment phase.

The Evaluation Criteria is available on the project website.

Following the evaluation of the Alternatives there will be another PIC in late spring 2016 to present the Preferred Alternative by Shoreline Segment, as well as additional PIC's at key milestones during the project.

Comments and Questions

The following comments and questions were raised during the meeting:

- Would like to see the existing sand beach maintained.
- The Project needs to consider that 70% of the nearshore habitat along Lake Ontario is gone.
- The Project needs to consider access to the water for wildlife.
- Water quality is an important consideration which should be a primary Objective of the Project.
- The stormwater outfalls which discharge into Grey Abbey Ravine should be considered.
- TRCA provided information about private property ownership at the first PIC meeting, however additional mapping/resources will be provided at the next PIC to further illustrate private vs. public land in the Study Area.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Lake Ontario Waterkeeper Meeting**

Wednesday April 27, 2016
10:30 am - 11:30 am

379 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, Ontario Canada. M5V 1S4

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants

Alexis Moxley Toronto and Region Conservation
Nancy Gaffney Toronto and Region Conservation
Lionel Worrell Toronto and Region Conservation
[REDACTED] Lake Ontario Waterkeeper

Questions / Comments

N. Gaffney indicated that the TRCA welcomed Lake Ontario Waterkeeper to the SWP Stakeholder Committee. She explained the function of the Stakeholder Committee and identified some of the agencies that were members of the committee. N. Gaffney also mentioned Toronto City Council's support for the SWP Environmental Assessment (EA).

[REDACTED] indicated his interest in supporting the Project from a high level. He indicated that the Project was a good opportunity, especially if it is combined with water quality improvements.

N. Gaffney explained that the Project is following a mandated process, with improvement to water quality being considered. She highlighted the involvement of Toronto Water in the process.

[REDACTED] expressed concern that the Federal and Provincial governments are not sufficiently familiar with the Scarborough Waterfront Project. He suggested an increase in the role of the Federal government in the Project.

N. Gaffney responded that Mitzie Hunter, MPP Scarborough-Guildwood, is aware of the Project and continues to be consulted. Members of the federal government are also aware of the Project.

A. Moxley indicated that there would be an increased opportunity for Lake Ontario Waterkeeper to participate in the Project once the Preferred Alternative has been selected. She indicated that at this point there would be an opportunity to focus on elements such as storm water outfalls and backshore wetlands.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Update Meeting with East Scarborough Storefront

August 15, 2016

10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

4117 Lawrence Ave E, Unit 100A

Attendees:

██████████ (East Scarborough Storefront), Nancy Gaffney (TRCA), Alexis Moxley (TRCA), Lionel Worrell (TRCA)

MEETING NOTES

- N. Gaffney provided an overview of the project and explained how it will improve community access to the Scarborough waterfront.
 - ██████████ commented that many members of the community are not aware of how to access the Scarborough waterfront. For instance, many people are not familiar with the Guild Park and Gardens and are not aware of how to access this site. ██████████ further highlighted barriers to access including lack of TTC access, parking and signage.
- ██████████ commented that Galloway Road is a potential corridor that could be highlighted to access the waterfront. She commented that this could be accomplished through the addition of signage. ██████████ also suggested that programming could be developed to bring members down to the waterfront (e.g. for learn to fish initiatives). She said this could be modelled on similar initiatives being developed with Rouge National Urban Park.
- N. Gaffney indicated that a tour could be organized in order to bring community members down to the Scarborough waterfront.
 - ██████████ indicated that the East Scarborough Storefront would be interested in participating in this tour and said that she would confirm a day that worked. She suggested that the tour might be able to occur on the same day as the WaterWise festival taking place on Saturday, September 17, 2016. East Scarborough Storefront will facilitate registration for the event.
- ██████████ indicated that their staff can provide assistance for outreach events linked to the project. She commented that there were opportunities to partner with educational institutions to offer future courses along the Scarborough shoreline.

- [REDACTED] suggested that the project implementation could engage the local workforce so that members of the community could also benefit from the project implementation in this way.

Scarborough Waterfront Project

Scarborough Community Renewal Organization and Centennial Community and Recreation Association

September 27, 2016

6:00 PM – 9:00 PM

Attendees:

Nancy Gaffney (TRCA), Karen McDonald (TRCA), approximately 16 community representatives

SUMMARY

The itinerary included a walking tour of East Point Park followed by a presentation.

East Point Park Tour

N. Gaffney and K. McDonald led the group on a walk along the existing trail at East Point Park which is also the approximate alignment of the Preferred Alternative. The group then walked to the sand beach at East Point Park to view the existing conditions. Discussion included:

- The opportunity to experience different views and vistas along the Scarborough Waterfront with the inclusion of the Top-of-Bluffs trail option.
- Confirmation that accessibility can be achieved in the transition from the bottom to the top of the Bluffs.
- Parking options in the East Segment.
- Confirmation that the trail can accommodate cyclists.
- Confirmation that the TRCA will not restrict access to the beach and that it will still be available for walking.
- Clarification that the map provided by Councillor Moeser was not produced by TRCA and does not indicate the correct location of the trail alignment at East Point Park.
- Suggestions that the distance from the Bluff edge and the shoreline be indicated on subsequent images to clarify that the trail is along the waterfront.

Presentation and Meeting Summary

- N. Gaffney and K. McDonald presented an overview of the Project including information on the EA process, background studies undertaken to inform the project; public consultation; Study Area history and current conditions.

- The Preferred Alternatives for each Study Segment were reviewed, and all of the Alternatives considered for the East Segment were reviewed in detail, including information on how the Preferred Alternative for the East Segment best meets the Project Objectives.
- **The following questions and comments from SCRO and CCRA were received:**

QUESTION: What has the response been to habitat restoration opportunities?

RESPONSE: The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) have requested that lakefill be minimized. They have also indicated Alternatives that resulted in the loss of the sand beach at East Point Park would be a concern. We have explored habitat enhancements, especially aquatic habitat, with TRCA's internal experts and the opportunities are quite favourable. We have also consulted with and will continue to discuss aquatic habitat enhancement opportunities with Aquatic Habitat Toronto.

QUESTION: What is the process for the transfer of private lands into the public domain?

RESPONSE: TRCA will negotiate with the property owners for a settlement on their riparian rights. If negotiation does not result in a solution we will then engage in mediation. TRCA is very hesitant to expropriate lands.

COMMENT: I am concerned about the formalization of existing trails and the perceived impact on ecological features.

RESPONSE: TRCA has a great deal of experience with trail management and based on this experience the formalization of ad hoc trails typically results in a decrease in the number of informal trail resulting in an overall benefit for the area. The EA will recommend that a management plan be developed for East Point Park, which will include information on trail decommissioning and management. Trail formalization will also help to address some of the social issues that are problematic at East Point Park.

QUESTION: Please clarify about the Top-of-Bluffs trail alignment for the East Segment.

RESPONSE: The alignment of the trail at the Top-of-Bluffs in East Point Park will follow the current alignment of the mowed trail near the edge of the bluffs.

QUESTION: What trail infrastructure can we expect?

RESPONSE: TRCA is working with the City of Toronto on what infrastructure should be included, however this is in its early stages. The trail will not be lighted; lights do not improve safety and may impact the natural environment. Given the distance limitations of mobility scooters, we are looking at the possibility of charging stations. Brimley Road poses a challenge and we are looking at access options that may include TTC or a shuttle service, but we still need to understand demand. Trail infrastructure, including wayfinding, is a package deal – it will not be left half complete.

COMMENT: Wayfinding might need to be different here than other trail systems within the City to meet the needs of the Scarborough Community since there are basically no amenities within the sightline of the trail.

QUESTION: There is little parking or public transit. Is that being looked at?

RESPONSE: As part of the EA we need to understand all impacts and are currently undertaking traffic and pedestrian studies to obtain a baseline of current conditions. We understand that parking must be able to accommodate typical usage; we do not want neighbourhood congestion. We've had some success working with TDSB and TDCSB for parking during trail peak periods in the summertime, which is off-peak for schools.

QUESTION: What is the implementation timeline?

RESPONSE: Implementation of the Project and opening of the trail will likely be phased and the details still need to be sorted out.

QUESTION: What funding options are you considering? Is Section 37 funding available?

RESPONSE: The Project will cost in the magnitude of \$80-100 million and we will look for efficiencies wherever we can. Every source of funding will be explored within all levels of government.

COMMENT: Tax-free municipal bonds and enabling legislation should be investigated as a funding mechanism.

QUESTION: There is the potential for the Scarborough Bluffs to be declared a Unesco World Heritage site. Could the Project impact the designation?

RESPONSE: The Project team has looked at the designation and have determined that the Project does not preclude a future designation. Our understanding is that the designation does not offer legal protection [aside from military enterprises], but celebrates and provides recognition for the site.

QUESTION: How the public will have input on refinements to the Project? Can we have a bike trail now?

