

10. Consultation

10.1 Consultation on Environmental Assessment

Chapter 10 documents the public, agency and Indigenous consultation activities that took place as part of the SWP. Consultation activities were undertaken in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Consultation* (MOECC, 2014).

Consultation on the SWP also took place during the ToR phase and is detailed in the Record of Consultation that was submitted with the ToR to the MOECC in June of 2015. This chapter provides the details of consultation activities that took place in support of the EA phase of the SWP.

10.2 Guiding Principles and Objectives

The principles of engagement for the Project were to listen; encourage all ideas and promote inclusiveness; respect other opinions; encourage full participation; seek constructive feedback; and provide informative and timely information. These principles guided the delivery of all consultation activities outlined in this chapter.

The objectives of the consultation plan were to:

- meet the consultation requirements under the *EA Act*;
- provide opportunities to participate in the consultation process;
- provide clear, concise information to the public in straight-forward language;
- create opportunities for meaningful information exchange between TRCA, its consultants, and interested persons;
- thoroughly review and consider all feedback and advice received throughout the process; and,
- prepare accurate and comprehensive summary reports that capture all feedback and advice received.

Section 10.3 of this chapter provides an overview of the consultation mechanisms that were used as part of the SWP consultation program. **Section 10.4** summarizes the outcome of the consultation activities that were undertaken with the public and provides the Project Team's responses to feedback. Consultation activities that occurred with Indigenous communities are described in **Section 10.5**. Agency meetings and associated consultation activities are outlined in **Section 10.6**. Materials used in the consultation activities, and additional details on input received, are included in **Appendix L** of this document.

10.3 Consultation Mechanisms

This section provides an overview of the various communication channels that were used as part of the public consultation program.

10.3.1 Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications

10.3.1.1 Notice of Commencement and Public Information Centre #1

The Notice of Commencement announcing the initiation of the EA was published in the Scarborough Mirror first on January 7, 2016 and then again on January 14, 2016 (**Table 10-1**). The Notice included Project and contact information, as well as an invitation to the first Public Information Centre (PIC) for the EA held on January 28, 2016 (see **Section 10.4.2** for further PIC#1 information).

The Notice was also added to the Project website on January 7, 2016, and then sent through the Project e-newsletter on January 7, 2016, with a reminder email about the PIC sent on January 25, 2016 (see **Table 10-2**). Additionally, the Notice was emailed to agencies, utilities, as well as Councillors, Members of Provincial Parliament (MPPs), and Members of Parliament (MPs) in the Project Study Area (see **Table 10-2**).

The Notice was distributed to local businesses in the Project Study Area, and circulated to 4,717 households/apartments with postal codes M1M and M1E that were located south of Kingston Road (Project Study Area) via Canada Post the week of January 11, 2016 (see **Table 10-2**). Twitter was also used as a channel to communicate PIC#1 (see **Table 10-1**).

In addition, as a follow up to PIC#1, a newsletter was distributed on March 8, 2016 with a PIC overview and summary of next steps.

A copy of the Notice of Commencement and PIC#1 is included in **Appendix L1**.

10.3.1.2 Notice of Public Information Centre #2

The Notice for PIC#2 was published in the Scarborough Mirror on June 9, 2016 and then again on June 16, 2016 (**Table 10-1**). The Notice included Project information and contact information, as well as an invitation to PIC#2 held on June 28, 2016 (see **Section 10.4.2** for further PIC#2 information).

Notice of PIC#2 was also added to the Project website on June 16, 2016, and sent through the Project e-newsletter on June 16, 2016, with a reminder email about PIC#2 sent on June 23, 2016 (see **Table 10-2**). Additionally, the Notice was emailed to agencies, as well as Councillors, MPPs and MPs in the Project Study Area (see **Table 10-2**).

The Notice was distributed to local businesses in the Project Study Area, and circulated to 4,707 households/apartments with postal codes M1M and M1E that were located south of Kingston Road (Project Study Area) via Canada Post the week of June 13, 2016 (see **Table 10-2**). Although the mail out was sent to the same area for PIC#1 and PIC#2, the number of deliveries decreased slightly for

PIC#2 as a few households/apartments and businesses had selected not to receive unaddressed mail. Twitter and Facebook were also used as channels to communicate PIC#2 (see **Table 10-1**).

In addition, as a follow up to PIC#2, a newsletter was distributed on June 30, 2016 with a link to all materials presented at the PIC and summary of next steps (including the date of when comments were due).

A copy of the Notice of PIC#2 is included in **Appendix L1**.

10.3.1.3 Notice of Public Information Centre #3

The Notice for PIC#3 was published in the Scarborough Mirror on June 8, 2017 (**Table 10-1**), and included Project and contact information, as well as PIC#3 information held on June 28, 2017 (see **Section 10.4.2** for further PIC#3 information).

Notice of PIC#3 was also added to the Project website on June 16, 2017, and sent through the Project e-newsletter on June 9, 2017, with a reminder email about PIC#3 sent on June 23, 2017 (see **Table 10-2**). Additionally, the Notice of PIC#3 was emailed to agencies, as well as Councillors, MPPs and MPs in the Project Study Area (see **Table 10-2**).

The Notice was distributed to local businesses in the Project Study Area, and circulated to 21,929 households/apartments with postal codes M1M, M1E, M1C and M1N within and to the north of the Project Study Area the week of June 19, 2017 via Canada Post (see **Table 10-2**). Recognizing the broader interest in the Project, the delivery area was expanded to include households/apartments north of Kingston Road. Twitter and Facebook were also used as channels to communicate PIC#3 (see **Table 10-1**). On June 21, 2017, the Notice was sent by email to all who previously submitted comments and/or questions to the Project Team via email since the commencement of the EA.

In addition, as a follow up to PIC#3, a newsletter was distributed on June 30, 2017, with a reminder newsletter on July 7, 2017, with a link to all materials presented at the PIC and summary of next steps (including the date of when comments were due and advisement of the opportunity to submit correspondence or make a delegation at the TRCA Authority Board). Information regarding the TRCA Authority Board meeting was also distributed by email on July 7, 2017 to everyone who previously provided comments on the Project.

A copy of the Notice of PIC#3 is included in **Appendix L1**.

10.3.1.4 Notice of Submission of Draft EA

A Notice of Submission for the Draft EA was published on August 17, 2017 in the Scarborough Mirror (**Table 10-1**), and included Project and contact information, timelines for Draft EA review period, locations for the public to view a hard copy of the EA and the details of where comments could be sent.

The Notice of Submission was also communicated on the Project website on August 17, 2017 and sent through the Project e-newsletter on August 17, 2017 (**Table 10-2**). Additionally, the Notice of Submission of the Draft EA was emailed to agencies, as well as Councillors, MPPs and MPs in the Project Study Area on August 17, 2017 (see **Table 10-2**).

The Notice was distributed to local businesses in the Project Study Area. It was also circulated to approximately 21,949 households/apartments with postal codes M1M, M1E and M1N within and to the north of the Project Study Area the week of August 14, 2017 via Canada Post (see **Table 10-2**). Twitter and Facebook were also used to distribute the Notice of Submission (**Table 10-1**). On August 17, 2017, the notice was sent by email to all who submitted comments and/or questions to the Project Team via email since the commencement of the EA.

A copy of the Notice of Submission is included in **Appendix L1**.

Table 10-1: Publication and Notification Information

Notifications	Media Outlet	Publication Date(s)
Notice of Commencement and Notice of PIC#1	Scarborough Mirror	January 7 & 14, 2016
	Twitter	January 11, 2016
Notice of PIC#2	Scarborough Mirror	June 9 & 16, 2016
	Twitter	June 6, 8, 14 & 27, 2016
	Facebook	June 14 & 27, 2016
Notice of PIC#3	Scarborough Mirror	June 8, 2017
	Twitter	June 13 & 22, 2017
	Facebook	June 13 & 22, 2017
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	Scarborough Mirror	August 17, 2017
	Twitter	August 17, 2017
	Facebook	August 17, 2017
Notice of Submission of Final EA	Scarborough Mirror	June 14, 2018
	Twitter	June 15, 2018
	Facebook	June 15, 2018

Table 10-2: Email/Mail Notifications

Notification	Contact	Number of Individuals and Method of Contact	Date
Notice of Commencement and Notice of PIC#1	Agencies	36 by email	January 7, 2016
	Utility Companies	4 by email	January 7, 2016
	Political Representatives	7 by email	January 7, 2016
	Indigenous Communities	14 by courier and/or email	January 7, 2016
	E-Newsletter Mailing List	536 by email	January 7, 2016
	Local Businesses Flyer Drop	664 by mail	Week of January 11, 2016
	Household Flyer Drop	4,717 by mail	Week of January 11, 2016

Table 10-2: Email/Mail Notifications

Notification	Contact	Number of Individuals and Method of Contact	Date
Notice of PIC#2	Agencies	37 by email	June 16, 2016
	Utility Companies	Not contacted	Not contacted
	Political Representatives	8 by email	June 16, 2016
	Indigenous Communities	14 by courier and/or email	June 8, 2016 (courier) June 9, 2016 (email)
	E-Newsletter Mailing List	687 by email	June 16 - 20, 2016
	Local Businesses Flyer Drop	661 by mail	Week of June 13, 2016
	Household Flyer Drop	4,707 by mail	Week of June 13, 2016
Notice of PIC#3	Agencies	33 by email	June 14, 2017
	Utility Companies	5 by email	June 14, 2017
	Political Representatives	11 by email	June 14, 2017
	Indigenous Communities	14 by courier and/or email	June 9, 2017 (email) June 12, 2017 (courier)
	E-Newsletter Mailing List	801 by email 805 by email 865 by email 855 by email	June 9, 2017 June 23, 2017 June 30, 2017 July 7, 2017
	Local Businesses Flyer Drop	868 by mail	Week of June 19, 2017
	Household Flyer Drop	21,929 by mail	Week of June 19, 2017
Notice of Submission of Draft EA	Agencies	37 by email	August 17, 2017
	Utility Companies	6 by email	August 17, 2017
	Political Representatives	11 by email	August 17, 2017
	Indigenous Communities	14 by courier and/or email	August 16, 2017 (courier) August 17, 2017 (email)
	E-Newsletter Mailing List	849 by email	August 17, 2017
	Local Businesses Flyer Drop	866 by mail	Week of August 14, 2017
	Household Flyer Drop	21,949 by mail	Week of August 14, 2017
Notice of Submission of Final EA	Agencies	38 by email	June 15, 2018
	Utility Companies	5 by email	June 15, 2018
	Political Representatives	10 by email	June 15, 2018
	Indigenous Communities	14 by courier and/or email	June 14, 2018 (courier) June 15, 2018 (email)
	E-Newsletter Mailing List	846 by email	June 15, 2018
	Local Businesses Flyer Drop	1,020 by mail	Week of June 11, 2018
	Household Flyer Drop	26,453 by mail	Week of June 11, 2018

10.3.2 E-Newsletter Project Updates

An online Project e-newsletter was created at the beginning of the ToR phase to distribute Project updates and information to subscribers. Members of the public are able to sign up to receive and download the e-newsletter through the Project website (see **Section 10.3.4**). Individuals also signed up for the e-newsletter at PICs for the Project and during Community Outreach events (**Section 10.4.4**) hosted or attended by TRCA staff.

During the EA phase, 32 e-newsletter Project updates were distributed. **Table 10-3** lists each newsletter, key topic(s), number of recipients it was delivered to, open rate (how many successfully delivered campaigns were opened by subscribers) and click rate (how many successfully delivered campaigns registered at least one click).