RESPONSE: We encourage you to make comments now, but there will be an opportunity to participate again once the EA is approved and detailed design begins. We understand the strong desire to have a well-connected trail system on the waterfront and beyond. The trail at Port Union is 3.8m wide, the widest to date, and was at capacity the day it opened. We want to minimize user conflicts and are putting forward ideas to promote good behaviour.

QUESTION: How will success of the Project be measured?

RESPONSE: We certainly want the community to be able to appreciate the new infrastructure, and also think it will become a regional destination. We intend to do more than we are compelled to do – we only want to do this once; we do not want to be required to return after the project is completed to undertake retrofits because we got it wrong.

COMMENT: We recommend that SCRO and/or CCRA host a Public Open House to allow for more dialogue about the Project.

RESPONSE: The Project team would be happy to participate in an Open House; it allows shier people to talk to staff one-on-one about the Project.

COMMENT: Suggest that your team meet with more community groups to help address misinformation about the project.

RESPONSE: We have already met with a number of community groups, with more meetings planned and would welcome any suggestions you may have on other groups to talk to.

COMMENT: Compliments about the rigorous approach and balance that TRCA has taken for the EA.

COMMENT: General support for the EA process.

COMMENT: Suggestion to provide TRCA with letter(s) of support for the Project.

QUESTION: Can you clarify the next steps for the Project approval and EA submission?

RESPONSE: The Project team will continue conversations with the Community to ensure the correct information is being circulated and to obtain comments and feedback. We expect to have the final Public Information Centre in the New Year and will also present at the City of Toronto Public Works and Environment Committee. After that we will seek the Authority Board's approval to submit the EA to the MOECC.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Meeting with Variety Village

September 30, 2016

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Teleconference

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Karen McDonald

Alexandra Papaiconomou

██████████

██████████

Toronto and Region Conservation

Toronto and Region Conservation

Variety Village

Variety Village

Project Overview and Discussion:

A. Papaiconomou sent a slide deck one day prior to the meeting providing Variety Village a high level update on the Scarborough Waterfront Project (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”).

During the call, K. McDonald provided a status update as to where the Project is in its timeline. Currently, we are about midway through the Environmental Assessment and staff are considering refinements to the Alternatives. The detailed design process, where engagement on accessibility is critical to help the Project Team, is at least a year away. K. McDonald suggested that it still might be worthwhile to meet a small group over the next little while, and have more of a workshop styled event during the detailed design phase.

Variety Village agreed that it would be great to engage with their membership soon and again during the detailed design process. They suggested inviting key stakeholders like Quadrangle Architects and the City of Toronto’s Disability Issues Committee to discuss accessibility as it relates to the Project.

Discussions involved the confirmation of a meeting to take place over the next couple of months, as well as what the best format would be. It was agreed that a meeting would take place during the day at Variety Village, and TRCA would lead a presentation providing an update on the Project, then giving guests an opportunity to ask questions and provide their feedback.

Variety Village also agreed to support the promotion of a potential Open House.

Next Steps:

██████████ to provide TRCA a list of potential dates for a consultation meeting, giving their members at least 6-8 weeks’ notice.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Toronto Field Naturalists**

October 4, 2016

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Nancy Gaffney	Toronto and Region Conservation
Alexis Moxley	Toronto and Region Conservation
Karen McDonald	Toronto and Region Conservation
Approximately 20 Toronto Field Naturalists members	

Project Overview:

K. McDonald, N. Gaffney, A. Moxley provided an overview of the Project, including background, existing conditions, and historical context of the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative for each Segment was discussed, including why these options were evaluated as meeting the Project Vision and Objectives to the best extent.

Main Discussion Points:

- Coordination with the local industries, residential communities, and Metrolinx track expansion, and how these factors were considered in the evaluation of the Alternatives.
- Overview of how public and other stakeholder input has helped shape the project to-date, and will continue to help inform the process.
- It is anticipated that the Environmental Assessment will recommend the preparation of a Management Plan for East Point Park and a Revitalization Plan for Bluffer's Park.
- Discussion of the habitat enhancement elements and the overall benefit to the natural environment.
- Range of options considered for the East Segment.

The following questions and comments from Toronto Field Naturalists were received:

QUESTION: Has climate change been considered in terms of potential for the Highland Creek to migrate further west?

RESPONSE: Climate change is being considered in the EA in terms of ensuring potential future shoreline protection function into the future, recognizing the potential impacts of

climate change such as more frequent and intense storm events; however, given the uncertainty associated with climate change, the potential for the Highland Creek to migrate further west is not considered within the scope of the Project.

QUESTION: Have the specific impacts of each component been considered? There is an overall benefit, but what about the impacts (positive/negative) for each element being proposed?

RESPONSE: A rigorous evaluation was undertaken which considered all aspects of the environment, including the physical, social, and natural environments. As part of the next steps, a Detailed Effects Assessment will be undertaken to examine the impacts, both negative and positive, of the Overall Preferred Alternative in more detail. The Overall Preferred Alternative will be evaluated against the Do Nothing Alternative to re-confirm the overall benefits of the Project.

QUESTION: When will the next public meeting be held?

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that the next public meeting will be held in early 2017.

QUESTION: What will access up to the top of the bluffs at East Point Park look like? Will it be fully accessible?

RESPONSE: It is anticipated that the new access proposed at East Point Park will meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act with regards to grade.

QUESTION: Will the headlands which are currently in need of repair at Bluffer's Park be considered as part of this Project?

RESPONSE: The headlands protecting the Bluffer's Park embayment are Federally owned infrastructure, and not considered within the scope of this Project, with the exception of the eastern headland which is proposed to be expanded as a component of the Project. As the Project is proposing alterations to this headland, the condition of the headland would be addressed through the proposed works. Discussions with the responsible Federal department are underway regarding acquisition.

QUESTION: The Terrestrial Biological Inventory recommends that dogs off leash be controlled at East Point. How is this being considered?

RESPONSE: Off-leash dogs are a significant concern in natural areas. TRCA will be recommending that a Management Plan for East Point Park be developed, which may include recommendations for more by-law control to assist with the concerns regarding off-leash dogs.

QUESTION: Were offshore breakwalls considered, as they seem to be beneficial to fish in tropical locations like Florida?

RESPONSE: Breakwalls can work well in coastal environments, especially considering the reef communities that they can facilitate; however, in temperate climates like Lake Ontario they are less beneficial to the aquatic communities.

QUESTION: Concern about the current aesthetics of previous shoreline works and how the SWP project will address aesthetics (i.e. rebar).

RESPONSE: As part of the construction documents, the quality and type of material that will be accepted will be stipulate as a condition of acceptance.

QUESTION: There are a number of social issues at East Point Park and along the shoreline, is the Project considering these and how may help address the issues?

RESPONSE: Experience has shown that trail formalization tends to reduce the majority of social issues, especially the current issues at East Point Park.

QUESTION: Are recreational conflicts, including cyclists speed, off-leash dogs, and recreational angling, being considered in the Project?

RESPONSE: TRCA and the City are very aware of these recreational conflicts, especially along the very popular Waterfront Trail, and the Project design is intended to reduce these conflicts wherever possible. For example, a separated path for pedestrians and cyclists where feasible and appropriate.

COMMENT: General support for the Project, with an offer to provide a formal letter of support.

COMMENT: Concern about increasing the amount of Phragmites along the shoreline.

RESPONSE: TRCA is very concerned about the invasion of Phragmites, but we need to be realistic about the likelihood of successful control, which is very challenging. There are already large stands of Phragmites within the Study Area so it is likely that it will continue to increase regardless of implementation of the SWP. Phragmites does have some beneficial attributes including stormwater tertiary treatment.

COMMENT: Desire for tableland connection/easement from South Marine Drive to the Guild (currently gated and blocked).

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with West Rouge Community Association

October 4, 2016

7:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

West Rouge Community Centre
270 Rouge Hills Drive, Scarborough ON

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Nancy Gaffney	Toronto and Region Conservation
Alexis Moxley	Toronto and Region Conservation
West Rouge Community Association Board Members	

Project Overview:

N. Gaffney and A. Moxley provided an overview of the Project, including background, existing conditions, and historical context of the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative for each Segment, with a focus on the East Segment, was discussed, including why the Overall Preferred Alternative best met the Vision and Objectives.

Main Discussion Points:

- Coordination with the local industries, residential communities, and Metrolinx track expansion, and how these factors were considered in the evaluation of the Alternatives.
- How public and other stakeholder input has helped shape the Project.
- Habitat enhancement elements and the overall benefit to the natural environment.
- Range of options considered for the East Segment.
- Input received from First Responders regarding the Project and the Preferred Alternative, and the overall support for the overall Preferred Alternative.
- Different environmental conditions between Port Union and East Point Park.
- Constraints associated with a trail along the full base of the Bluffs, including:
 - species at risk,
 - waterlot ownership,
 - impact on the natural environment, and,
 - impact on the cultural features of the bluffs.
- Outreach and advertising undertaken prior to each public meeting.

The following key features of the East Segment were discussed:

- The new Waterfront Trail will provide a seamless connection between the central segment to the west and Port Union to the east.
- The new Waterfront Trail is anticipated to meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act in terms of grade. While the Project Team is currently exploring a conceptual design for this connection to the top of the bluffs, it is not anticipated to be a tightly winding trail (e.g., tight switch-back), and rather more of a gradual accent to the top of the bluffs, although some turns may be required.
- it is anticipated that the new Waterfront Trail will connect to the existing path along the top of the Bluffs at East Point Park, and will provide a range of experiences along the waterfront, including majestic views at the top of the Bluffs looking out over Lake Ontario, as well as a water's edge experience at base of the Bluffs. A geotechnical analysis is underway, and given the low rates of erosion at East Point Park, it is anticipated that the existing trail is well beyond the 10-year safe set-back from the edge of the bluffs, although there are some areas where overland flow may need to be addressed, and the trail shifted slightly to the north.
- The existing sand shoreline at East Point Park will remain as it currently exists, providing the opportunity for those that wish to walk along the sand shoreline to do so. The existing privately owned shoreline west of East Point Park, is moved into the public domain, increasing the length of publically accessible waterfront by approximately 1.6 km.
- From the existing conditions studies undertaken early in the planning process, the informal trail mapping documented a large number of informal trails through East Point Park forest and down the side of the bluff face. Experience has shown that by formalizing one primary access route, public use is more effectively managed to reduce the impact on the natural environment. By formalizing a trail along the top of the bluffs, and decommissioning the informal trails through East Point Park, the Project will contribute to an improvement to the condition of the East Point ESA, including the bird sanctuary and forested areas.
- The Project will also be recommending the development of a Management Plan for East Point Park, which will further benefit the condition of the East Point ESA.

The following questions & comments from the West Rouge Community Association were received:

QUESTION: It does not appear that there is any reason why a trail along the full base of the Bluffs is not proposed.

RESPONSE: We looked at a range of Alternatives were considered for the East Segment, including a top-of-Bluffs connection, a connection along the full length of the base of the Bluffs, and other options such as a boardwalk, beach curb, bridges, and island-bridges. These were either considered and determined to not be feasible, such as the boardwalk, or did not meet the Project Vision and Objectives to the same extent as the Preferred Alternative.

COMMENT: The primary concern of our community was to maintain a trail along the waterfront, and to understand why the trail was proposed along the top, instead of the bottom of the bluffs at East Point Park, and it seems as though you've provided a good answer.

COMMENT: West Rouge Community Association was not invited to participate on the Stakeholder Committee.

RESPONSE: The Project consultation records indicate that a representative from the West Rouge Community Association was invited to participate on the Stakeholder Committee on September 26, 2014. While no response was received to the request was received by the Project Team at that time, the Project Team is pleased to continue to engage with the West Rouge Community Association as the Project progresses. The Stakeholder Committee is only one of a range of forums which the Project uses to obtain community feedback and input. The West Rouge Community Association is invited to participate in all Public Meetings, and through direct meetings with the Project Team.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Guildwood Village Community Association

October 11, 2016

7:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Chartwell-Guildwood Retirement Residences

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Nancy Gaffney	Toronto and Region Conservation
Alexis Moxley	Toronto and Region Conservation
Guildwood Village Community Association Board Members	

Project Overview:

N. Gaffney and A. Moxley provided an overview of the project, including background, existing conditions, and historical context of the Study Area. The Preferred Alternative for each segment was discussed, including why these options were evaluated as meeting the Project's Vision and Objectives to the best extent.

Main Discussion Points:

- Coordination with: local residential communities; redevelopment of the future Guild Park and Gardens site; and the Metrolinx track expansion.
- Discussion regarding how coordination with these other projects and plans were considered in the evaluation of Alternatives.
- Overview of public and stakeholder input received to-date, and how this feedback has helped shape the Project, and will continue to help inform the Project as the process moves forward.
- Overview of the habitat enhancement elements and the overall benefit to the natural environment.
- A traffic study is underway to inform future construction access, and alternate access opportunities are being explored.
- Range of options considered for the East Segment, including the top of bluffs and base of bluffs connections, and why the Preliminary Preferred Alternative was identified as meeting the Project Vision and Objectives to the best extent.

The following key features of the east segment were discussed:

- The new Waterfront Trail is anticipated to meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act with regards to grade, including the new connection to the top of bluffs.
- It is anticipated that the new Waterfront Trail will connect to the existing path along the top of the Bluffs at East Point Park, and will provide a range of experiences along the waterfront, including majestic views at the top of the Bluffs looking out over Lake Ontario, as well as a water's edge experience at base of the Bluffs. A geotechnical analysis is underway, and given the low rates of erosion at East Point Park, it is anticipated that the existing trail is well beyond the 10-year safe set-back from the edge of the bluffs, although there are some areas where overland flow may need to be addressed, and the trail shifted slightly to the north.
- The existing sand shoreline at East Point Park will remain as it currently exists, providing the opportunity for those that wish to walk along the sand shoreline to do so. The existing privately owned shoreline west of East Point Park, is moved into the public domain, increasing the length of publically accessible waterfront by approximately 1.6 km.
- From the existing conditions studies undertaken early in the planning process, the informal trail mapping documented a large number of informal trails through East Point Park forest and down the side of the bluff face. Experience has shown that by formalizing one primary access route, public use is more effectively managed to reduce the impact on the natural environment. By formalizing a trail along the top of the bluffs, and decommissioning the informal trails through East Point Park, the Project will contribute to an improvement to the condition of the East Point ESA, including the bird sanctuary and forested areas.
- The Project will also be recommending the development of a Management Plan for East Point Park, which will further benefit the condition of the East Point ESA.

The following questions and comments from Guildwood Village Community Association were received:

COMMENT: Concern regarding additional land base along the Central Segment and the number of trucks which would be required to bring the material to the shoreline. Concern regarding the potential traffic implications through the Guildwood community.

RESPONSE: Refinements are currently underway to minimize the amount of fill required, including exploring alternate opportunities to address the risk to public safety from slope failure. For example, in some areas along the Central Segment raising the trail may provide the same opportunities to mitigate the risk

QUESTION: How will the privately owned shoreline in the East Segment be acquired for the Project?

RESPONSE: The Project Team has been engaging with the private property owners since the initiation of the EA, and consultation is ongoing regarding the potential future need to purchase the riparian rights and shoreline.

COMMENT: Ensure that the new trail is connected to the future Guild Park and Gardens site.

RESPONSE: The City of Toronto will be undertaking a Trails Master Plan for the Guild Park and Gardens site, and the Project is working closely with the City to ensure coordination between the Project and the future Guild Park and Gardens site.

COMMENT: The Project will be discussed as a group, and should a decision be made to support the Project, will a letter of support be helpful?

RESPONSE: A letter of support for the Project, even the process undertaken, is always beneficial. The Project Team would be pleased to provide any additional information that you may require.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Mature Adult Day (MAD)**

October 11, 2016

12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

West Rouge Community Centre
270 Rouge Hills Drive, Scarborough, ON

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Alexis Moxley	Toronto and Region Conservation
Alexandra Papaiconomou	Toronto and Region Conservation
Members of Mature Adult Day (over 40 people)	

Project Overview:

A. Moxley and A. Papaiconomou provided an overview of the Project, including background, existing conditions, historical context of the Study Area, summary of the Environmental Assessment process and public input taken thus far. The Preferred Alternative for each segment was discussed, including why these options were evaluated as meeting the Project Vision and Objectives to the best extent.

The following questions and comments were received from Mature Adult Day members:

QUESTION: Will there be a continuous trail at the bottom and top of the Bluffs?

RESPONSE: The trail will be continuous from Bluffer's Park to East Point Park. The Overall Preferred Alternative is proposing that the trail run along the base of the Bluffs from Bluffer's Park to western section of East Point Park, where it would move to the top of the Bluffs. Those who wish to continue along the base of the Bluffs, can walk along the existing sand shoreline.

QUESTION What is the timeframe for completion of the Project?

RESPONSE: There is a lot of work to be done before implementation can commence. The input and feedback received in formats such as today will inform the next steps in the process, including confirming and refining the Preferred Alternative. It is anticipated that the refinements will be submitted to the public in early 2017, prior to submitting the Environmental Assessment to the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change in 2017. Should a favourable decision be made by the Minister, the earliest construction could commence is 2019, with a 10-15 year construction timeline.

QUESTION: Will the trail be wheelchair accessible (including access points)?

RESPONSE: Accessibility will be provided wherever feasible and appropriate along the shoreline. Opportunities are being explored to reduce the grades along the Guild construction access road and Doris McCarthy Trail. It is anticipated that new access to the top of the Bluffs at East Point Park will meet the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act in terms of grade.

QUESTION: An 11 km trail is quite long; will there be washrooms available along the trail?

RESPONSE: The Project will explore opportunities to install compostable toilets along the trail as part of the future Detailed Design process. The Project will also be committing to undertaking a Park User Assessment with the City of Toronto as part of Detailed Design to help inform the current washroom capacity and future use projections for the existing facilities at Bluffer's Park and East Point Park.