Table 10-3: Project E-Newsletters

Date	Key Topic(s)	Number of Recipients	Open Rate	Click Rate
August 11, 2015	Update on ToR process and promotion for Shoreline Tour #1	504	63.66%	35.16%
August 25, 2015	Shoreline Tour #1 promotion	496	65.17%	24.38%
December 15, 2015	Shoreline Tour #1 summary	540	60.75%	20.81%
January 7, 2016	Notice of Commencement and PIC#1 Save the Date	536	62.64%	26.81%
January 25, 2016	PIC#1 reminder	551	60.4%	18.73%
March 8, 2016	PIC#1 Recap, project next steps, and EA Info Sheet #3 release	643	61.25%	22.31%
April 19, 2016	Shoreline Tour #2 promotion	637	59.43%	10.13%
April 25, 2016	Shoreline Tour #2 reminder	640	60.38%	23.18%
May 24, 2016	Shoreline Tour #2 update, EA Info Sheet #4 release, Bluffs History feature on the Halfway House	652	60.43%	20.2%
June 16, 2016	PIC#2 invitation	658	54.89%	27.3%
June 23, 2016	PIC#2 reminder	659	50.38%	11.45%
June 30, 2016	PIC#2 summary	672	54.4%	15.9%
July 28, 2016	General Project Information	759	48.4%	16.1%
September 3, 2016	General Project Information	781	50.1%	20.3%
September 15, 2016	General Project Information and outreach activity promotion	775	56.7%	14.8%
October 31, 2016	Project Update	798	47.3%	9.2%
November 30, 2016	General Project information and update	795	49.1%	19.2%
December 20, 2016	General Project information and update	798	45.9%	13.8%
January 31, 2017	General Project information and update	805	46.3%	11.2%
March 1, 2017	General Project information	803	43.5%	11.1%
May 17, 2017	Notice of landslides and shoreline erosion along the Bluffs	805	58.2%	3.0%
June 9, 2017	PIC#3 invitation	801	50.8%	4.1%
June 23, 2017	PIC#3 reminder	805	38.4%	4.6%
June 30, 2017	PIC#3 summary	865	44.8%	13.0%
July 7, 2017	Notice of TRCA Authority Item in regard to the Project	855	40.7%	2.6%
August 17, 2017	Notice of Draft EA Submission	853	46.2%	10.4%
September 13, 2017	Notice of Draft EA Submission Reminder and Doris McCarthy Trail Closure	854	45.1%	4.5%
September 27, 2017	Final Reminder of Draft EA Comment Submission Deadline of October 2, 2017	852	46.6%	4.6%
December 1, 2017	Project Next Steps Update and Happy Holidays	853	46.0%	6.3%
April 20, 2018	Notice of City of Toronto Executive Committee Meeting	852	56.2%	5.2%
May 16, 2018	Notice of City Council Meeting	846	45.2%	6.7%
June 15, 2018	Notice of Final EA Submission	846	*	*

Note: * Not known at time of publication

The contact list for the e-newsletter was initially generated early in the ToR phase, and additions to the list have continued throughout the EA via the following avenues:

- Direct sign-ups at PICs (see **Section 10.4.3**);
- Direct sign-ups on the Project website;
- By request to the Project Team via e-mail or phone; and
- Direct sign-ups at Direct Community Engagement & Consultation events attended by TRCA staff (see **Section 10.4.4**).

The Project contact list was used for direct email notifications of relevant SWP information, including e-newsletters with Project updates and public consultation opportunities. As of May 25, 2018, the Project contact list had 846 subscribers.

Copies of the e-newsletter Project updates are included in **Appendix L2**.

10.3.3 Project Information Materials

10.3.3.1 Information Sheets

The Project Team developed two information sheets in the ToR phase, titled:

- EA Info Sheet #1 – Project Overview; and,
- EA Info Sheet #2 – EA Process.

These were created to help provide concise information about the Project to the public. These EA Info Sheets were made available through the Project website and e-newsletters.

In the EA phase two additional EA Info Sheets were developed for the Project:

- EA Info Sheet #3 – EA Alternatives; and,
- EA Info Sheet #4 – Evaluations of Alternatives.

The information sheets were made available online on the Project website (within the Resource and Project Map sections), in hard copy at Direct Community Engagement events, and at PICs (see **Section 10.4.4**).

There were a total of 480 online page views for all four information sheets from January 1, 2016 to August 1, 2017.

Copies of the information sheets are included in **Appendix L3**.

10.3.4 Project Website

At the beginning of the ToR phase in 2014, a dedicated Project website (www.trca.ca/swp) was created on the TRCA website to provide Project information.

The Project website contains a detailed description of the SWP, information on the EA process, as well as a number of document links. The website was provided in advertisements, official correspondence, and in presentations given to the public regarding the Project.

The following documents are available for download from the SWP Project website:

- PIC information and material
- E-newsletters
- Information Sheets
- Draft ToR
- Final EA ToR and Approval
- Notice of Submission of Draft EA
- Draft EA
- Notice of Submission of Final EA
- Final EA

In November 2016, an “Interactive Map” was added to the Project website. Recognizing the large scope and complexity of the Project, the purpose of the Interactive Map was to help explain the Project visually and help orient people to the Project Study Area. Since the launch, the Interactive Map has received 4,675 page views. The map was removed from the website in June 2017 prior to PIC#3 when the Refined Preferred Alternative was presented to avoid confusion. In its place, a map of the Refined Preferred Alternative was posted.

From January 1, 2016 until May 25, 2018, the SWP Project website received 38,832 page views.

10.3.5 Social Media

Two social media platforms were used throughout the EA: Twitter and Facebook. Between January 1, 2016 to June 15, 2018, these platforms were used to promote Project information, events, or public consultation initiatives/activities. **Table 10-4** illustrates the engagement summary for each platform.

Table 10-4: Social Media Platforms

Platform	Handle/Website	Number of Posts Related to SWP*	Followers/Likes*
Twitter	@WaterfrontTRCA	92	1,189
	@TRCA_News	36	7,683
Facebook	@WaterfrontTRCA	41	229
	@TorontoConservation	49	4,882

*Note: * As of May 25, 2018*

10.3.6 Project Videos

Four videos were developed during the EA phase. These were created to provide additional Project information through various communication channels. These videos quickly captured key Project topics and linked back to the Project website where more information was available. All videos were uploaded on TRCA’s YouTube channel and promoted through the Project e-newsletter and social media channels.

Table 10-5 illustrates the engagement summary for each video.

Table 10-5: Project Videos

Video Topic	Link to Video	Release Date	Number of Views*
Protecting and Preserving a Natural Wonder for Everyone to Enjoy	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zn8myWBns0E	June 2016	1,604
Trails and Habitat	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IsJ4LC0yaxM	November 2016	929
Bank Swallows	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_p2m7LyjiZY	December 2016	194
Physical Processes	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VYISzfxopb0	January 2017	1,172

Note: * As of May 25, 2018

10.4 Public Consultation & Engagement

Throughout the SWP EA, the Project Team provided early and ongoing consultation activities to help develop a collective understanding of the Project and provide opportunities for Stakeholders and community members to provide input into the Project. The objectives of public consultation activities undertaken through the EA were:

- To identify any additional interested parties, including landowners, waterfront users, members of the public, and other key Stakeholders that were not identified in the ToR;
- To inform people about the Project, and the associated planning process; and,
- To obtain input from interested parties in the development of the EA.

10.4.1 Stakeholder Committee

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

The Stakeholder Committee was formed during the ToR phase. Applicants were reviewed and sorted into the following categories:

- Community groups (including local ratepayers)
- Regional user groups
- Local user groups (i.e. boat clubs, recreational user groups)
- Academia or institutions
- Local residents
- Indigenous Communities

In an effort to obtain a broader perspective throughout the EA, and as follow-up to discussions with Committee members and local community groups, additional members were added at the commencement of the EA phase. This included the addition of the Wild Bluffs, a resident within the Project Study Area, and a member of the City of Toronto's Disability, Access and Inclusion Advisory Committee. In March 2016, the Project Team further examined the list of Stakeholder Committee

members to evaluate if any gaps were present in Committee representation. As a result of this inventory, Lake Ontario Waterkeeper was invited to join the Stakeholder Committee; however, due to time commitments, Lake Ontario Waterkeeper was unable to participate as a representative of the Stakeholder Committee, and instead chose to remain engaged through other avenues.

Representation on the Stakeholder Committee was made up of representatives from the following groups:

- Bluffer's Park Boating Federation
- Bluffs Performance
- Cathedral Bluffs Yacht Club
- Centennial College
- Centennial Community & Recreation Association
- City of Toronto Disability, Access and Inclusion Advisory Committee
- Cycle Toronto
- Elected officials
- Friends of the Guild Park & Gardens
- Guild Renaissance Group
- Guildwood Village Community Association
- Local residents
- Park People
- Parkcrest Tenants Association
- Sir Wilfrid Laurier Collegiate Institute
- The Wild Bluffs
- Toronto Field Naturalists
- Toronto Ornithological Club
- Toronto Police Service
- Waterfront Regeneration Trust

10.4.1.1 Stakeholder Committee Workbooks

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

Stakeholder Committee Terms of Reference, meeting summaries and/or summary workbooks for the Stakeholder Committee meetings are included in **Appendix L4**.

Table 10-6 summarizes each Stakeholder Committee meeting.

10.4.2 Public Information Centres (PICs)

Three PICs were held during the EA phase of the Project. **Table 10-7** provides an overview of PIC attendance. The information discussed and input received at each PIC is documented in the following subsections. Comments and questions raised at these PICs by members of the public are documented in **Table 10-12** (see **Section 10.4.7**).

PIC meeting summaries, panels, presentations and workbooks are included in **Appendix L5**.

Table 10-6: Stakeholder Committee Meeting Summary

Stakeholder Committee Meeting	Date	Meeting Purpose	Attendance
Stakeholder Committee Shoreline Boat Tour	August 28, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide an opportunity for members to gain a better familiarity with the Project Study Area and the area's existing conditions. Five tours were conducted from 9:00 am – 5:00 pm, with each tour approximately one hour in length. 	21 Stakeholder Committee members
Stakeholder Committee Preliminary Alternatives Discussion (referred to as Meeting #4)	September 23, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Preliminary Draft Alternatives to ensure that all reasonable Alternatives were put forward for consideration; and, ▶ How to present the information to the general public at upcoming PIC#1. 	16 Stakeholder Committee members
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1	January 14, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Format and materials to be shown at EA PIC#1 (draft display panels and draft presentation); and, ▶ Members provided additional feedback regarding the draft Alternatives, draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators. 	15 Stakeholder Committee members
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2A	June 2, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Draft Evaluation Results; and, ▶ Preliminary Preferred Alternatives by Project Area Segment. 	16 Stakeholder Committee members 4 observers
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2B	June 14, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Materials prepared for SWP EA PIC#2; and, ▶ Draft Effects Assessment Criteria. 	9 Stakeholder Committee members 4 observers
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3A	January 11, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An update on the work undertaken since the last PIC; ▶ The concepts for shoreline access to the water; ▶ The Refined Overall Preferred Alternative; ▶ The Draft Detailed Effects Assessment Criteria; and, ▶ Discuss next steps in the process. 	19 Stakeholder Committee members 9 observers
Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3B	June 14, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present and seek feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Update on the Project; ▶ Refined Preferred Alternative and construction approach; and, ▶ Discuss next steps in the process. 	18 Stakeholder Committee members 5 observers

Table 10-7: PIC Summaries

PIC/Date/Location	Meeting Summary	Attendance
PIC#1 January 28, 2016 Qssis Banquet Hall	<p>Purpose: Provide Project update and present and seek input into the draft Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria.</p> <p>Format: Open House session with panel display information, a formal presentation followed by a question and answer period.</p> <p>Input Received:... 12 hard copy workbooks were received the day of the PIC, followed by an additional 50 emails received by the end of the comment period.</p>	Approximately 122 members of the public
PIC#2 June 28, 2016 Blessed Cardinal Newman Catholic High School	<p>Purpose: Present and seek feedback from the public on the evaluation of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Alternatives by Shoreline Segment; ▶ Preliminary Preferred Segment Alternative(s); and, ▶ Draft Detailed Effects Assessment Criteria. <p>Format: Open House session with panel display information, a formal presentation followed by a question and answer period.</p> <p>Input Received:... 31 hard copy workbooks were received the day of the PIC, followed by an additional 77 emails received by the end of the comment period.</p>	Approximately 250 members of the public
PIC#3 June 28, 2017 Blessed Cardinal Newman Catholic High School	<p>Purpose: In advance of the release of the Draft EA for review, present and obtain input on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Refinements to the Preferred Alternative; and, ▶ Detailed Effects Assessment. <p>Format: Open House session with panel display information, a formal presentation followed by a question and answer period.</p> <p>Input Received:... 39 hard copy workbooks were received the day of the PIC, followed by an additional 57 emails/online forms received by the end of the comment period.</p>	Approximately 190 members of the public

10.4.3 Direct Community Engagement

In addition to PICs and Stakeholder Committee meetings, the Project Team undertook a variety of additional community engagement initiatives including hosting various SWP targeted events (tours, walks, information stations, etc.).

A total of nine Direct Community Engagement activities led by the Project Team were undertaken during the EA phase. **Table 10-8** captures these activities.

The Project participated in a total of 13 partner organization events during the EA phase. **Table 10-9** summarizes these activities.

A summary of comments received at these engagement activities by members of the public are included in the comment summary presented in **Table 10-12**.

10.4.4 Landowners and Community Organizations

10.4.4.1 Landowners

The Project Team met with residential landowners potentially affected by the Project as a result of land acquisition. There were various touch points throughout the EA by mail, email, in-person meetings or tours, and telephone conversations. Landowners were contacted before each PIC to notify them of the public meeting details while also offering to meet with them if they so wished. In-person meetings generally provided updates on the Project at key milestones. A total of 26 landowners were engaged during the EA phase.

The Project Team also met with industrial property owners Dow Chemical/Rohm and Haas to provide information on the Project and ensure their comments and concerns were collected and recorded. Various forms of communication have occurred throughout the EA including mail, email, in-person meetings and telephone conversations. Communication from Dow Chemical Canada ULC can be found in **Appendix L6**. Communication with these landowners is summarized within **Table 10-12** and is also captured in **Appendix L9**.

10.4.4.2 Community Organizations & Local Residents

During the EA, the Project Team met individually with a number of community groups/organizations and local residents to further discuss the Project, or to address any specific concerns or questions the group/organization or local resident may have had with regards to the Project.

Table 10-10 provides an overview of these individual meetings held with community groups/organizations and local residents during the EA. Comments and questions raised at these meetings, and the responses to these comments, are documented in **Table 10-12** (see **Section 10.4.7**).

Table 10-8: Direct Community Engagement – Project Team Led

Date	Event Name	Overview	No. of Attendees (approximate)
September 12, 2015	2015 Shoreline Tour	A free guided tour of the Scarborough shoreline between the Guild Park and Gardens and Meadowcliffe in the Project Study Area to inform members of the public about the history of the waterfront, highlights of the natural environment, geological features in the area and how these relate to the SWP. As this section is an informal trail, it provided the opportunity for the public to get down to the shoreline while minimizing risk.	94
May 14, 2016	2016 Shoreline Tour	Due to the popularity of the 2015 Shoreline Tour, a similar tour was held in 2016. This free guided tour of the Scarborough shoreline between the Guild Park and Gardens and Meadowcliffe in the Project Study Area was scheduled to inform members of the public about the history of the waterfront, highlights of the natural environment, geological features in the area and how these relate to the SWP. As this section is an informal trail, it provided the opportunity for the public to get down to the shoreline while minimizing risk.	79
August 20, 2016	Informational Display at East Point Park	Project Team staff set up an “Ask Us About the Future of the Waterfront” information station within the parking lot at East Point Park (Beechgrove Drive and Copperfield Road) to educate users of the Park on the Project and to also obtain their feedback.	25
August 27, 2016	Informational Display at Bluffer’s Park	Project Team staff set up an “Ask Us About the Future of the Waterfront” information station within Bluffer’s Park just outside the washroom station (before the entrance to Bluffer’s Park Beach) to educate users of the park on the Project and to also obtain their feedback.	22
August 31, 2016	East Point Nature Walk	Project Team staff led a walk of the tablelands at East Point Park to discuss the history and natural features of the park, while discussing how the SWP will be enhancing and protecting the natural features of the Bluffs and terrestrial environment. The existing trail was walked and native plants, birds, and other wildlife were identified and discussed.	13
September 10, 2016	East Point Park Shoreline Walk	Project Team staff led a walk of the shoreline at East Point Park and reviewed the history of the area and discussed the Preferred Alternative, including the constraints and opportunities within the East Segment.	10
September 21, 2016	Guild Park & Gardens Bat Walk	Project Team staff and Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) staff led a walk at Guild Park and Gardens to speak to the bat study undertaken for the SWP Study Area. ROM staff provided a general overview of bats found in Ontario and showcased the recording device used to capture bat ultrasonic vocalizations that helped ROM staff determine the species of the bats present in the Study Area.	30
September 24, 2016	Van Tour with East Scarborough Storefront community members	Project Team staff led a van tour with members of East Scarborough Storefront of the Central and East Segment of the Project. An introduction to the Project was provided followed by the current conditions and constraints of each area with an overview of the Preliminary Preferred Alternatives by Segment.	7
September 24, 2016	Bluffer’s Wetland Walk	Project Team and TRCA staff provided a brief history about the wetland located in Bluffer’s Park. Detailed information was provided on the wetland restoration project that was completed at Bluffer’s Park in 2009, including an examination of the issues that had resulted in poor water quality and beach closings prior to Project implementation. This past project significantly contributed to improved water quality and led to the Blue Flag designation for Bluffer’s Park Beach.	27

Table 10-9: Direct Community Engagement – Partner Organizations

Date	Event Name	Overview	No. of Attendees (approximate)
July 25 & 26, 2015	Guild Alive with Arts & Culture	A TRCA information booth was set up at the Guild Alive with Culture Arts Festival at Guild Park and Gardens in Scarborough, Ontario. TRCA staff handed out SWP bookmarks.	205
February 18-21, 2016	Outdoor Adventure Show	Waterfront Regeneration Trust (WRT) hosted a booth at The Outdoor Adventure Show at the International Centre in Mississauga from February 18-21, 2016 and a booth at the Toronto International Bike Show from March 4-6, 2016. At these trade shows WRT handed out SWP bookmarks and posted a map of the 3 Project Area Segments and Study Area. Participants were encouraged to visit the Project website, or email the Project Team if they had any questions.	1,000
March 4-6, 2016	Toronto International Bicycle Show		1,000
June 24, 2016	Port Union Waterfront Festival	Materials about the SWP were on display to inform festival attendees about the Project. Information about PIC#2 was also shared.	60
July 1-3, 2016	Redpath Waterfront Festival	Project information and bookmarks were available at the WRT booth at the Redpath Waterfront Festival.	600
July 23, 2016	Community Summer Festival (Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities)	Project Team staff set up an information station at the Eglinton Ave. East - Kennedy Park - Ionview Community Summer Festival. Feedback was collected from members of the public regarding the Project.	50
August 21, 2016	Community BBQ	Project Team staff set up an information station during the Annual Community BBQ hosted by Gary Anandasangaree. Staff responded to questions and obtained feedback from attendees.	30
September 17, 2016	Waterwise Festival	Project Team staff attended and provided SWP information. Information about the Study Area shoreline van tour planned with the East Scarborough Storefront for September 24th, 2016 was also provided.	30
September 24, 2016	Thompson Memorial Park Environment Day	Project Team staff set up an <i>Ask Us About the Future of the Waterfront</i> information station at Councillor Glenn DeBaeremaeker's Environment Day at Thompson Memorial Park to inform community members of the Project and obtain their feedback.	14
September 27, 2016	Centennial College Paint the Town	Project Team and TRCA staff led a group of Centennial College students and instructors on a tour of Bluffer's Park. Participants were provided with a history of Bluffer's Park as well as information about the SWP. Participants were encouraged to participate in the ongoing public consultation process.	20
September 27, 2016	Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods 2020 Summit	Project Team staff set up an <i>Ask Us About the Future of the Waterfront</i> information station at the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy 2020 District Summit to inform community members of the Project and obtain their feedback.	4
October 2, 2016	Highland Creek Salmon Festival	Project Team staff set up an <i>Ask Us About the Future of the Waterfront</i> information station within Morningside Park coinciding with the Highland Creek Salmon Festival to inform community members of the Project and obtain their feedback.	15
July 1-3, 2017	Redpath Waterfront Festival	Project information and bookmarks were displayed at the WRT booth at the festival. WRT manned the booth and provided Project contact information.	24

Table 10-10: Consultation with Community Organizations and Local Residents

Date	Attendee	Purpose
July 15, 2015 & July 29, 2015	Wild Bluffs	Provide an update on Project status and discuss natural environment background information.
February 19, 2016	Lake Ontario Waterkeeper & Two Local Residents	Provide an overview of the Project, discuss PIC#1 and next steps in the Project process.
April 27, 2016	Lake Ontario Waterkeeper	Provide an update on Project status and discuss Stakeholder Committee participation.
August 15, 2016	East Scarborough Storefront	Provide an update on Project and seek feedback/comments.
September 27, 2016	Scarborough Community Renewal Organization and Centennial Community and Recreation Association	Provide an update on Project, specifically the East Segment, and seek feedback/comments.
September 30, 2016	Variety Village	Provide an update on the Project and seek feedback on how best to engage with their community.
October 4, 2016	Toronto Field Naturalists	Provide an update on Project, existing conditions, and historical context of the Study Area, and seek feedback / comments.
October 4, 2016	West Rouge Community Association	Provide an update on Project, specifically the East Segment, and seek feedback/comments.
October 11, 2016	Mature Adult Day	Provide an update on Project and seek feedback/comments.
October 11, 2016	Guildwood Village Community Association	Provide an update on Project and seek feedback/comments.
November 1, 2016	Coronation Community Association of West Hill	Provide an update on Project, specifically the East Segment, and seek feedback/comments.
December 13, 2016	Friends of the Bluffs	Provide an update on Project, specifically the East Segment, and seek feedback/comments.
December 19, 2016	The Wild Bluffs	Provide an update on Project, specifically on the materials to be presented at PIC#2, summary of input received, Project Team activities and next steps.
January 18, 2017	Variety Village	Provide an update on Project, and seek feedback on accessibility.
February 13, 2017	Waterfront Regeneration Trust	Provide an update on Project.
March 29, 2017	Centennial College Environmental Student Society	Provide overview of entire EA process.
April 10, 2017	Friends of the Bluffs	Provide an update on Project, specifically the East Segment along with Project experts, and seek feedback/comments.
May 2, 2017	Toronto Field Naturalists	Provide an update on Project, specifically on natural environment opportunities.
May 12, 2017	Surfing Community	Provide an update on Project, specifically the West Segment, and seek feedback/comments.
June 15, 2017	Surfing Community	Provide an update on Project, specifically on the West Segment of the Refined Preferred Alternative, its relationship to surfing conditions, and future engagement with the surfing community.

For direct community organization meeting summaries, see **Appendix L7**.

10.4.5 Petitions

Throughout Project planning TRCA was made aware of three petitions being circulated with respect to the Project. Each petition is described in the following paragraphs.

The first petition, *Keep our Trail at Water's Edge*, was submitted to TRCA in hard copy to Nancy Gaffney on June 28, 2016 at PIC #2. Additional signatures were added by email following the PIC for a total of 273 signatures. The petition reads as follows:

Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) has initiated a study under the Environmental Assessment Act to create a trail system connecting the Lake Ontario shoreline between Bluffer's Park and East Point Park in eastern Scarborough.

It has always been the vision of the local community to have a truly accessible water's edge experience (bottom of bluff's trail) that would complete a seamless trail system from Bluffers Park in the west to Rouge Beach in the east.

One of their leading proposals is a top of bank (bluffs) option that would require tree removal in East Point Park, interfering with an environmentally sensitive forested and bird habitat area. This option would also severely restrict the community's access to the water's edge.

We have one chance to get this right! We need your support and input to promote and ensure this vision becomes realized.

Please sign our petition and let them know Scarborough East wants a true water's edge trail.

The second petition, *East Point Park and Bluffer's Beach – Keep Our Shorelines Natural*, has not been submitted to TRCA although some members of the public have referenced it in their comments. Also, for a period of time TRCA received emails at regular intervals indicating how many signatures were on the petition; this ceased in mid-2017. In early 2018 the petition was closed. According to the torontonaturalshorelines.com website, 1,029 people signed the petition. It is unclear if any of the signatures are duplicates and where the signatories reside given limited access to the petition information. The petition reads as follows online:

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) is currently planning a major overhaul of about 11 kilometres of the Scarborough waterfront, from Bluffer's Park in the west to East Point Park, near the mouth of Highland Creek. This is a very big decision that has the potential to fundamentally alter the contour and shape of the eastern waterfront, and the way we relate to the lake, for generations to come.

Our primary concern is the preservation of the beaches, ravines and diverse animal species that live along the shore. We are not opposed to people coming down to experience Lake Ontario. What we are opposed to is any development proposal to facilitate access to the

waterfront that will ultimately destroy the delicate ecology of the ravines and sand beaches, limit unobstructed views of the water and/or compromise the remarkably varied wildlife that inhabits the shore and near shore areas.

We support a diversified and balanced waterfront that allows for varied experiences and interactions with Lake Ontario. We hold that the placement of the Waterfront Trail should not supersede the preservation of the remaining beach areas in Scarborough.

Please tell the TRCA that Scarborough's beaches are off-limits. This means that you want the beaches that already exist to remain intact.

The third petition, *Save Lighthouse Surf Break*, has not been submitted to TRCA, however, the SWP team was informed that it existed online. This petition has been referenced in email correspondence by members of the surfing community. The petition is located on activism.com or the savelighthouse.ca website. Based on a review of the petition online, as of May 2018, approximately 311 people have signed the petition. The petition reads as follows online:

Lighthouse surf break at Bluffers Park Toronto is in imminent danger of being destroyed forever. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) will be seeking approval from government bodies (City Council) as early as June of 2017 to approve coastal development in Scarborough, including the development of the Western segment of the Bluffers Park.

As surfers, SUPers and residents, we support Headland Protection and a Bluffers Redevelopment for the enjoyment and safety of everyone. However, the proposed changes to the Western Segment of the Scarborough Waterfront Project will destroy the most unique, high quality SW surf break in the City of Toronto which we call Lighthouse. This piece of the development will also stand to eliminate the SW swell in the Bluffers East Main Beach which is often surfed by the growing numbers of beginner surfers and SUP enthusiasts.

We, the undersigned, ask the TRCA, the Toronto City Council, our MPs and MPPs to work together with the GTA's growing SUP/surf community and reconsider the plans for the Western segment of the Scarborough Waterfront Project so that it can achieve the goals of the project without destroying what many of us consider to be the best quality surf break that the City of Toronto has to offer. We urge the TRCA to work with members of our SUP/surf community on this and other coastal development projects so that these developments can add to our community without destroying what we already have.

10.4.6 Utilities

Utility companies with existing infrastructure in the Study Area were kept apprised of the SWP during the EA. Notifications sent to these utility companies included Project updates and contact information for the Project Team.