QUESTION: In Ajax, they have a trail that operates all year long with washrooms. What is the difference between the City of Toronto and Town of Ajax?

RESPONSE: The City of Toronto is responsible for the operations and management of the existing park facilities, and is outside the scope of the current Project.

QUESTION: Will the trail be accessible all year long?

RESPONSE: The City of Toronto is responsible for the operations and maintenance of the future park facility. Currently, waterfront parks are not typically maintained in the winter.

QUESTION: Have the plans been made public?

RESPONSE: The information presented here today is available on the Project webpage at www.trca.ca/swp.

QUESTION: Will there be seating facilities?

RESPONSE: The specifics regarding the public realm infrastructure, including seating will be determined during the future Detailed Design phase. It is anticipated that seating will be provided at regular intervals along the shoreline, where feasible and appropriate.

QUESTION: Are there any parts of this stretch that are being kept natural?

RESPONSE: The full length of the sand shoreline along the base of East Point Park will remain in its existing condition.

QUESTION: Are you working on extending the Waterfront Trail?

RESPONSE: The Project is focused on the area between Bluffer's Park in the west, and East Point Park in the east. It is anticipated that the future trail will become the Waterfront Trail along this section of the waterfront. The area outside of the Project Area is outside the scope of the Project.

QUESTION: Will the Project be providing access to the Cathedral Bluffs (currently can't see it and it's one of the interesting things of Scarborough)?

RESPONSE: While the Project Study Area does extend to the western boundary of Bluffer's Park, the Project Area is focused on the area from Brimley Road east to the western end of East Point Park. The Cathedral Bluffs are outside the scope of the Project.

QUESTION: Will the trail be able to accommodate emergency vehicles?

RESPONSE: The Project is exploring opportunities to improve access to and along the shoreline for emergency services. Access will be provided for emergency services vehicles, wherever possible, and where feasible.

QUESTION: Will there be a way to get down to the Bluffs at Guild Park and Gardens with the restaurant being built there?

RESPONSE: The City of Toronto will be undertaking a Trails Master Plan for the Guild Park and Gardens site, and the Project is working closely with the City to ensure coordination between the Project and the future Guild Park and Gardens site.

QUESTION: Coordination of money for the construction of this park and the Rail Deck Park proposed by City of Toronto Council?

RESPONSE: The Project is funded by the City of Toronto, and staff from all departments are integrated into the Planning Process.

QUESTION: Are there any problems like sewage with floating homes at the public marina?

RESPONSE: TRCA will follow-up with the Mature Adult Day coordinator with a response.

Verbal comments/suggestions received:

- Funicular tube to easily move up and down the Bluffs (mentioned during the conversation of Bluffer's Park).
- In discussions around having a trail available all year long, it was suggested to install solar panels for any infrastructure that may be needed and require heating.
- Enjoy the waterfront trail at Port Union.
- Separate cycling and pedestrian access and have appropriate signage to clearly mark where cyclists and pedestrians should go (i.e. cyclists yield to the left).

Action Items:

- A. Papaiconomou to keep Mature Adult Day informed of any upcoming progress on the Project (i.e. public meeting, etc).
- N. Gaffney to reach out to gentleman asking about the floating homes at the public marina.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Coronation Community Association of West Hill

November 1, 2016

7:30 PM - 8:30 PM

Toronto Police Service 43 Division
4331 Lawrence Ave. East, Scarborough, ON

MEETING SUMMARY

The Scarborough Waterfront Project was invited to attend a Coronation Community Association General Meeting to present and discuss the Scarborough Waterfront Project, with a focus on the Preferred Alternative for the East Segment.

Staff in Attendance:

- Alexis Moxley Toronto and Region Conservation
- Karen McDonald Toronto and Region Conservation
- Lionel Worrell Toronto and Region Conservation

Political Representatives in Attendance:

- Representative from the office of Gary Anandasangaree, MP (Scarborough-Rouge Park)
- Representative from the office of Mitzie Hunter, MPP (Scarborough-Guildwood)
- Paul Ainslie, Councillor (Ward 43 Scarborough East)

Introduction and Presentation

Ron Wootton, chair of the Coronation Community Association of West Hill opened the meeting, thanked everyone for attending, and invited the representatives from the Project Team to deliver their presentation to the group.

A. Moxley and K. McDonald provided an overview of the Scarborough Waterfront Project, including:

- An overview of the Project Study Area;
- Project Vision and Objectives;
- Effect of historical Stonehooking;
- Impacts of Development;
- Public Input;
- Outreach;
- Importance of Public Comments;
- Preferred Alternatives for the West, Central and East Segments;

- Various Alternatives considered for the East Segment;
- How the East Segment Preferred Alternative meets the Project Objectives;
- The Overall Preferred Alternative; and,
- Next Steps.

18 individuals attended the presentation and the subsequent question and answer period.

Question and Answer Period:

Question: Where can we go to find information about the Project online?

Response: Information about the Project, and Project material is available on the Project’s webpage (www.trca.ca/swp), including the last public meeting presentation and display panels. An updated webpage will be launched shortly.

Question: You refer to constructing a natural berm along the trail in the Central Segment; won’t this require a lot of fill and affect the natural environment?

Response: By raising the trail, it creates a type of berm, where material that falls from the Bluffs would be captured. It is anticipated that the berm would be located on the existing road allowance. The refinements to the concept are anticipated to be presented to the public early in the New Year.

Question: How will you be able to establish a connection from Bluffer’s Park to Meadowcliffe, considering the steepness of the Cudia Bluffs?

Response: The geotechnical and coastal studies undertaken in support of the Project noted that the Cudia Bluffs are in the process of starting to self-stabilize. The trail would be located outside the hazard area.

Question: Why does the Study Area not extend over to Highland Creek?

Response: The Project does consider connections to Highland Creek and to Port Union along the existing Waterfront Trail south of the Highland Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. Further opportunities to move the trail location closer to the water or providing a secondary trail along this area are being explored.

Question: By placing the trail along the tablelands aren’t you going to have to keep replacing it as the Bluffs recede?

Response: We are not seeking to stop erosion in the East Segment. Erosion of the Bluffs in this area is very gradual, and is important for maintaining the bluff vegetation communities and Bank Swallow habitat – features for which East Point Park is designated as an ESA. We don’t anticipate needing to replace the trail on an ongoing basis, but any adjustments can be undertaken through regular maintenance activities.

Question: Are you potentially putting people at risk by having them at the top of the Bluffs? How do you propose to keep people away from the edge?

Response: Through proper planning, and by improving access from the top to the bottom of the Bluffs, experience has shown that the number of informal trails will decrease. Currently, the number of informal trails down the side of the Bluffs are not only impacting the natural environment, but also show that people want access to the shoreline. By formalizing access to the shoreline at the western end of East Point Park, and along Beechgrove Road, it is anticipated that these will become the favoured access routes, improving the natural environment and public safety.

The Project Team has consulted with Emergency Services regarding the Preferred Alternative, who have expressed support for the Project.

Question: The existing trail at East Point Park has a wood chip surface; what will the trail be like in winter?

Response: The trail along the tablelands will meet the City of Toronto guidelines for a primary multi-use trail, and as such will likely be a hard surface. The City of Toronto Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department does not undertake trail maintenance during the winter.

Question: What is the elevation at the site where you will be moving from the shoreline to the top of the Bluffs in the East Segment?

Response: The elevation of the Bluffs in this area is approximately 25 m. For this trail we would be improving the existing approximately 15% grade to one closer to 7.5%.

Question: What were the other Alternatives considered for the East Segment?

Response: We looked at a range of Alternatives were considered for the East Segment, including a top-of-Bluffs connection, a connection along the full length of the base of the Bluffs, and other options such as a boardwalk, beach curb, bridges, and island-bridges. These were either considered and determined to not be feasible, such as the boardwalk, or did not meet the Project Vision and Objectives to the same extent as the Preferred Alternative.

Question: Can the trail or a raised boardwalk be placed along the base of the Bluffs along East Point Park?

Response: A coastal engineering study was undertaken in support of the Project. The potential for a boardwalk or raised boardwalk along the base of the Bluffs was explored, and determined that with the existing coastal conditions, such options would not meet the Project Objectives, and were not feasible for the area.

Question: What is the difference in cost between the Preferred Alternative and going along the base of the Bluffs at East Point Park?

Response: A trail along the base of the Bluffs is approximately a 50% increase in cost as compared to the Preferred Alternative.

Question: Why can't we build a trail like the one along Port Union?

Response: The existing conditions along the Port Union shoreline were very different than the conditions at East Point Park, and was mostly industrial with no significant environmental features (such as the Bluffs).

Question: What will the headlands look like and how do they work?

Response: Headland-beach system is composed of armourstone headlands protecting a cobble beach in between. The width and number of headlands may vary from the concept shown. The Project Team is currently exploring opportunities to reduce the number of headlands and reduce the size of cobble required between the headlands.