Utility companies contacted included:

- Bell Canada
- Enbridge Gas
- Hydro One
- Rogers
- Toronto Hydro

Following the Notice of Commencement, Hydro One advised that the Project was not within its distribution area, and that no further consultation regarding the Project was required. Hydro One was removed from further contact lists. As Toronto Hydro infrastructure is present along Brimley Road, Toronto Hydro was engaged following development of the concept for improvements along Brimley Road (e.g., separated pedestrian and cycling path along the east side of the road). No concerns were raised with regards to the proposed improvements.

Table 10-11 provides an overview of the contact with these companies.

Table 10-11: Consultation with Utilities

Notification	Utilities	Method of Communication	Date
Notice of Commencement and PIC#1	Enbridge Gas Bell Canada Rogers Hydro One	Email	January 7, 2016
Project Update	Toronto Hydro	Email Webinar	February 23, 2017 April 24, 2017
PIC#3	Enbridge Gas Bell Canada Rogers Toronto Hydro	Email	June 14, 2017
Submission of Draft EA	Enbridge Gas Bell Canada Rogers Toronto Hydro	Email	August 17, 2017
Submission of Final EA	Enbridge Gas Bell Canada Rogers Toronto Hydro	Email	June 15, 2018

The Project Team met with Toronto Hydro on April 24, 2017 to provide an overview of the Project, and discuss the relationship between the proposed works along Brimley Road and Toronto Hydro infrastructure in the area. **Appendix L8** provides the meeting materials.

10.4.7 Response to Public Comments

Table 10-12 provides a summary of the comments and concerns received from the public to date through PICs, Stakeholder Committee meetings, direct community engagement initiatives, the Project email and other sources. The table also provides an explanation of how the Project Team has taken the comments received into consideration during Project planning. All comments received during the EA are included in **Appendix L9**.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
Access	Consider maintaining safe access for both cyclists and pedestrians.	Please see Section 2.2. The City and TRCA are required to meet the City's Multi-Use Trail Design Guidelines, which includes safe access for pedestrians, cyclists, and Emergency Services.
	Consider additional access points.	Please see Section 6.2, which details the provision of access to and along the shoreline.
	More people having access to the area is not necessarily a good thing.	Comment noted. TRCA and the City of Toronto cannot control the number of people accessing the shoreline; however, how the shoreline is accessed can be managed.
	Access should be given to the bottom of the Bluffs.	Please see Section 6.2, which details the provision of access to and along the shoreline.
	How can one get down the Bluffs from Guild Park?	Please see Section 6.2. The existing informal construction access route will be formalized.
	Consider a gondola/funicular/etc.	Comment noted.
	Consider an access point at Guild Inn and Park. It is currently steep and dangerous.	Please see Section 6.2. Changes to access at the Guild Park and Gardens were investigated, but were found to be unfeasible.
	Consider paving Doris McCarthy Trail.	Please see Section 6.2.
	Consider no access to the waterfront off Greyabbey Trail.	Alternative access through Grey Abbey Ravine was investigated, but was deemed unfeasible.
	Consider improving access down Beechgrove Drive.	Please see Section 6.2. Improving access down the Beechgrove Drive extension was investigated and deemed unfeasible.
	Consider limiting public access.	Comment noted.
	Consider alternate modes of access down to Bluffs (TTC, shuttle, water taxi, etc.).	The City of Toronto recognizes the existing congestion issues at Bluffer's Park and is exploring alternate modes of access outside of the SWP.
	Boat clubs are concerned with increased public access.	Comment noted.
	Consider access by car.	It is not within the mandate of TRCA to provide private vehicle access.
	Consider clearer public access points and connections to Bluffs.	The City of Toronto is undertaking a wayfinding strategy outside of the SWP.
Consider emergency access throughout.	Please see Section 6.2. Provision of a multi-use trail includes provision for Emergency Services access.	
Consider access that does not impact nearby neighbourhoods.	Please see Section 7.3.4. Where possible, a formal multi-use trail has been provided along the water's edge.	

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Does access need to be given 24/7?	Operations and maintenance of the new park space will be the responsibility of the City of Toronto.
	Consider shoreline access.	Please see Section 6.2, which details the provision of access to and along the shoreline.
	Consider providing additional access will cause negative impacts (garbage, climate change, etc.).	An Operations and Maintenance Plan will be developed during Detailed Design in collaboration with the City of Toronto.
	Access points are still not clear – can you provide further information on what it will look like?	Please see Section 6.2.
	Can access realistically be granted to accommodate a multi-use trail along a shoreline that is currently narrow?	Please see Section 6.2. Shoreline protection structures will extend far enough into the lake such that a multi-use trail can be constructed outside the risk line.
	Consider access into the water (not just to the shoreline).	Section 7.3.3 assesses how the Preferred Alternative changes the use of the shoreline. The cobble beaches will still permit access into the water.
	Consider alternate route for cyclists (not along the shoreline to lessen/remove impact to current shoreline).	An alternate route for cyclists is not possible; however, where possible, a separated trail will be explored during Detailed Design.
	Consider naturalized access routes similar to Doris McCarthy Trail.	See Section 6.2 for consideration of alternate access points.
	Consider sound barrier along the Brimley Road access route that border residential areas.	Operation of the future path, including a potential sound barrier adjacent to residential properties, is the responsibility of the City of Toronto, and may be explored with the City as part of Detailed Design.
Accessibility (AODA)	Consider accessibility so all can access the trail safely.	Please see Section 7.3. Where feasible, City of Toronto primary to high-capacity multi-use trail standards will be achieved, which meet or exceed minimum requirements for accessibility.
	Consider accessibility along Beechgrove Drive.	Please see Section 6.2. Unfortunately, grade changes to the Beechgrove Drive extension were not feasible without considerable impacts to the surrounding area.
	Consider accessibility at the top of Bluffs in the East Segment.	See Section 6.2. Where feasible, City of Toronto primary to high-capacity multi-use trail standards will be achieved, which meet or exceed minimum requirements for accessibility.
	Is accessibility achievable in all areas of the Bluffs without changing the characteristic of the Bluffs?	Please see Section 6.2. For detailed discussion for where and how accessibility is possible.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider placing the trail along Copperfield Road for those who require an accessible trail in the East Segment.	Please see Section 5.4.4. The alignment along Copperfield Road was considered as part of the “Do Nothing” Alternative.
	Consider a trail surface that is accessible.	Where feasible, City of Toronto primary to high-capacity multi-use trail standards will be achieved, which meet or exceed minimum requirements for accessibility.
	Consider protecting natural beach and accessibility.	Please see Section 7.3. Throughout Project planning, careful consideration was given to the provision of the accessibility and protection of Bluffer’s Park Beach and other sandy shorelines.
	Consider a fully accessible trail from Bluffer's Park to East Point Park.	Please see Section 6.2. Where feasible, City of Toronto primary to high capacity multi-use trail standards will be achieved, which meet or exceed minimum requirements for accessibility.
	Consider accessible parking at the access routes.	Operations and maintenance of the new park space will be the responsibility of the City of Toronto.
	Consider that accessibility does not need to be considered in all areas of the Project Area.	Please see Section 6.2. The City of Toronto and TRCA policies require that we examine accessibility throughout the Project Area. The SWP mandate is to consider opportunities to provide access to the water's edge throughout the Study Area, where feasible, in accordance with the City of Toronto Official Plan and TRCA's The Living City Policies.
	Consider consulting with Variety Village.	See Section 10.4. Variety Village has been consulted.
	Disagree that residents opposing Project should be viewed as selfish to want to keep it to themselves and not support use of the area by all people at varying levels of mobility.	Comment noted.
	Consider accessibility without impacting natural features of the Bluffs.	Please see Section 7.3. Throughout Project planning, careful consideration was given to the provision of accessibility and protection of the natural environment.
	Will access routes be accessible?	Please Section 6.2. Where feasible, City of Toronto primary to high-capacity multi-use trail standards will be achieved, which meet or exceed minimum requirements for accessibility.
Beach	Consider preserving as much beach as possible considering all opportunities are explored.	Please see Section 6.2 and Section 7.3. Throughout the identification and evaluation of Alternatives, trade-offs between the preservation of Bluffer’s Park Beach and other sandy shorelines, and achieving Project Objectives, were evaluated.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	What criteria are needed to acquire an additional Blue Flag Beach status?	Detailed Criteria are available at www.blueflag.global .
	A revetment would eliminate the current shoreline experience of the Bluffs in the East Segment.	Please see Section 5.4.4, which details the evaluation of the revetment option and its impact on the shoreline experience.
	Will the beach at Bluffer's Park be designated as a Blue Flag beach?	The beach at Bluffer's Park is currently designated as a Blue Flag Beach and it is not anticipated to change as a result of this Project.
	Consider using the sand dredged from Bluffer's Park to fill the beach at Cudia Bluff.	Opportunities to use dredged material have been examined. Please see Section 6.1.1 or 6.2.1.
	Consider beaches that are swimmable.	The City of Toronto designates swimmable beaches.
	Consider not having a beach that is swimmable.	The City of Toronto designates swimmable beaches.
	Do not consider hardened beaches (e.g. revetments, headlands); instead soft sand beaches.	In order to provide toe erosion protection in an open coast environment, hardened structures are required at various points of the Project Area.
	Consider removal of rebar embedded in concrete along the shoreline.	Please see Section 6.1. Areas of historic shoreline protection works which utilized old concrete will be covered to enhance habitat opportunities. TRCA also has an annual monitoring program that inspects these areas and cuts rebar that becomes visible over the winter.
	Construct a stone wall 100 m offshore at East Segment to protect the beach and provide a protected water recreation area.	This Alternative was not considered as it would not achieve the Project Vision and Objectives, and would have high costs.
	Consider habitat creation along the beach.	Please see Section 6.2.2 and Section 7.3.1. An Objective of this Project is to protect and enhance terrestrial and aquatic natural features and linkages.
Boat Dock / Launch / Marina	Consider a marina/canoe launch within the East Segment.	A formalized marina/canoe launch was not considered because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potentially unsafe lake conditions for small motorized boats. ▪ Unsuitable for large motorized and sail boats. ▪ Paddle craft do not require a formal launch facility. ▪ Potential to impact Highland Creek Waste Water Treatment Plant truck traffic operations. ▪ Potential to impact local water quality. ▪ Other launch facilities available close by.
	A boat launch was previously approved. Why is it not being considered now?	Please note a boat launch has not been previously approved for East Point Park.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider having a boat launch in the West Segment.	There is an existing boat launch in Bluffer's Park. No additional boat launch opportunities have been identified as part of the Preferred Alternative.
	To accommodate the loss of the Marina in Frenchman's Bay, one should be considered at the Guild.	The marina at Frenchman's Bay is not being lost to the best of our knowledge.
	Support how the headland option in the West Segment will decrease the amount of dredging required at the current entrance of the Marina.	Comment noted.
	Consider a boat launch at the Guild Inn and Park construction road.	A formalized marina/canoe launch is not a part of the Preferred Alternative. Vehicular access will not be provided at the Guild Park and Gardens to the water.
Brimley Road	Consider safe access down Brimley Road (for pedestrians, cyclists, cars).	Please see Section 6.2 for proposed changes to Brimley Road access.
	Consider a crosswalk along Brimley Road.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for providing cross walks.
	Consider that Brimley Road is priority one in terms of creating a safe pathway for pedestrians/cyclists.	Improvements to Brimley Road have been proposed; please see Section 6.2.
	Consider that speed bumps are not suitable for cyclists along Brimley Road.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps.
By-Law Enforcement	Consider by-law enforcement along the entire Scarborough Bluffs.	Operations and maintenance of the new park space will be the responsibility of the City of Toronto.
Climate Change	Consider with increased access, there will be an increase impact on Climate Change effects in the area.	The Project and the recreational use of the area will not create measurable impacts to climate change.
	Consider climate change should not be planned for.	Provincial EA guidance requires TRCA to consider climate change as part of project planning.
	Consider climate change impacts for all Alternatives.	The effects of climate change on the Project have been considered.
Community Involvement	Consider inviting local community groups to assist with the implementation phase.	Comment noted.
Comment on Alternative	Central Segment: consider tableland trail east of Guild Inn Park & Gardens.	The existing Waterfront Trail is on the tablelands in this area and has been considered as part of the 'Do Nothing' Alternative in Sections 5.3 and 5.4.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	East Segment: Why can't the sandy shoreline be left as is at the bottom of Grey Abbey Park?	Shoreline protection structures are required at the bottom of Grey Abbey Park as the roadway and associated infrastructure is at risk from erosion within the planning timeframe of the Project.
	Consider additional Alternatives.	Comment noted.
	Consider classifying this proposed trail as the waterfront trail.	Comment noted. It is anticipated that the proposed trail will become part of the Waterfront Trail.
	Consider connection to Rouge Park.	Comment noted. The trail will connect to the Port Union Waterfront Trail, which connects to the Rouge Park.
	Consider a water's edge trail connecting the waterfront park at Beechgrove.	The trail will proceed along the top of the Bluffs through East Point Park and connect to the existing Port Union Waterfront Trail at Beechgrove Drive.
	Consider current waterfront trail location.	The current Waterfront Trail location has been considered as part of the Alternatives in Chapter 5.
	Consider decommissioning unofficial trails.	Please see Section 6.2.2 and 7.3.1.
	Consider doing nothing.	Comment noted. Please see Chapter 5 for the consideration of the Alternatives.
	Consider future needs.	Please see Chapter 3.
	Consider improving the Doris McCarthy trail with limited impact to natural environment.	Please see Section 6.2.
	Consider improving/protecting Grey Abbey Ravine.	Comment noted.
	Consider incorporating sand beaches wherever possible.	Comment noted.
	Consider Kingston Road as a trail location.	Please see Chapter 5 for the consideration of the Alternatives.
	Consider lookouts/views/vistas.	Comment noted.
	Consider maintaining natural look.	Comment noted.
	Consider natural shoreline work that still gives access to the lake.	Please see Chapter 5 for the consideration of the Alternatives.
	Consider not providing a continuous trail connection.	Please see Chapter 5 for the consideration of the Alternatives.
	Support of continuous shoreline trail.	Comment noted.
	Consider placing trail at top of Bluffs.	Please see Chapter 5 for the consideration of the Alternatives.
	Consider a trail similar to Port Union.	Please see Section 6.2 for a description of the Preferred Alternative.
	Consider a trail different to Port Union (with the Scarborough Bluffs as iconic feature).	Please see Section 6.2 for a description of the Preferred Alternative.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider trail connectivity beyond Study Area.	The Project provides better connectivity to the Port Union trail network to the east.
	Consider not paving shoreline for a parking lot.	No parking lots are proposed along the shoreline.
	Consider that hardened shorelines are not good for wildlife.	Please see Section 7.3.1 for the assessment of positive and negative effects to the ecological system. The SWP results in a positive change for the aquatic and terrestrial ecology of the area.
	Consider that hardened structures create barriers to access the water.	Access to the water will still be available in several areas such as Bluffer's Park Beach and the cobble beaches proposed to the east. Refer to Section 7.3.3, the Project results in 3,200 m of shoreline with formal, direct access to the water.
	Consider there is no need for shoreline works.	The 'Do Nothing' Alternative was considered for all Segments in Chapter 5.
	Consider that hardened structures don't stand against mother nature.	During flooding and high water levels in Spring 2017, the headland beach structures along the Toronto shoreline withstood mother nature best and prevented costly damage and dangerous conditions.
	Consider planning for high lake levels.	All Project planning has been based on the 100-year high water levels.
	Consider that human intervention is not feasible/workable.	The 'Do Nothing' Alternative was considered for all Segments in Chapter 5.
	Consider that the outcome of this Project will bring increased traffic (people who want to get to the Bluffs) to the area that will not be supported by the infrastructure created. This will lead to more pollution, disturbance, etc.	Neither the City nor TRCA can control the number of people accessing the shoreline. People will come with or without the Project. The SWP provides for the management of this use to minimize problems from unmanaged use.
	Consider that the public does not want this Project.	Comment noted. EAs seek public input to Project decision-making, and a range of comments have been received. All comments have been considered.
	Consider wave model for Refined Preferred Alternative.	Refer to Appendix K. A wave model was undertaken for the West Segment.
	Consider 2012 resolution made at TRCA's Authority Board to make improvements to Waterfront Trail along Copperfield Road.	A study was undertaken to review potential trail alignments along Copperfield Road. The results of the study indicated that a trail was not possible in this area. A follow-up report was not finalized as the works quickly indicated that a trail was not possible in this area.
	Do not support the Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	Consider ending the trail at Morningside Avenue.	Shoreline protection works are required at the bottom of Grey Abbey Park as the roadway and associated infrastructure is at risk from erosion within the planning timeframe of the Project.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Appreciate the changes, but still not enough.	Comment noted.
	Consider not formalizing path in East Point Park.	The trail through East Point Park must be formalized to manage use and minimize the impact to vegetation communities of concern caused by informal trails and inappropriate uses.
	Consider that connectivity from the Central to East Segments is not needed.	Shoreline protection works are required at the bottom of Grey Abbey Park as the roadway and associated infrastructure is at risk from erosion within the planning timeframe of the Project.
	Consider that East Point Park is a bird sanctuary and should not be disturbed.	The impact on birds has been assessed; please see Section 7.3.1.
	Consider that the trail will be impacted shortly after built with events like high lake levels.	The trail will be built to withstand high lake levels and adverse coastal conditions.
	Save money by not doing Project.	Comment noted.
	The Refined Preferred Alternative meets the plans as set out in previous planning reports (i.e. Master Plan, Waterfront Regeneration Plan principles, etc.).	Comment noted.
	Reconsider the stone revetment to save the popular surf break.	Alternatives for the West Segment were evaluated in Section 5.4.2.
	Do not consider hardening of existing sandy beach.	Please see Section 5.4. Throughout the identification and evaluation of Alternatives, trade-offs between the preservation of Bluffer's Park Beach and other sandy shorelines, and achieving Project Objectives, were evaluated.
	How will the trail connection to the Port Union trail be made?	Section 6.2 details the location of the trail connection to the Port Union trail near Beechgrove Drive.
	Opposition to Preliminary Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	Support for overall Preliminary Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	Support of the Project and acknowledgement of challenges.	Comment noted.
	The current waterfront trail location is dangerous.	Comment noted.
	Support EA and proposed Project and agree with the combination of Alternatives presented.	Comment noted.
	What are the impacts of a headland-beach structure?	Section 7.3 details the positive and negative effects associated with the Preferred Alternative, which includes the headland beach structure.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	East Segment: Consider alternate route that will leave sand beach.	See Section 5.4.4.
	East Segment: Consider Do Nothing.	See Section 5.4.4.
	East Segment: Consider that if a section of the trail is narrow and bordered by fencing, that it would be reasonable/acceptable if it protects the sandy shoreline.	Comment noted.
	Consider installing a raised boardwalk along beach at East Point Park.	Comment noted. Softer shoreline treatments such as boardwalks are not possible along East Point Park as waves often reach the toe of the Bluffs, so this type of treatment is likely to be damaged or washed away.
	East Segment: Consider keeping current trail location.	Comment noted.
	East Segment: Consider keeping East Point Park natural/leave as is.	Comment noted.
	East Segment: Consider not having the trail run through East Point Park.	Comment noted.
	East Segment: Support for Preliminary Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	East Segment: Will the proposed trail location be near the Metrolinx tracks?	Please see Chapter 6.
	East Segment: Will the public be able to access the sand beach?	Please see Chapter 6.
	Opposition to Central and East Segment Alternatives.	Comment noted.
	Project seeks balance in maintaining unique characteristic of the Bluffs while also meeting the five Project Objectives.	Comment noted.
	Reconsider asphalt surface for trail.	The surface of the trail will be determined in Detailed Design.
	Support of Overall Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	West Segment: Consider improving surfing conditions at Bluffer's Park.	TRCA will continue to work with the surfing community during Detailed Design.
	West Segment: Consider surfing conditions/community at Bluffer's Park.	TRCA will continue to work with the surfing community during Detailed Design.
	West Segment: Support of Project.	Comment noted.
	West Segment: Consider Do Nothing.	Comment noted. See Section 5.4.2.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	West Segment: Consider bridge to make connection to Meadowcliffe.	See Section 5.4.2.
	West Segment: Consider top of Bluffs connection.	A connection along the top of the Bluffs was not considered, as the access issues in this Segment are along the shoreline. The public are currently trying to access east of the Bluffer's Park Beach, where risk to public safety exists.
	West Segment: How will the trail be connected to Meadowcliffe?	Please see Section 6.2.
	West Segment: Support of Preliminary Preferred Alternative.	Comment noted.
	What is the full rationale for the proposed hardening of the sand beach in the Central and East segments?	Shoreline protection structures are required at the bottom of Grey Abbey Park as the roadway and associated infrastructure is at risk from erosion within the planning timeframe of the Project.
	It has always been the vision of the local community to have a truly accessible water's edge experience (bottom of bluff's trail) that would complete a seamless trail system from Bluffers Park in the west to Rouge Beach in the east. One of the proposals is a top of bank (bluffs) option that would require tree removal in East Point Park, interfering with an environmentally sensitive forested and bird habitat area. This option would also severely restrict the community's access to the water's edge.	Please see Chapter 5 for the evaluation of Alternatives.
Construction & Implementation	Consider impacts to wildlife during construction.	Please see Section 7.3.1.
	Consider limited construction access along Guildwood Parkway.	Please see Section 6.4.
	Consider Clean Equipment Protocol during construction.	The use of Clean Equipment Protocol is standard practice for the TRCA.
	Concern regarding construction (materials, method, staging, trucks, etc.).	Please see Section 6.4.
	Consider monitoring post construction on water quality.	The City of Toronto is responsible for water quality monitoring at their intake locations.
	Consider infrastructure impacts during construction.	Please see Section 7.3.
	How will materials be brought down to the shoreline during construction?	Please see Section 6.4.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Request for detailed construction plans to show angles of sandbanks to assess production of surfing waves.	This information will not be available until Detailed Design is completed.
	Consider construction that moves east to west (not west to east).	Comment noted.
	Consider other construction initiatives in the Guildwood area to lessen impact on local neighbourhood.	The effects of other projects has been assessed; please see Section 7.3.4.
	Consider impacts that construction will have on wildlife (i.e. noise, etc.).	Please see Section 7.3.1.
	What is the construction timeline?	The Project will take approximately 12 years to construct.
Consultation	Consider incorporating public feedback into the Alternatives.	Please see Chapter 10. Public comments have played a role in the identification and evaluation of Alternatives.
	What does 'agency input' mean?	Please see Chapter 10.
	Consider engaging with all stakeholders (TTC, Parks & Recreation, safety, etc.)	Please see Chapter 10.
	Support for EA process.	Comment noted.
	Encourage community participation with advance warning.	Comment noted.
	Consider hosting additional events about the Project.	Comment noted. Please see Chapter 10.
	Consider making presented information more accessible.	Comment noted.
	Consider plan submitted by the public.	Comment noted. See sensitivity analysis in Appendix G.
	Resident's summary of the PIC#3, stating people were not asking relevant questions, but rather grandstanding. Also thanked the support of local Councillors and their attendance.	Comment noted.
	Consider additional consultation.	Additional consultation will occur during Detailed Design if the EA is approved.
	Consider making all comments received on the Project public.	All comments received are provided in Appendix L9.
	Consider not having public meetings at the end of the school season.	Comment noted.
	Consider that you are only checking off consultation activities to get them done.	Comment noted.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Recommend that at the public meeting attendees write down questions for the facilitator to read in an effort to extend respect to the panel team, politicians and all others taking their time to meet with the public.	Comment noted.
	Note the petition with some 1000 signatures of people who want to save the beach.	TRCA has been informed of this petition; however, it has not yet been submitted.
	Support that political members were present at public meeting.	Comment noted.
	Public meeting was taken over by public with one-sided view.	Comment noted.
	Thanks for the transparency used in sharing information and excited for the outcome.	Comment noted.
Development	Do not allow development to occur, only recreational opportunities.	This Project includes long-term protection for public infrastructure and recreational opportunities, not development.
	Will the Project help facilitate development along the Scarborough Bluffs later on?	This Project is mandated to provide for protection for public infrastructure and recreational opportunities.
Ecology	Consider educating users to limit impact to wildlife.	This is beyond the mandate of the Project. TRCA does however, provide stewardship opportunities.
	Consider Bank Swallow habitat.	Bank Swallow habitat has been an important consideration. Please see Section 7.3.1.
	Consider current sand beach is of ecological value.	The impacts to the entire ecological system are detailed in Section 7.3.1.
	What terrestrial/aquatic communities will be impacted/removed?	The impacts to the entire ecological system are detailed in Section 7.3.1.
	Consider posting habitat crossing signs where appropriate to protect wildlife from vehicles/cyclists.	This will be considered during Detailed Design.
	Consider less vegetation along the path.	Trail maintenance is the responsibility of the City of Toronto and will be done in accordance with their appropriate guidelines and requirements.
	Consider vegetation removal.	See Section 7.3.1, which details vegetation removal as a result of Project implementation.
	Consider methods to increase wildlife to the area (i.e. bat boxes, wetlands, etc.). Also how will they be maintained post installation?	Please see Section 7.3.1 for habitat enhancement opportunities.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	How will impacts of increased traffic be mitigated to protect the ecological diversity of the Bluffs?	Please see Section 7.3.1. By provision of managed access opportunities, it is anticipated that the impacts to ecological diversity to those access areas will be mitigated.
	What are the aquatic benefits of a headland system?	Please see Section 7.3.1.
	How will invasive species be managed?	Invasive species will be managed in accordance with City of Toronto and TRCA policies.
	Consider making improvements to aquatic habitat.	Comment noted. An improvement to aquatic habitat is one of the Project Objectives and is considered throughout Project planning.
	Consider sediment control at Bluffer's Park.	Comment noted. Please see Section 6.2. The Preferred Alternative will limit sediment accumulation in the harbour entrance.
	Which natural heritage communities will be affected by the Project?	Please see Section 7.3.1 for detailing of how ecology will be positively and negatively impacted by the Project.
	What are the species found in the Study Area?	Please see Section 3.2.
	Consider wildlife access to the water.	See Section 5.4. The ability of each Alternative to permit wildlife to access water was assessed.
	Consider habitat enhancement, protection, and creation.	Habitat protection takes many forms. Within urban areas, human effects to habitat are often managed as appropriate response to provide for habitat protection. Section 7.3.1 details how habitat will be negatively and positively impacted by this Project.
	Consider limited tree removal at East Point Park.	Comment noted. Please see Section 7.3.1.
	Consider balance between habitat loss and meeting accessibility standards.	Comment noted.
	Consider habitat restoration in addition to improving fish habitat.	Habitat restoration is a part of improving fish habitat.
	Consider incorporating what is documented in the 2012 TRCA report that calls for protecting the natural heritage system.	The 2012 report was a background study focused only on the terrestrial ecological character of the area and not long-term solutions for access to and along the waterfront. This report was used as background into the EA.
	Consider offshore break walls to improve fish habitat.	Comment noted.
	Support for the Project in terms of promoting environment for wildlife.	Comment noted.
	Consider enhancing terrestrial and aquatic linkages.	Comment noted.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Vegetation blocks views of the lake.	Comment noted.
	Consider further naturalization at East Point Park.	Further naturalization at East Point Park will be considered as comprehensively as part of a future Revitalization Plan to be prepared at a later date.
	Consider mitigating wildlife disturbance from increased public access at East Point Park.	Generally, the wildlife found in East Point Park are accustomed to disturbances associated with living in an urban area. Further mitigation will be considered as part of a future Revitalization Plan to be prepared at a later date.
	Consider preserving the natural environment.	Comment noted. Improvements to the natural environment is one of the Project Objectives being considered throughout Project planning.
	How are habitats going to be protected?	Please see Section 6.2 and 7.3.1.
	Consider weighing preserving the natural environment more than creating a waterfront trail.	Comment noted.
	What areas are being kept natural?	Please see Section 6.2 and 7.3.1.
Erosion	Consider erosion solutions that are natural.	Comment noted.
	Educate public on the erosion of the Bluffs.	Comment noted.
	Erosion controls are not required/should not be considered at East Point Park.	See Section 6.2. Erosion controls at East Point Park are not part of the Preferred Alternative.
	Slumping is a major concern of the cliffs falling. This should be addressed.	Comment noted.
	If the bank is stabilized, will more construction take place on top?	Construction applications are considered through a separate process.
	Why is it okay for the erosion process to continue along the East Segment? (Why is it now okay to have the sand beach extended longer if erosion isn't being considered)?	Along the East Segment, east of Grey Abbey Ravine, public infrastructure is not at risk from erosion within the planning timeframe for the Project (approximately 60 years). While park land is at risk, this was considered an acceptable trade-off.
	Consider erosion to protect homes.	The SWP does not consider erosion protection for private property.
	Observation of damage as a result of Spring/Summer highwater levels and subsequent erosion to the bluffs near Grey Abbey appears that there is erosion in areas of shoreline stabilization, however no erosion observed at the Grey Abbey beach.	Landslides have occurred along the entire Bluffs including Grey Abbey. The erosion in areas with existing shoreline protection works was anticipated as part of crest migration until the bluff reaches a stable slope.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider already completed erosion control measures for private properties along the Bluffs.	Comment noted.
	Erosion benefits wildlife.	Comment noted.
	Does vegetation help protect the cliffs from eroding?	Vegetation assists once the slope has stabilized.
ESAs / ANSIs / Species Protection	Consider protecting the bird observation in East Point Park.	Comment noted.
	Consider protecting Bank Swallow habitat.	Please see Section 7.3.1.
	Consider mitigating species impacts.	See Section 7.3.1.
	There are designated ANSI and ESA within the Project Area.	Comment noted. See Section 3.2.1.5.
	How will public access affect ESAs?	The public is currently accessing the ESAs within the Project Study Area. See Section 2.5.3
	Consider limiting public access in protected areas.	The SWP is seeking to manage existing public access in ESAs and ANSIs to minimize damage.
	Increased public access will negatively impact sensitive areas.	The SWP is seeking to manage existing public access in ESAs and ANSIs to minimize damage.
Evaluation of Alternatives	Who does the evaluation?	The evaluation was undertaken by the Project Team which includes staff from TRCA and the consulting team. The results were presented for review by the City of Toronto and interested Stakeholders in June 2016.
	Support for Effects Assessment Criteria.	Comment noted.
	Opposition to evaluation.	Comment noted.
	Support for evaluation.	Comment noted.
	Reconsider the evaluation so that "most preferred" isn't as common as it currently is.	Comment noted.
	Consider relevant reports as part of the evaluation (i.e. ESA/ANSI, TRCA 2012 Report, Toronto's Waterfront and the Sustainable City, etc.).	Comment noted. All of these reports have been considered.
Existing Conditions	Public often climbs down the Bluffs.	Please see Section 2.5. It is this informal access which the SWP is seeking to address.
	Bluffer's Park Beach sees a lot of disturbance (garbage, traffic, etc.) with the current ability to access it. Do not want to see the same thing occur within the East Segment.	Comment noted.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Boulders have rolled down the Bluffs.	Comment noted.
	The shoreline at East Point Park is currently accessible.	Please see Section 3.3. The shoreline at East Point Park is currently not accessible. Those informally accessing this section of the shoreline are causing damage to sensitive bluff vegetation, potentially trespassing along private property, and/or putting themselves at risk from bluff failure and coastal processes.
	The public currently uses the construction road indicating the demand for a trail.	Agreed. Please see Section 6.2.
	Consider stormwater outfalls.	Comment noted.
	Consider managing trail use so that it is respected by all users.	Operations and maintenance of the new park space will be the responsibility of the City of Toronto.
	Consider safety of landslides.	Risk to public safety is an Objective of the SWP. Existing risk to public safety from bluff failure was considered in the development and evaluation of Alternatives.
	Consider impacts of harsh water conditions along the shore.	All Alternatives have been developed and assessed considering coastal conditions.
	Consider improving state of current wetlands (Bluffer's Park).	Comment noted.
	Consider improving previous shoreline protection works along Study Area.	Comment noted. Please See Section 6.2.
Funding / Cost	Consider current and future maintenance cost as part of the evaluation.	Comment noted.
	Consider funding for park maintenance/by-law enforcement.	City of Toronto is responsible for maintenance and by-law enforcement.
	Provide cost breakdown (construction costs, maintenance costs).	See Section 7.3.5.
	Consider cost/funding sources.	Comment noted.
	Consider directing funding to City needs (i.e. not trail).	The City of Toronto is responsible for directing funds.
	Consider multiple revenue sources.	Comment noted.
	What is the cost difference of the current Alternative at the East Segment compared to having the trail along the entire bottom of the Bluffs?	Relative costs are provided in Section 5.4.4.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Request for costing breakdown for public meetings, consultant fees and report preparation.	Capital costs have been provided in Section 7.3.5.
	Are tipping fees a source of funding?	TRCA projects typically explore tipping fees to offset expenses associated with Project construction. Where possible, tipping fees are received, but they are not a significant source of funding.
	Concern that budget presented will increase dramatically later on.	Comment noted.
	Consider that this Project is a waste of taxpayers' dollars.	Comment noted.
	How will the Project be funded?	The Project will be looking for funding from all levels of government.
Management	Consider planning for increased usage of the trail.	Project planning has been undertaken considering future conditions including increased usage.
	Consider planning for future needs/environment.	Project planning has been undertaken considering future conditions.
Mandate	Consider TRCA's mandate to conserve.	See Chapter 2.
	What is the driver/purpose of this Project?	See Chapter 2.
Materials	Consider a smooth trail surface.	The multi-use trail must be paved or hardened in accordance with City Guidelines.
	Consider a natural trail surface.	The multi-use trail must be paved or hardened in accordance with City Guidelines.
	Concern regarding safety of infill material.	All infill material must meet MOECC's <i>Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario</i> (2011).
	Considered granular material rather than asphalt in construction of multi-use path to promote infiltration.	The surface material for the trail will be determined during Detailed Design.
	Consider materials that have a long duration life.	Comment noted.
	Consider eco-friendly materials.	Comment noted.
	Consider materials that do not require ongoing maintenance.	Comment noted.
	What material will be used to fill in the beach?	See Section 6.2. Depending on the beach location, beach fill may be comprised of dredged sand, imported sand, and sand naturally deposited.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
Miscellaneous	Promote economic interests.	Comment noted.
	Consider classifying the Bluffs as a World Heritage site.	It is unlikely that the Bluffs will qualify as a World Heritage site. An application would be need to be prepared and submitted by Parks Canada.
	Consider nearby residential homes.	See Section 7.3.4. Affects to nearby homes have been considered.
	What is the history of the Bluffs?	See Chapter 3.
	Consider meaningful interaction between trail users and natural environment	Comment noted.
	Consider cultural heritage.	See Section 7.3.4.
	Consider international waterfront projects.	Comment noted.
	How do occurrences like the spring/summer 2017 high lake levels impact the Project planning and implementation?	The SWP is being planned to be resilient to high lake levels. Analysis of the Spring 2017 lake levels, which exceeded recorded high water levels, will be part of Detailed Design to ensure the Project is resilient.
	Consider employment and tourism opportunities.	Comment noted.
	Consider sustainable development options (i.e. solar).	Comment noted.
Other Initiatives	Consider coordinating with Metrolinx.	Comment noted. Metrolinx has been engaged with throughout the EA process.
	What is the future plan for GO Train service in the Study Area?	Information on the Metrolinx Lakeshore East rail corridor expansion (Don River to Scarborough) is available on their website.
	How will the GO Train expansion Project impact this Project?	The rail corridor expansion may constrain the off-road portion of the Waterfront Trail in the vicinity of Grey Abbey Ravine and will constrain the on-road portion as the frequency of trains every 7 minutes will make trail/rail crossings difficult.
	Consider that the GO Train expansion does not need to impact the current Waterfront Trail (does not need to displace the trail).	Comment noted.
	Consider 1989 East Point Park Master Plan.	The 1989 East Point Park Master Plan/EA was drafted but never submitted for approval due to changing policies.
	What was the purpose of the previous construction works at the base of Meadowcliffe?	Previous erosion protection structures along the Central Segment were implemented to address high priority areas at risk from erosion.
	Consider coordination with City of Toronto departments.	Appropriate City departments have been consulted with.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
Park Amenities	Consider access to view ship wreck (diving).	Comment noted.
	Consider incorporating washroom facilities along the trail.	Comment noted. Compostable washrooms may be investigated during Detailed Design.
	Consider adequate lighting along the trail.	In general, it is not anticipated the trail will have night-time lighting, or be maintained through the winter months.
	Consider building sport facilities.	There is not adequate space for sports facilities along the shoreline.
	Consider creating art/nature walk.	Comment noted.
	Consider creating a water park.	This is not within the Objectives of the Project.
	Consider placing picnic areas along the trail.	Comment noted.
	Consider incorporating smart technology to access information along the trail.	Comment noted.
	Consider access for dogs.	The City of Toronto by-laws permit dogs on-leash on multi-use trails.
	Consider off-leash access for dogs.	The City of Toronto by-laws permit dogs on-leash on multi-use trails. Programming will be further explored by the City of Toronto.
	Consider skating facility.	This is not within the Objectives of the Project.
	Consider fishing nodes.	Fishing is only permitted where it is signed and by those who have a valid license from the MNRF. A fishing node has been constructed at the Bluffer's Park boat launch area.
	Consider an interpretative station along the trail.	Comment noted.
	Consider limiting fishing.	Fishing is only permitted where it is signed and by those who have a valid license from the MNRF. Designated areas will be posted by the City of Toronto to reduce user conflicts.
	Consider placing benches along the trail.	Comment noted.
	Consider canoe/kayak launch.	A canoe/kayak launch currently exists at the Bluffer's Park boat launch area. The use of the cobble/sand will provide for additional informal access points for canoes/kayaks/etc.
Consider boat marina.	A formalized marina/canoe launch is not a part of the Preferred Alternative. However, that does not preclude the use of the cobble/sand as an informal access point for canoes/kayaks/etc.	