Question: I've seen a lot of algae accumulating along the headlands in Port Union. Why does this happen?

Response: Algae is an issue throughout the Great Lakes and many factors such as nutrient loading influence this. The Project will not be addressing the issue of algae in the Great Lakes.

Question: Will the beach at East Point Park be designated a Blue Flag Beach like Bluffer's Park?

Response: The City currently has no plans to designate further Blue Flag Beaches within the Study Area. Blue Flag beaches are designated based on a number of factors, including water quality and available amenities.

Question: You have indicated that private property rights extend down to the water; I did not think this was possible in Ontario.

Response: Approximately 1.5km of the shoreline in the East Segment is privately owned, and in some instances, the ownership extends into the water. The Project Team is consulting with these landowners at key milestones throughout the Project.

Following the Question and Answer session association members indicated by a show of hands that a majority prefer a trail along the full length of the base of the Bluffs, connecting over to the mouth of the Highland Creek.

The Project Team thanked the Coronation Community Association of West Hill for hosting them, and for their feedback, and concluded their presentation. It was noted that all comments are recorded, considered, and will be made available in the EA document.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project
Conference Call with Community Member**

December 7, 2016

4:00 PM - 4:30 PM

Conference Call

CALL SUMMARY

Participants:

- Nancy Gaffney Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)
- Anneliese Grieve Anneliese Grieve Strategic Environmental Planning Solutions
- [REDACTED] Community Member

Project Overview and Update:

N. Gaffney began the call by introducing A. Grieve from Anneliese Grieve Strategic Environmental Planning Solutions who is an agent/representative of TRCA.

Progress made since the last Public Information Centre held in June was then discussed. Since then, the Project Team continued on with regular engagement with public members, confirmation was received from senior TRCA and City of Toronto staff to move forward with the Preferred Alternative as presented in June. The Preferred Alternative is currently being refined by the Project Team.

The following questions and comments were received:

Question: Who has the Project Team met with and why were they were chosen to be engaged with?

Answer: Local Community Associations/Groups were met with over the summer and fall of 2016. These groups were reached out to either because they were recommended by local political representatives, or because the groups reached out to the Project Team requesting an update. These meetings provided a simple update on the Project - - no new information was presented.

Question: Why was a comment period provided if comments are still being captured?

Answer: Every comment received by the Project Team throughout the entire Environmental Assessment (EA) process (from the Notice of Commencement to the Notice of Submission for the Final EA) is captured, recorded and considered.

A two-week comment period after a Public Information Centre is provided to allow the Project Team to collect comments based on the materials presented. Once comments are

captured, the Project Team is able to move forward on to next steps to meet Project timelines.

Question: It was expressed that it was difficult to believe that the Project was going the way that no one agrees with.

Answer: Comments have been received that support the Project and the Preferred Alternative.

Question: How can TRCA undertake the 2012 Terrestrial Biological Inventory and Assessment and have no regard for it?

Answer: The Lake Ontario shoreline extending from Bluffer's Park to East Point Park was inventoried to characterize the terrestrial natural heritage features, both locally and within the larger regional context of TRCA's Terrestrial Natural Heritage Program. The study considered the existing conditions within the context of the terrestrial natural heritage system, and recommended a number of site-specific management strategies. The SWP revisited these recommendations within the comprehensive context of the area, including:

- Protecting and enhancing existing habitats and features;
- Managing public use through careful trail planning and strategic use of infrastructure (e.g. fences to direct trail use);
- The control of *invasive species*; and,
- Further assessment and monitoring.

Question: What happens next?

Answer: The Project Team is currently undertaking refinements to the Preferred Alternative and is preparing the Detailed Effects Assessment. The results of this Assessment will be presented to the public at PIC #3 to be scheduled in spring 2017. Shortly after PIC #3 is complete, approval will be sought to submit the EA to TRCA's Board, the City's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee and City Council. The Project Team will then submit the Draft EA to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and make it available to stakeholders for a 30 day review. Once comments are collected, the EA will be finalized for formal submission to the MOECC for the regulatory review. Once again, it will be available for public comment.

Comment: ██████████ expressed that the Project Team had not listened to her comments.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Update Meeting with Community Members

December 13, 2016

6:00 PM – 8:30 PM

Scarborough Civic Centre

Attendees:

Nancy Gaffney (TRCA), Alexis Moxley (TRCA), Karen McDonald (TRCA), Anneliese Grieve (Anneliese Grieve Strategic Environmental Solutions), [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

MEETING NOTES

- N. Gaffney introduced Anneliese Grieve who has been retained by TRCA as an independent third party advisor for the Scarborough Waterfront Project Environmental Assessment (EA). A. Grieve is an agent of TRCA, therefore any references within this summary that note “TRCA” also refers to A. Grieve. A. Grieve clarified that she is independent and is reviewing the facts and process.
- This meeting focused specifically on the East Segment and in these notes discussion points have been grouped by relevant theme, not necessarily the order in which the discussion occurred.
- TRCA reviewed the Project’s Vision and Objectives; Project activities since the last Public Information Centre (PIC); a high level overview of comments received to date; and confirmed that TRCA is proceeding with refinements to the Preliminary Preferred Alternative as was presented at the last PIC.
- TRCA provided an overview of the EA process, explaining that EAs are a rationale planning model for evidence based decision making and the purpose of EAs are for the betterment of the people or any part of Ontario by providing for the protection, conservation and wise management of the environment.
- By their nature EAs are about trade-offs, including social, economic and environmental aspects, which often conflict and compete against each other. EAs identify a solution to a problem, however not everyone will be satisfied with the solution. The SWP EA is an Objective based EA where the Alternatives are evaluated based on how well they are able to achieve the Objectives.
- TRCA explained that the issues or constraints of the SWP EA can be grouped by three main themes: City Building and Recreational Spaces, Dynamic Coastal Conditions and Policy.

- **City Building and Recreational Spaces** must consider the City's population growth and densification over the next 25 years which will increase pressure and demand on green spaces and result in the degradation of the natural environment without formal access and management. The "Do Nothing" Alternative must consider this. A community member suggested that TRCA should be looking 100 years into the future, noting that 25 years seems like a convenient reference point. The community member also wondered how the Project will help people, wildlife and the lake by creating an asphalt trail.
- **The Dynamic Coastal Conditions** of Lake Ontario must be considered, including waves, precipitation and the freeze-thaw cycle. Broadly defined, beaches must align to the waves to endure. The sand beach in this area is an eroding beach in that it is an eroding "cohesive shoreline" overlain by a veneer of sand which can accumulate and disburse frequently as a result of coastal processes here sand moves into and away from the shore and does not accumulate.
- Coastal conditions must also consider climate change, which will include more frequent and severe storms. Community members remarked that climate change is simply weather, and that the Project will contribute to climate change due to heat from the asphalt trail. TRCA explained that this is a microclimate effect. TRCA further clarified that we must work within Federal and Provincial policy frameworks which requires us to look at how the Project may be affected by climate change; however, climate change is not driving the Project.
- Community members requested clarification on the definition of a "natural sand beach". [TRCA has consulted with coastal engineers regarding the definition: a beach is a landform along a body of water. It usually consists of loose particles, which are often composed of rock, such as sand, gravel, shingle, pebbles, or cobblestones. This area of the shoreline has a cohesive substrate that is eroding and that the sand gravel/cobble deposits are transitory. It is an eroding beach upon which the sand/gravel/cobble deposits move in and out of.] The sand in the East Segment does not accumulate - it is constantly coming in, and going out.
- TRCA explained that erosion processes at the Scarborough Bluffs are episodic, that is there may be a major land slide one year, but then no major slides for the next 10 years. The erosion is averaged out to determine the erosion loss per year.
- Community members requested clarification on how the Project will deal with the freeze-thaw process at the Scarborough Bluffs. TRCA responded that it is considered, however it is a minor variable compared to the other processes such as wind and toe erosion.
- Community members requested clarification on toe erosion given that much of the Bluffs in the East Segment are fully vegetated. TRCA explained that there is toe erosion and that it is a dynamic relationship with the angle of the bluff slope.
- The Project must also consider **Policy Direction**, which includes the City of Toronto Official Plan (OP), TRCA's Strategic Plan and The Living City Policies,

the City's Multi-Use Trail Guidelines and Metrolinx rail expansion. The City's OP directs the Waterfront Trail to be moved to the water's edge where feasible; TRCA's policies also support this approach. Community members noted that policy is not a constraint to the public and that policies can be changed. TRCA noted that they and the City have to work within the existing policy framework. The Project cannot go against policies.