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider year round trail access.	The City of Toronto is responsible for the opening and closing of parks. In general, it is not anticipated the trail will have night-time lighting, or be maintained through the winter months.
	Consider quiet/nature escape nodes.	Comment noted.
	Consider multi-use trails.	One of the Objectives of the SWP was to provide a primary to high-capacity multi-use trail.
	Consider incorporating water recreational activities.	The Preferred Alternative allows for the continued informal use of the area for water-based recreation, such as non-motorized watercraft and swimming in appropriate areas.
	Consider surfing conditions at Bluffer's Park.	Comment noted. See Section 7.3.3. TRCA has committed to continue to work with the surfing community during Detailed Design to try to minimize changes to surfing conditions.
Parking	Consider increase in parking spaces.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for how parking lots are used.
	Consider free parking.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for how parking lots are used.
	Remove parking lot at Bluffer's Park and put at the top of the hill on the Seminary property. Provide access from the parking lot to the park via gondola, sidewalk or train. The area is too special to have parking lots.	The City is looking for all ways to decrease the amount of cars going to Bluffer's Park, including public transit. The Seminary lands are private property.
	Consider limiting parking spaces.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for how parking lots are used.
	Consider parking for those who wish to bring their boats down to the lake.	The City of Toronto has responsibility for how parking lots are used.
Private Landowners	Consider full public access along the entire shore.	The SWP lays the groundwork for any acquisition of private lands to allow for full public access along the entire shore.
	How is private property going to be transferred to public ownership?	Any transfer of private property can only be considered once the EA has been approved.
	Consider current property owners tranquil experience.	Comment noted.
	Consider construction impacts to local residents.	Comment noted. Please see Section 7.3.4.
Process	Consider speeding up process.	Comment noted.
	Consider limiting potential Alternatives.	Comment noted.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Why are staff/consultants allowed to work on the Project if they have not been to the Bluffs? (How can they understand the uniqueness to protect if they haven't been there?)	All staff working on the Project have been to the publicly accessible portions of the Bluffs. TRCA does not allow staff or consultants to access private property without landowners' permission. All sections of the shoreline have also been viewed by boat from the water.
	What is the implementation process?	See Chapter 2.
	Consider engaging with appropriate experts.	Appropriate experts have been engaged as part of the Project Team.
	Consider releasing information prior to meetings to help the public evaluate them.	Comment noted.
	Reconsider the need for a waterfront trail.	See Chapter 2.
	Have the plans been made public?	See Chapter 10 for details of the extensive consultations that have been undertaken.
	It appears that the majority of the people attending this meeting don't want this Project. Why are you proceeding with this?	An EA is not a referendum. Often meeting attendees are opposed to the Project, and those who are supportive may not attend. Public events are not the sole determinants of the support for a Project. See Chapter 11 for the discussion of the Advantages and Disadvantages of the SWP. On balance, the advantages of proceeding with the Project outweigh the negative effects.
	Consider a slower, more informed process.	The process has been ongoing since 2014.
	Consider providing additional Alternatives.	See Chapter 5 for the extensive list of Alternatives considered.
Safety	Consider trail safety.	Comment noted.
	Consider safety at top of Bluffs.	Comment noted.
	Scarborough Bluffs are not a current risk.	See Section 3.1. Over the spring of 2017, there have been over 70 landslides along the Bluffs, and the Bluffs have been closed to public access. While this season has seen unusually high erosion activity, it is within the planning framework of the Project. This provides additional evidence for why safety along the Bluffs is a prime consideration.
	Consider that a nature experience isn't always safe.	Comment noted.
Signage	Consider educational signage.	Comment noted.
	Consider adequate signage at the top of the Bluffs where access to the Bluffs is not possible to avoid unnecessary traffic.	The City of Toronto is responsible for the operations and maintenance of the parks, including signage.