- Community members inquired where a waterfront trail at the water's edge is not feasible. TRCA noted that a water's edge trail near the Pickering Nuclear Generating Station or the Ashbridge's Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant are precluded due to security concerns.
- TRCA explained the risk line along the shore, which is currently an unmanaged risk. The risk line along the shore is the extent to which talus material will extend in the event of slope failure. Community members suggested that the safety issue has been exaggerated.
- The EA will demonstrate how the Alternatives meet the Objectives. The Objectives are trade-offs against each other. TRCA is looking for a compromise that fulfills the Objectives best.
- Community members would like to see the criteria for the trade-offs. TRCA explained that the process of writing and refining the Evaluation is currently underway. The EA document will describe the trade-offs by Objective and between Objectives, and will include detail in the Appendix.
- TRCA provided information about activities since the last PIC including confirming the Project's direction with senior TRCA and City of Toronto staff; engaging with agencies; refining the Preferred Alternative; and establishing pedestrian and cyclist access points; and continued public engagement. The Project team is starting the detailed effects assessment, which is compared to the "Do Nothing" Alternative and is looking at further habitat enhancement opportunities.
- Community members inquired about consultation with other community organizations, specifically Councillor Moeser's constituents. TRCA explained that Councillor Moeser requested TRCA undertake additional consultation since some of his constituents are outside of the Project Study Area. During this consultation we explained why a trail at the bottom of East Point Park was not being advanced. Most people understood the reasons why and asked for refinements to the Alternatives, including access routes.
- Community members expressed concerns about access routes that if routes aren't provided people will make their own. The plan to improve access at the Guild Park and Gardens is great. An access route was suggested at or near Grey Abbey Park. TRCA explained that it was determined an access route in this area would result in too much impact on the natural environment. TRCA clarified that the access at the western part of East Point Park will use an existing feature south of the softball complex to minimize impacts on the natural environment and will not involve a switchback trail, but rather gradual bends.

- Community members expressed concern that some water-based recreational uses such as paddle boarding, wind surfing and kayaking will be impacted by the Headland-Beach Alternative.
- A community member remarked that the Waterfront Trail is excellent, but sand beaches were not sacrificed in other locations. TRCA clarified that the Lakeview Water Connection EA did in fact include the removal of part of a sand beach.
- A community member expressed concern that wildlife will leave the area if the Project is implemented. Another community member believes that the Project will negatively affect fish habitat and that rocks are bad for fish. TRCA clarified that the Project will improve aquatic habitat by providing a diversity of shoreline conditions.
- Community members expressed confusion with the EA process and the next steps of the Project and where approvals are required. TRCA responded after the next PIC, the Board and the City's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee must approve the submission of the EA to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC).
- Community members requested clarification on the role of TRCA's Board in the process and the delegation process. TRCA explained that staff will provide the Board with a report recommending that the Draft EA be submitted to the MOECC and that it is the Board's prerogative to endorse the recommendation as-is, or edit it, and then vote upon it. It does not necessarily mean that the Board approves of the Project. Delegations made to the Board without a report lack context and that the public will have an opportunity to make a delegation once the report goes to the Board, which is anticipated in spring 2017. [Information on how to make a delegation to the Board is found here: <https://trca.ca/about/boards-committees/delegation-information/>] TRCA added that once City and Board approval are attained the Draft EA will be available for review for 30 days to provide an opportunity for people to voice concerns and allow TRCA to resolve those concerns prior to the final EA submission. TRCA will communicate when the Draft EA has been submitted and will provide direct links for easy access.
- Community members suggested that the public is being misled and that information provided to the public is incomplete. They desire more transparency and collaboration. TRCA recognizes that there have been issues in the past and they will not be repeated.
- Community members feel that the public has not been given an option – the Preferred Alternative is TRCA option. TRCA noted that the fundamental piece of the EA is the land base itself, not about the details because EA approval is not required for details. People often want details right away; however, EAs are typically conceptual and high level. TRCA is using science to inform decisions and are undertaking the EA thoughtfully so that the Project results in an overall positive impact.

- A community member expressed concern that not enough time was allowed for commenting. TRCA clarified that a deadline was provided, however all comments received to date have been considered and are included in the EA. The EA document will contain a summary of these comments, with all of the verbatim comments included in the Appendix.
- Some community members indicated that they are not in support of the Preferred Alternative and believe that there are other solutions. They do not necessarily want the “Do Nothing” Alternative, but want a softer option. Other community members indicated they only supported the “Do Nothing” Alternative and will always advocate to preserve the sand beach. They feel a trail at the bottom of the Bluffs in the East Segment is overkill.
- TRCA also explained that the Project will involve land acquisition from private landowners, which technically currently restricts public access. Community members inquired about negotiations with private industry in the East Segment. TRCA explained that we have discussed the Project with the operators, but have not yet approached the owners.
- A community member inquired if TRCA was open to considering the option they had developed for the East Segment. TRCA explained that the Alternative being advanced considers all aspects of coastal conditions. TRCA offered to make the technical experts involved in the Project available for consultation. Some community members accepted this invitation. A meeting will be scheduled in the future.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Friends of the Bluffs

April 10, 2017

6:30 PM – 8:00 PM

Scarborough Civic Centre

Attendees:

Nancy Gaffney (TRCA), Alexis Moxley (TRCA), Karen McDonald (TRCA), Anneliese Grieve (Anneliese Grieve Strategic Environmental Planning Solutions), Jason Crowder (Terraprobe), Milo Sturm (Shoreplan), Jennifer Hyland (City of Toronto, Transportation),



MEETING NOTES

Nancy thanked everyone for attending the meeting, and introduced the technical experts present to answer questions from the Friends of the Bluffs group (the Group).

- Anneliese Grieve, EA Advisor
- Milo Sturm, Coastal Engineer
- Jason Crowder, Geotechnical Engineer
- Karen McDonald, Natural Environment Specialist
- Jennifer Hyland, Transportation, Cycling Infrastructure

The Friends of the Bluffs thanked the experts for coming together and noted that The Group is committed to protecting the existing shoreline along the East Segment.

This meeting focused specifically on the East Segment (e.g., the sandy shoreline along Greyabbey Trail and East Point Park) and in these notes discussion points have been grouped by relevant theme, not necessarily the order in which the discussion occurred. The notes are a summary of discussion themes, and not a verbatim record of the meeting.

Shoreline Erosion

- The Group does not feel that erosion is an issue along the East Segment, and based on research and observations, it seems unnecessary to further harden the shoreline.

Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs reiterated their position that erosion occurs on the top of the bluffs independent of wave action therefore softer approaches should be considered along the shore.

- The Project's coastal engineer noted that there are records of erosion along the unprotected sections of the bluffs which go back to the 1920s, including surveys and photographs, which support the erosion rates. West of Grey Abbey Ravine has high rates of erosion of approximately 0.3 – 1.4 m/year; and, (b) east of Grey Abbey Ravine has lesser rates of erosion of approximately 0.1m/year. West of Grey Abbey ravine public property will be threatened within 60 years based on established erosion rates.
 - The driving force for the erosion is wave action. It can take decades for what happens at the bottom of the bluffs to be apparent at the top.
 - *Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs reiterated their position that wave-driven erosion is not a significant issue in the East Segment. Friends of the Bluffs also asserted that erosion would take hundreds of years to threaten property.*
 - Water level variations affect erosion.
 - It may appear as though in a single year there is no erosion however, the erosion rate is averaged.
 - Once the shoreline is protected, crest migration will continue until a Long Term Stable Slope is reached.

Lake Ontario Water Levels

- The Group referenced a newspaper article which noted that lake levels will be lower in the future, and that sand beaches will increase with these lower water levels. It is likely this will stop the erosion along this shoreline. A report published by Harvey Shear, University of Toronto, was also referenced in terms of the expectation that Lake Ontario water levels will drop by 1.5' by the end of the Century.
- The Project's coastal engineer advised that predicted water level drops are true for the Great Lakes in general. However, Lake Ontario is regulated (due to responsibilities to downstream users), and studies show that Lake Ontario water levels will stay more or less the same however, the new approach to regulations will widen the range within which water levels will fluctuate.
- It was noted that while the technical experts were not familiar with Harvey Shear's report, the statement is inconsistent with the majority of studies and EAs completed in recent years, which state that Lake Ontario will see minimal change.
- The EA Advisor notes that the EA needs to consider the weight of the evidence – the general consensus from scientists. This information is then reviewed by technical experts.
 - *Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs indicated that the scientific evidence provided was conjecture.*

Climate Change

- The Group noted that climate change is still undetermined, and that some scientists just view it as the natural cycle of weather.
- The EA Advisor indicated that the EA is required by provincial and federal regulators to consider the potential effects of climate change.

Slope Stabilization

- The Group repeatedly suggested that surface water runoff and groundwater were the primary contributors to the bluff erosion, and not wave action. A request was made to quantify the contributing factor of runoff and wave action.
- The Project's geotechnical engineer noted that surface runoff and groundwater are minor contributors to crest migration within the Project Study Area. While vegetation is helpful to stabilize the bluffs, as long as there is toe erosion, the ongoing erosion causes oversteepening of the slope toe and hence drives slope instability. As the waves erode the toe of the bluffs, the bluffs become oversteepened, causing the bluffs to slump. By stopping the toe erosion, the instability is addressed, and eventually the slope will self-stabilize and then re-vegetate.
- The Group also noted that the bluffs west of Grey Abbey Ravine are quite vegetated, which has stabilized the bluffs in this area. Some of the trees are over 30 years old, noting the bluffs have been stable for quite some time.
- The Project's coastal engineer reiterated that along unprotected sections of the bluffs erosion is 100% driven by wave action.

Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs reiterated their position that wave-driven erosion is not a significant issue in the East Segment.

- A photo of a recent failure along the East Segment was shown.

Public Access

- The Group advised that they do not agree with putting in access, and noted concerns with regards to armourstone providing safe access, and direct access to the water. The Group noted that the sandy shoreline provides both access and multiple uses. The need to provide access for people of all abilities was questioned by The Group. The Group also suggested that increased access leads to increased destruction of the natural environment. The group suggested that safe public access could be constructed at Grey Abbey Park; however, TRCA has indicated several times that this access is not possible without significant removal of the bluff face and vegetation communities of concern.
- The Project team advised that there are a number of access issues to be considered in this segment, including ~8km of informal trails both along the

tablelands and down the side of the bluffs. These informal trails are fragmenting and impacting the sensitive vegetation communities.

Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs indicated their position that the Project's planned reduction in the number of informal trails will not protect the natural environment.

- The EA Advisor and Project Team noted:
 - TRCA stated that formal access has been shown to be an effective means of conservation and management human use to protect ecosystems.
 - TRCA indicated that approximately 3km of the shoreline to the east of the end of the existing construction access road is not formally accessible to the public. There is private property and critical public infrastructure to consider. Some private owners have expressed frustration with members of the public who wish to access the shoreline, trespassing through private property to do so. These landowners have expressed a desire for better access across the entire shoreline.
 - The City is changing, the population is increasing, and how people are using parks is changing. Densification is increasing demand on recreational spaces. This access and use must be appropriately managed.

Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs indicated that they felt TRCA should use signage and supervision to manage the natural space.
 - There are also safety issues associated with the risk of bluff failure along the entire shoreline in the east segment. The risk line is lakeward of the existing shoreline, and in some areas at certain times of the year, the lake reaches the toe of the bluffs, and becomes inaccessible.

Shoreline Protection

- The Group referenced the Great Lake Mapping Organization's recommendation that "straight structures destroy natural vegetation, impacts stormflow, alters nearshore sediment transport, and accelerates nuisance species". There are alternatives to shoreline hardening. Stones could be placed along the shoreline underwater to recreate historical conditions and dissipate the wave energy.
 - The Project's coastal engineer noted that the Preferred Alternative for the SWP is similar to the "greener" sills shown on the handout of shoreline protection measures circulated by the group. Headlands stabilize a cobble and gravel beach in behind. Cobble beaches are quite natural around the world, provide access to the water, and benefit the aquatic species.
 - Turbidity is actually higher along unprotected sections of the shoreline due to the erosion. That is a natural occurrence.

- It is anticipated the Project will further enhance the aquatic environment by placing stones along the nearshore. While these will reduce erosion, it will not halt the erosion. Historically, prior to stonehooking, there was erosion, it was just at a much lower rate.

Closing

- Photos of the unprotected section of the shoreline along the east segment were shown. These photos illustrated the existing conditions of the shoreline in the east segment, including the evidence of toe erosion and areas where water level reached the toe of the bluffs, precluding access along the shoreline.
- The Group requested that a compromise be found.
- The Project Team closed by noting that it's a resource management discussion, and that the feedback received will be considered in the EA.

Note: Following review of the draft meeting notes, Friends of the Bluffs indicated their opposition to the Project.

Prepared By: Alexis Moxley, April 12, 2017

Draft Notes Issued: April 24, 2017

Revised Notes Issued: May 17, 2017

This confirms and records TRCA's interpretation of the discussions which occurred during this meeting.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Meeting with Variety Village

January 18, 2017

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Alexis Moxley
Karen McDonald
[REDACTED]
Community members

Toronto and Region Conservation
Toronto and Region Conservation
Variety Village
Variety Village

Project Overview and Discussion:

A. Moxley and K. McDonald provided an overview of the Project to community members. They provided information on the shoreline concept, as well as the access routes.

Overall community members like the idea of a connected waterfront and think people should be encouraged to go there. They also noted that access to the shoreline is challenging. Shuttles, including Wheel-Trans, can help mitigate this barrier. There was some discussion about trail surface, with members noting that the evenness of the trail is important. They also suggested the idea of a raised boardwalk through forested areas (i.e., Guild area) and noted that separate trails for cyclists and pedestrians are important. TRCA noted there will be more discussion about trail surfaces at the detailed design phase and members suggested that options be presented to that community members can note their preferences.

Next Steps:

TRCA to send the presentation and website information to Variety Village. TRCA will also send a copy of the next Public Information Centre advertisement so that community members can post and distribute it. TRCA will continue dialogue with Variety Village during the detailed design phase.

**Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Toronto Field Naturalists**

May 2, 2017
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Anne Leon's Residence
[REDACTED]

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Karen McDonald Toronto and Region Conservation
Alexandra Papaiconomou Toronto and Region Conservation
Approximately 9 Toronto Field Naturalists members

Project Overview:

The Project Team met with Toronto Field Naturalists as a follow up to questions that were submitted on the refinements to the Preferred Alternative and access routes following Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3A held on January 11, 2017.

K. McDonald provided an overview on the access routes and the refinement to the tableland connection in the East Segment as presented at the Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3A. K. McDonald concluded with an anticipated timeline of next steps.

Discussion Points:

- Some access routes are currently difficult to access due to high water levels.
- Improving access along Brimley Road by providing separate access.
- No further improvements are proposed along the Doris McCarthy Trail to not impact the natural area and wetland that exists there.
- Proposal for Guild Access Road is to include level rest stops.
- In the eastern section of the Study Area, there are no improvements being proposed at Beechgrove Drive. The creation of a potential node was discussed at Stakeholder Committee Meeting 3A, however this scope of work is outside of the Environmental Assessment (EA) as it would not be mitigating risk along the shoreline. This could be considered after the EA. There is potential for a softer node.
- East Segment connection. At Stakeholder Committee Meeting 3A, the gully was proposed to make the connection to the top of Bluffs without significant impacts to the natural environment. This area was deemed with the lowest vegetation community (L4). This also would provide parking and bathroom facilities at the top of the Bluffs as infrastructure is currently there.

The following questions and comments from Toronto Field Naturalists were received:

QUESTION: Are there plans for an access route from the west side at Chine Drive?

RESPONSE: The Project Team has not looked at this access point.

COMMENT: Consider an informal trail along/near Chine Drive.

COMMENT: Caution with level rest stops as they can be dangerous with electric chairs as they can ride down quite fast.

QUESTION: How do you deal with the landfill along Brimley Road?

RESPONSE: The Project Team will not be digging beside the landfill. Safe access will be provided along the top of Brimley Road.

QUESTION: Will there be better access to Sylvan Park?

RESPONSE: Have not examined this.

QUESTION: Have comments influenced the decision to not do anything now?

RESPONSE: Comments have been taken into account; however this is a Project Objective based Environmental Assessment and all Alternatives need to meet the Objectives. The Refinements to the Preferred Alternative that incorporate public comments will be presented shortly at the Stakeholder Committee meeting and Public Information Centre.

COMMENT: When the Guild Access Road was being discussed, it was noted that parking is only available at Guildwood Parkway.

RESPONSE: The Project Team looked at the fenced-in compound, which could possibly be turned into parking. The Master Plan for Guild Park & Gardens is looking to make a better connection down to the shoreline.

QUESTION: Who owns the area in the East Segment?

RESPONSE: East Point Park is owned by the Toronto and Region Conservation. To the west of East Point Park, ownership changes at the FJ Horgan site and further west, where Rohm and Hass (DOW Canada) resides.

COMMENT: East Point Park is a nice area for hand gliders.

RESPONSE: This is not a city sanctioned activity.

QUESTION: Are there plans for enhancing nature in East Point Park?

RESPONSE: There is a recommendation in the EA to start a management plan in East Point Park. This would involve forestry planning.

COMMENT: There are motorized bikes that ride through East Point Park.

RESPONSE: An enforcement strategy will need to be figured out.

QUESTION: Will East Point Park be left as is for about 10 years?

RESPONSE: Possibly, but we hope we could do something sooner.

QUESTION: Could the top of Bluffs connection be made further west near Morningside Avenue?

RESPONSE: The Project Team did look at this option; however the challenge is crossing Grey Abbey ravine as it is eroding and deemed to have a negative impact to the ravine with the columns that would be needed to support a bridge.

QUESTION: Could the road adjacent to 220 Grey Abbey be used?

RESPONSE: We wouldn't want to be in a position of expropriating someone's home unless it was seriously impacted due to erosion. This also wouldn't meet AODA guidelines, and would still come across the negative impact to Grey Abbey ravine with the columns that would be needed to support a bridge.

COMMENT: If you were to go up the road at 220 Grey Abbey, the existing waterfront trail route could be used; the trail doesn't need to be kept alongside the lake.