Table 10-12: Summary of Comments and Comment Consideration

Theme	Comments and Questions Received	Comment Consideration
	Consider signage for fishing.	Comment noted.
	Consider directional signage (along trail and nearby neighbourhoods).	Comment noted.
	Consider safety signage.	Comment noted.
Traffic	Consider current and future traffic/congestion.	A traffic study was conducted. Please see Section 7.3 and Appendix J.
	Request for confirmation of duration of construction to include in a report being prepared to manage traffic in the Guild area.	Cannot be confirmed until Detail Design.
	Consider alternate transportation modes to alleviate traffic.	The City of Toronto recognizes the existing congestion issues at Bluffer's Park and is exploring alternate modes of access outside of SWP.
Water Quality	Consider water quality.	As part of this study, regional water quality modeling was undertaken to understand the impact of the Project on water quality. Please see Appendix I.
	Consider ongoing water quality testing/sampling for water-users.	City of Toronto is responsible for ongoing water quality monitoring.
	Consider improvements to current water quality.	As part of this study, regional water quality modeling was undertaken to understand the impact of the Project on water quality. Please see Appendix I.
	Consider mitigating algae.	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.

10.5 Indigenous Consultation

Ontario, as the Crown, has a legal obligation to consult with Indigenous peoples where it contemplates decisions or actions that may adversely impact asserted or established Aboriginal or Treaty Rights. As the proponent of this EA, the Project Team has been delegated with a third party role to consult with potentially affected Aboriginal communities as required.

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

10.5.1 Potentially Interested Indigenous Communities

In the ToR phase of the Project, the contact list for the Project was established by searching the Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Information System (ATRIS), contacting the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) and through community contact lists from the City of Toronto and TRCA. At the start of the EA phase the MOECC was contacted to determine if the ToR list was still up to date, and if any additional community contacts should be considered. Communities that were contacted had established rights and/or interests in the Project Study Area, and are listed below.

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

10.5.2 Identification of Indigenous and Treaty Rights within the Study Area

The Study Area is located on lands originally surrendered as part of the 1787 Johnson-Butler Purchase. However, in 1794 the Crown acknowledged that the Johnson-Butler Purchase was not valid due to a number of irregularities in the treaty document. The lands within the Study Area were therefore not formally surrendered until 1923 as part of the Williams Commission. Specifically, the Study Area is found within the Clause 2 Williams Treaty lands. The seven First Nation signatories of the Williams Treaties include the Mississaugas of Scugog Island, the Mississaugas of Alderville, Hiawatha, Curve Lake, Chippewas of Rama-Mnjikaning, the Chippewas of Georgina Island, and Beausoleil First Nation.

In addition to the Williams Treaties signatories, other Indigenous and Métis communities may have an interest in the Project related to potential Project effects to traditional land and/or Treaty Rights and land claims.

Ongoing claims within the Study Area were also reviewed. TRCA is aware of the 'Aboriginal Title to Water' submitted by Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to the Governments of Canada and Ontario in September, 2016.

10.5.3 Correspondence with Indigenous and Métis Communities

10.5.3.1 Indigenous Communities Outreach/Communication

A summary of the correspondence sent to Indigenous and Métis communities is outlined in **Table 10-13**. In all correspondence to Indigenous communities, the SWP Project Team extended an open invitation to meet and discuss the Project in greater detail, and provided the SWP website as another source of information.

Table 10-13: Outgoing Consultation with Indigenous Communities

Notification	Initial Outreach Date
1. Notice of Commencement and PIC #1 Included Terrestrial Archaeology Stage 1 Report and Marine Archaeology Report	Mail: January 7, 2016 Email: January 7, 2016 and January 8, 2016
2. PIC#2	Mail: June 8, 2016 Email: June 9, 2016
3. PIC#3 Included Marine Archaeology Technical Memo	Mail: June 12, 2017 Email: June 9, 2017
4. Notice of Submission of Draft EA	Mail: August 16, 2017 Email: August 17, 2017
5. Notice of Submission of Final EA	Mail: June 14, 2018 Email: June 15, 2018

Examples of each notification can be found in **Appendix L10**.

Indigenous communities were contacted a total of five times throughout the SWP EA process. Each letter and/or email was followed up with at least one phone call to confirm receipt of the Notice. All

letters were sent via tracked priority mail (unless otherwise advised). The complete Record of Consultation for engagement with Indigenous communities is included at the end of **Appendix L10**.

The communication process that was followed for each Notification was as follows:

- Initial Outreach sent by mail and email (unless requested otherwise by community).
- For Notice of PIC#1 to Notice of PIC#3:
 - ▶ An email was sent a few days after the PIC with a link to PIC materials and a request to provide comment.
 - ▶ If there was no communication received from the community, a courtesy call was made one week after this email to make sure the materials were received and to confirm whether the community had any questions. If a voicemail was left on this courtesy call, a follow-up email was sent.

10.5.3.2 Additional Indigenous Communities Outreach/Communication

10.5.3.2.1 Curve Lake First Nation

On November 25, 2015, TRCA Archaeology staff met with a representative of Curve Lake First Nation to speak to all active TRCA projects and discuss the process of engagement. The SWP was quickly mentioned in this meeting to notify them that an EA would be initiated in the near future. A quick description of the purpose of the Project was provided. Curve Lake First Nation's concern was with fish spawning areas and asked whether TRCA performed studies related to fish spawning habitat in the Study Area.

10.5.3.2.2 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation BBQ Open House

Project staff participated as presenters at the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Department of Consultation and Accommodation Open House, held on Thursday, September 24, 2015 from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Information regarding the SWP was on display, and Project staff were on hand to discuss the Project and answer any questions. Approximately 50 members of the community stopped by the Project display throughout the event. There were no concerns regarding the Project raised, and all comments received were positive in nature.

A summary of this event is included in **Appendix L10**.

10.5.3.2.3 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Meeting

Project staff met with Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation on Friday, April 7, 2017 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. to provide an update on the SWP alongside additional TRCA projects. The update included a Project overview (Project Vision and Objectives in addition to the planning context), work undertaken (consultation, evaluation, Preferred Alternatives, natural environment opportunities and access), and next steps.

As a follow up to the meeting, Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation staff requested to be sent the bat survey results for informational purposes, which was provided on July 24, 2017. They also requested a tour of the Project Area be organized.

The presentation and meeting summary are provided in **Appendix L10**.

10.5.3.2.4 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Project Area Tour

Project staff met with three representatives of the Mississaugas of the New Credit at Bluffer's Park Marina on Monday, October 2, 2017 from 11:00 a.m. to approximately 1:00 p.m. The tour was done by boat. General questions were raised about archaeological sites and assessments as well as fish habitats and populations within the Project Area. No Project specific concerns were raised.

A summary of this event is included in **Appendix L10**.

Records of communication made with Indigenous Communities during the ToR stage can be found in the ToR Record of Consultation.

10.5.4 Summary of Indigenous and Métis Comments

A summary of comments received by Indigenous and Métis communities during the EA are provided in **Table 10-14**.

Table 10-14: Responses from Indigenous Communities

Indigenous or Métis Community	Comments	Comment Consideration
Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noted some Huron-Wendat archaeological sites near the study zone and therefore quite interested by Project. ▪ Consider including historical information/commemorative sites in Study Area. ▪ Requested if any resources were available for a Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat implication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Conseil de la Nation Huronne-Wendat community and the City of Toronto during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, with respect to including historical/commemorative sites.
Curve Lake First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern around potential archaeological resources in the Study Area and their protection. ▪ Concern around the protection of the water and water sources with fish habitat and/or spawning areas. ▪ Expressed an interest in opportunities to create interpretive signage related to First Nations history in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA has a shared interest/commitment with respect to the natural environment. The positive impacts the SWP will have on the natural environment, and the mitigation measures to be implemented to minimize impacts, are detailed in Section 7.3.1 and Appendix H. ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Curve Lake First Nation community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, providing updates on additional archaeological work undertaken, as well as with respect to including interpretive signage (in partnership with the City of Toronto).

Indigenous or Métis Community	Comments	Comment Consideration
Hiawatha First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support of Preliminary Preferred Alternatives for three Segments. ▪ Some concerns lay around aquatic and terrestrial life during construction and a request of the steps being taken to ensure there will be very little to no loss to aquatic and terrestrial life. ▪ Some concern about changes to access to/use of the land/resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA has a shared interest/commitment with respect to the natural environment. The positive impacts the SWP will have on the natural environment, and the mitigation measures to be implemented to minimize impacts, are detailed in Section 7.3.1 and Appendix H. ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Hiawatha First Nation community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project to discuss any further concerns associated with changes in access or impacts on the natural environment.
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider educating the public on the history of the lakefront from the First Nation perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation community and the City of Toronto during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, with respect to incorporation public education pieces associated with the history of the lakefront from the First Nation perspective.
Six Nations of the Grand River Territory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments thus far. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, as more information becomes available.
Beausoleil First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments thus far. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Beausoleil First Nation community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, as more information becomes available.
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No previous concerns with Project. ▪ Main area of interest is archaeology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, as more information becomes available.
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to have monitors on site for all environmental and archaeological assessments. ▪ Expressed concern about impacts to fish habitat. ▪ Interested in archaeological potential in the Study Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TRCA has a shared interest/commitment with respect to the natural environment. The positive impacts the SWP will have on the natural environment, and the mitigation measures to be implemented to minimize impacts, are detailed in Section 7.3.1 and Appendix H. ▪ The request for on site monitors was received after the terrestrial Stage 1 and marine archaeological work had been completed. TRCA commits to continue engagement with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation community during the Detailed Design phase of the Project, providing updates on additional archaeological work undertaken.

10.6 Agency Consultation

Throughout the EA, regulatory bodies and interested agencies at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels were invited to participate in a comprehensive agency consultation program. The objectives of the EA agency consultation were to consult with all potentially interested agencies about the EA and to ensure coordination between the EA and the broader local and regional planning context.