RESPONSE: One of the Objectives of the Project is Waterfront Experience. This would also have it connect further east to the existing waterfront trail that runs along Copperfield Road adjacent to the chemical plant and Metrolinx expansion. The Project Team could not check off the Waterfront Experience box in this scenario.

COMMENT: There is the Morningside Avenue option.

RESPONSE: The Project Team looked at this option, but it would not achieve AODA guidelines.

QUESTION: What's 100 yards west of the gully? Can the top of Bluffs connection be made at FJ Horgan?

RESPONSE: No.

QUESTION: How about west of this area?

RESPONSE: There is no natural area to move to the top of Bluffs. This would have us cutting into the Bluffs.

QUESTION: Is there access currently on the top of Bluffs heading westward from East Point Park?

RESPONSE: Not really. You could walk westwards now, but it would be harder in the summer with increased vegetation.

QUESTION: The settling pond at/near the FJ Horgan site – have they finished it? Still looks clogged.

RESPONSE: It is no longer being used and it is no longer as bad as it used to be. They may put treated water there. There is bi-weekly testing to test grade so Copperfield Road does not get flooded.

COMMENT: Plans for the beach (“good” sandy beach) at the base of Morningside Avenue and further west – the Preferred Alternative is a headland-beach. Shoreline protection is not needed here.

RESPONSE: The Project is also about managing public access and risk.

QUESTION: So it will be paved over?

RESPONSE: The headland-beach system would be a cobble beach. Planning for a 7.6 m wide trail. The surface is not yet determined, but it will likely be asphalt so that it can withstand the lake.

COMMENT: Put the headland-beach option at East Point Park as that area is not a good beach area.

COMMENT: Preferable option is to have current waterfront trail go along Grey Abbey.

COMMENT: Regularly walk along beach. But right now, it is difficult due to high lake levels. Beach is great for walking, but not good for bicycles. Would like to have sandy beach remain.

COMMENT: Sandy beach is not as big at East Point Park.

COMMENT: Leave nature as is to let habitat flourish.

RESPONSE: TRCA has experience in situations where natural areas are left as is with no managed access results in the area degrading. When access is managed, there is habitat growth. Take for instance Tommy Thompson Park where the natural area has seen growth. These activities need to be managed.

QUESTION: The perimeter trail at East Point Park, will it be wood chip?

RESPONSE: It will be formalized (in about a 10 year timeline).

QUESTION: The trail west of the diamonds at East Point Park, will it be similar to the Port Union trail?

RESPONSE: Yes.

COMMENT: Nice bits of wetland created. Looking forward to the development of that habitat.

QUESTION: With increased traffic, how much more parking will be created?

RESPONSE: Not planning to increase parking.

COMMENT: There will be increased bike traffic, especially if connection is made further west of Bluffer’s Park.

QUESTION: The headland-beach system you say will increase aquatic habitat. Will this increase fishing in the area?

RESPONSE: TRCA does not manage fishing. However, do not think this will be an issue.

QUESTION: Are there fish along the beach area?

RESPONSE: Species richness is low along the sand beach area. In areas where we have done work, we have found that species richness has increased.

QUESTION: Why don't you throw rocks underwater to create fish habitat and leave sandy beach as is?

RESPONSE: We could look into that, but the trouble would be how to get down there with the large rocks, and considerable amount of rock would be needed. This would be cost prohibitive.

QUESTION: What could TFN do to help? Could we lobby to move the East Point Park management plan?

RESPONSE: Yes. We hope you can continue to be a part of this process, even during the detailed design phase if the EA is approved.

COMMENT: Fix the rusty structure at East Point Park. One panel is filled with graffiti.

RESPONSE: Any changes to that structure would be up to the City.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)
Meeting with Surfing Community
May 12, 2017
10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
43 Division
4331 Lawrence Avenue East, Scarborough ON

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Nancy Gaffney

Alexis Moxley



Toronto and Region Conservation

Toronto and Region Conservation

Surfing Community Representative

Surfing Community Representative

Project Overview:

N. Gaffney provided an overview of the Project, including background, summary of Environmental Assessment process, and anticipated next steps. A. Moxley briefly described the key existing conditions of the West Segment, including the risk line, area of risk to public safety, and maintenance needs of the existing shoreline protection works at Bluffer's Park. N. Gaffney then reviewed the Preferred Alternative as presented in June 2016 for the West Segment, including the range of options considered, and the rationale for why the Preferred Alternative was the highest ranked. It was explained that the Preferred Alternative provided a number of broader benefits, including:

- Reduced the need to dredge the marine entrance;
- Allowed for the expansion of the beach in order to provide a connection to Meadowcliffe which is outside of the risk line;
- Provided opportunities to benefit cold water fish species;
- Provided shelter to the rest of the eastern arm at Bluffer's Park;
- Allowed for the expansion of sand dune vegetation, a provincially significant vegetation community; and
- Provided for increased public use area, to reduce the growing pressures at Bluffer's Park.

N. Gaffney and A. Moxley reviewed the existing wave conditions, under both the easterly and southwesterly waves. The results of the wave model were discussed, and it was noted that there was no change in condition under the easterly waves; however, under the southwesterly waves, the headland will shelter the waves to the north of the structure. While there would be no change to the wave conditions offshore of the structure, the surfing community noted that these are not surfing conditions, given the deeper water. N. Gaffney concluded the presentation by reviewing the current status of the Project, and discussed next steps.

Surfing Area Discussion Points:

- It was noted that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are part of a larger surfing community which surfs the Great Lakes.
- There are 3 surf areas at Bluffer's Park:
 - The "Eastern" area as identified on the map shown is known to the surfers as "the cove" and provides the best surf conditions in the local areas under Easterly waves.
 - The "central" area identified on the map is surfed under the easterly waves.
 - The "Western" area as identified on the map shown is known to the surfers as "the lighthouse" and provides the only surf conditions under the west-south-westerly waves. This area was described as the best surf location in the local area.
- Surfers are using the area at Bluffer's in the fall and winter.
- The "lighthouse" surf area was described as providing the best surf conditions as the waves roll off the existing headland at Bluffer's Park, and the surf area is sheltered from the wind. The waves break under just the right conditions in this area.

Other Discussion Points/Comments:

- The surfing community was described as increasingly growing, with over 1,000 active surfers.
- Economic implications of losing the best surf area were highlighted, as the biggest surf shop for Great Lakes surfing gear is located in Toronto.
- Surfers are drawn from all over for the conditions at "the lighthouse."
- The surfing community was described as stewards of the environment, as they are in the area when no-one else is, and are sheppards of good environmental practice.
- The surfing community was identified as the only user group of the park, aside from dog walkers, in the off-season (fall and winter).
- The surfing representatives raised concern regarding the loss of the best and only surfing location under southwesterly waves.
- The representatives of the surfing community understood the necessity for reducing sedimentation in the marina entrance; however, felt that the larger extension of the headland to the east was only cosmetic in purpose. Suggestions were made for alternate options to encourage the expansion of the sand beach, including:
 - Expanding the smaller headland at Bluffer's Park, located just north of the headland proposed for expansion.
 - Adding a structure along the middle of the existing beach to allow the sand to build-up to the east for a sand connection to Meadowcliffe.
 - Removing the easterly projection of the expanded headland altogether.
- There was no concern with the expansion of the headland to the southwest.
- The surfing community noted interest in bringing their concerns to local political representatives, and ensuring that their voices are heard at the next public meeting, and when the Project is brought to TRCA's Authority, City of Toronto's Public Works and Infrastructure Committee, and finally City Council.

Scarborough Waterfront Project (SWP)

Meeting with Surfing Community

June 15, 2017

7:30 p.m.

Carter's Landing

1681 Lake Shore Blvd E, Toronto, ON

MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Nancy Gaffney
Anneliese Grieve
Milo Sturm



Toronto and Region Conservation
Strategic Environmental Planning Solutions
Shoreplan Engineering Ltd.
Surfing Community Representative
Surfing Community Representative
Surfing Community Representative
Surfing Community Representative

Project Overview:

N. Gaffney provided an overview of the Refined Preferred Alternative and discussed the changes from the Preferred Alternative as presented in June 2016.

Members of the surfing community informed the Project Team about the unique character of lighthouse surf break. They also spoke to the growing surfing community in the Toronto region.

Discussion points included:

- What could change during the Detailed Design phase (in terms of the magnitude of change, not the complete removal of the headland).
- Discussed the opportunity to recreate similar topography adjacent to the new node as an experiment to create the same surf break condition. This creation is not a science, more of an art work.
- Other spots along the Toronto Waterfront where surfing is occurring.
- Various questions were raised about the coastal conditions and wave modelling results.
- Concern raised: more rip tides could be created with the Preferred Alternative that can pose a danger for swimmers.
 - M. Sturm confirmed that the Project would not make the current conditions worse.
- Members of the surfing community also asked about the Alternatives considered and the rationale for why others were not chosen.
- Future approval steps and where the surfing community could provide their input.