10.6.1 Agency Contact List

The Project Team endeavoured to consult with any and all interested agencies during the development of the EA. As such, a contact list of regulatory and interested agencies was developed through an identification of all applicable provincial and federal regulatory agencies, other provincial and federal agencies, as well as municipal and regional departments with a potential or stated interest in the Project and/or Project Study Area. Any agency that noted during the ToR that continued consultation was not required was removed from the contact list (Hydro One Networks, Transport Canada, and Ministry of Transportation). **Table 10-15** documents those agencies contacted during the EA.

Table 10-15: Agencies and Working Groups Contacted During the EA

Agency/Working Group	Participating Agencies/Agency Department(s)
Aquatic Habitat Toronto (Working Group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ City of Toronto ▪ Environment Canada ▪ Fisheries and Oceans Canada ▪ Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry ▪ Toronto and Region Conservation Authority ▪ Waterfront Toronto
Bank Swallow Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Beacon Environmental ▪ Bird Studies Canada ▪ Environment Canada and Climate Change ▪ Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry ▪ Nature Canada ▪ Ontario Power Generation ▪ rare Charitable Research Reserve ▪ Toronto and Region Conservation Authority ▪ Trent University
City of Toronto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parks, Forestry and Recreation ▪ Toronto Water ▪ Transportation Services ▪ City Planning/Waterfront Secretariat ▪ Community Disability Steering Committee ▪ Urban Forestry Operations ▪ Waste Facility Management ▪ Toronto Fire Services ▪ Toronto Paramedic Services ▪ Toronto Police Services
Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fisheries Protection Program, Central and Arctic Region ▪ Lands Department
GO Transit/Metrolinx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capital Project Group
Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Assessment Services
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aurora District ▪ Lake Ontario Management Unit
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heritage Program Unit ▪ Central Region
Toronto Transit Commission (TTC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service Planning
Waterfront Toronto (WT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning and Design

10.6.2 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The TAC was established during the ToR to provide a forum for agency consultation.

Membership included representatives from:

- City of Toronto
- Metrolinx
- Ministry of Environment and Climate Change
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
- Toronto Transit Commission

Only one meeting was held January 18, 2016 with 21 members to present a Project update and the draft Alternatives and Evaluation Criteria. The committee was then disbanded in favour of individual meetings. On June 10, 2016, an update email was distributed to TAC members in place of a meeting, and the Project Team offered to meet with TAC members individually.

Again in 2017, the Project Team offered to meet with agencies individually to provide a forum for open communication on topics directly relevant to the various agencies.

10.6.3 Agency Meetings

In addition to consultation through the TAC, a number of individual agency consultation meetings were held.

10.6.3.1 Agency Working Groups

Throughout the EA, the Project Team met with two agency working groups: Aquatic Habitat Toronto (AHT) and the Bank Swallow Working Group. The purpose was to seek input from agencies that have a vested interest in the improvement of aquatic habitat along the Toronto waterfront (AHT) and the protection and recovery of Bank Swallows and their habitat (Bank Swallow Working Group).

AHT consists of agency partners including DFO, Environment Canada, MNRF, Waterfront Toronto, and TRCA in consultation with the City of Toronto. The Bank Swallow Working Group includes representatives from Environment Canada, Nature Canada, MNRF, Bird Studies Canada, Ontario Power Generation, rare Charitable Research Reserve, Trent University, Beacon Environmental and TRCA.

In addition to the broader Project updates provided to AHT that focused on the aquatic habitat components of the Project, and to the Bank Swallowing Working Group that focused on mitigation measures to avoid impacts on Bank Swallows during Project construction, individual meetings with the City of Toronto (see **Section 10.6.3.2**), DFO (see **Section 10.6.3.3**) and MNRF (see **Section 10.6.3.6**) were also held to discuss specific topics related to the Project. **Table 10-16** provides an overview of consultation activities held with the two agency working groups.

Table 10-16: Consultation Activities with Agency Working Groups

Date	Agency Working Group	Purpose
April 24, 2017	Bank Swallow Working Group	Provide an overview on Project to-date, focusing on mitigation measures to avoid impacts to Bank Swallows during Project construction.
July 14, 2016	Aquatic Habitat Toronto	Provide a Project update and discuss aquatic habitat conditions and opportunities the Preliminary Preferred Alternatives provides to improve these conditions.
June 1, 2017	Aquatic Habitat Toronto	Provide Project update and discuss aquatic habitat enhancement, construction mitigation and potential habitat compensation.

10.6.3.2 City of Toronto

In addition to participating as part of the TAC, staff from City of Toronto's Parks, Forestry and Recreation; Transportation Services; Toronto Water; Waterfront Secretariat; Planning; and Waste Management have participated in internal technical workshops for the Project. Five technical workshops were held during the EA phase. In addition, Emergency Services (First Responders) were sent Stakeholder Committee meeting information and were engaged with individually.

Table 10-17 provides an overview of the consultation activities undertaken with the City of Toronto outside of regular TAC and internal Technical Workshops for the Project.

Additionally, throughout the EA, various political representatives were engaged with to keep them apprised of Project update/status.

Table 10-17: City of Toronto Consultation

Date	Purpose
June 9, 2015	Discuss and review available technical information and reports regarding the former Brimley Road landfill site.
September 14, 2015	Provide an update on Project status and seek input on Preliminary Draft Alternatives.
April 21, 2016	Project update with First Responders.
June 21, 2016	Boat tour of the SWP Study Area with the City of Toronto General Manager.
July 7, 2016	Project update with Waterfront Secretariat.
July 8 & 11, 2016	Project updates with City of Toronto First Responders.
October 3, 2016	Discuss current Bluffer's Park Operations and Maintenance strategies in relation to SWP.
October 19, 2016	Project update with Urban Forestry staff to review the proposed habitat enhancements.
October 25, 2016	Site tour with Urban Forestry staff to review the early proposed access concepts for East Point Park and the Guild construction access route.
October 27, 2016	Meeting with Transportation Services and Toronto Water staff to discuss potential improvements to Brimley Road.
January 20, 2017	Review of the proposed approach for Brimley Road improvements with Transportation Services and Toronto Water.
February 15, 2017	Provide Project update and seek feedback from City of Toronto's Community Disability Steering Committee.

Table 10-17: City of Toronto Consultation

Date	Purpose
March 27, 2017	Project update with Parks, Forestry and Recreation, and Transportation Services and review of proposed approach for construction access, phasing, and staging for the Project.
March 27, 2017	Project update with Urban Forestry on access opportunities, options and constraints at East Point Park off Copperfield Road.
May 11, 2017	Page-turn review of the preliminary Draft EA with representatives from all applicable City divisions.
June 13, 2017	Project update with First Responders.
June 22, 2017	Provide Project update and seek feedback from City of Toronto's Community Disability Steering Committee.
July 21, 2017	Meeting with Urban Forestry to discuss comments on the preliminary Draft EA.
August 10, 2017	Project update with Parks Development & Capital Projects.
October 4, 2017	Page-turn review of the submitted Draft EA with representatives from all applicable City divisions.

10.6.3.3 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)

Throughout the EA, the Project Team met with DFO to seek input. A webinar was held on July 11th, 2016 to provide DFO with an update on the Project and present and discuss the Preferred Alternative for the West Segment.

10.6.3.4 GO Transit/Metrolinx

Throughout the EA, the Project Team met with Metrolinx/GO Transit to seek input. In addition, communication with Metrolinx was ongoing throughout the EA as part of the broader TRCA and Metrolinx co-ordination meetings on their Lakeshore East rail corridor expansion project, and these meetings are not reflected in **Table 10-18**.

In addition to GO Transit/Metrolinx TAC participation, the Project Team provided regular updates. **Table 10-18** provides an overview of consultation activities held with the GO Transit/Metrolinx.

Table 10-18: Consultation Activities with GO Transit/Metrolinx

Date	Purpose
November 25, 2016	Provide Project update, public and agency consultation, and the Overall Preferred Alternative, with a focus on the Preferred Alternative for the East Segment.
April 26, 2017	Specific meeting held to update and discuss Metrolinx's Lakeshore East rail corridor expansion in the vicinity of Manse Road and Copperfield Road in direct relation to the SWP only.

10.6.3.5 Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)

The Project Team initiated communication with the MOECC at the commencement of the EA phase, and maintained an open line of communication throughout the EA. Communication mechanisms

included email status updates, teleconferences, and in-person meetings. **Table 10-19** provides an overview of consultation activities held with the MOECC.

Table 10-19: Consultation Activities with MOECC

Date	Purpose
July 13, 2016	Project update.
August 18, 2016	Project update.
September 21, 2016	Boat tour of the SWP Study Area.
November 17, 2016	Project update.
April 21, 2017	Project update and discussion of proposed approach for East Segment.
June 15, 2017	Project update.
October 25, 2017	Project update and discussion of comments on the Draft EA.

10.6.3.6 Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

In addition to participating as part of the TAC, and as part of the AHT meetings, individual meetings were held to discuss specific topics. Communication mechanisms included email status updates, teleconferences and in-person meetings. **Table 10-20** provides an overview of consultation activities held with the MNRF.

Table 10-20: Consultation Activities with MNRF

Date	Purpose
March 1, 2016	Provide an update on Project status and present the draft Alternatives.
July 6, 2016	Project update.
August 24, 2016	Project update.
September 16, 2016	Walking tour of the SWP Study Area
June 8, 2017	Project update and present and discuss the Refined Preferred Alternative.
October 26, 2017	Project update and discussion of comments on the Draft EA.

10.6.3.7 Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)

In addition to meetings with the broader technical team, the Project Team met with MTCS on April 18, 2017 to provide a Project update and discuss archaeological resources in the Project Study Area.

10.7 TRCA Authority Meeting

On July 28, 2017, the Scarborough Waterfront Team made a presentation to the TRCA Authority Board. The intent of the presentation was to receive endorsement of the SWP's Refined Preferred Alternative, and direction to proceed to City of Toronto Council for approval to submit the Final EA Report to the MOECC. A copy of the meeting Agenda and presentation is provided in **Appendix L11**.

The Project Lead made a presentation to the Authority Board that summarized the EA process to-date and the Preferred Alternative. The presentation of the SWP to the Authority Board Meeting was met with 14 requests for delegation. Delegates were given the standard allotted 5 minutes to address the Board at the meeting. A copy of the meeting resolution sent to delegates can be found in **Appendix L11**. After discussion and questions the TRCA Authority Board endorsed the Refined Preferred Alternative and approved the Project to proceed to City of Toronto Council for approval to submit the Final EA Report to the MOECC. All comments received in relation to the Authority meeting are included in **Appendix L11**.

10.8 Draft Environmental Assessment Report Review

Notification of the Submission of the Draft EA Report was announced through:

- Social media (Twitter and Facebook)
- E-newsletter
- Email
- Mail drop (Canada Post mail service)
- Newspaper article

Details on each of the above listed mechanisms of communication are discussed in more detail in **Section 10.3**. Consultation Mechanisms and the Notice of Submission can be found in **Appendix L1**.

Hard copies of the Draft EA Report and Appendices were made available at eight review locations from August 17, 2017 to October 2, 2017. Locations included two TRCA offices, the City Clerk's Office, three local libraries, and two MOECC offices (locations listed on Notice of Submission provided in **Appendix L1**). The Draft EA was also available for download on the TRCA website.

Appendix L12 includes a series of tables that disposition all comments received from review of the Draft EA, as well as a response to each of the comments. **Appendix L12** consists of three tables:

1. Public Comments including General Public, Stakeholder Committee Page-Turn, Landowners, and Community Organizations. None of the utilities submitted comments.
2. Agency Comments from MOECC, MNRF, MTCS and the City of Toronto. DFO, GO Transit/Metrolinx, TTC and WT did not submit comments.
3. Indigenous Communities Comments.

10.9 Future Consultation Activities

As described throughout this Chapter, public involvement has been a key element of the SWP EA process. There is an involved community associated with the SWP who expect to remain involved throughout the remainder of the Project.

Should the SWP EA receive Ministry approval, it is recommended that the following public consultation mechanisms occur during the Detailed Design, construction and operation/establishment phases of the Project:

1. During the formal Detailed Design process for each Segment, a PIC be held to review the SWP and seek public input on any new information that is available to feed into the process, including similar engagement with other agencies, Indigenous communities and landowners;
2. A PIC for each Study Area Segment be held to provide construction details and schedules when the information is available;
3. A working group composed of local stakeholders who will be involved during the Detailed Design and construction phases of each Segment;
4. Continued engagement with the surfing community during the Detailed Design phase of the West Segment.
5. On-going consultation with Stakeholders in the East Segment through the Detailed Design phase of the East Segment, with respect to refinements.
6. Discussions with Rohm and Haas Canada LP/Dow Chemical Company to address safety concerns east of Grey Abbey Ravine during the Detailed Design phase of the West Segment.
7. A mechanism be established to ensure the reporting and investigation of complaints arising from construction activities;
8. Regular Project updates continue to be posted to the Project webpage; and,
9. SWP newsletter updates to be provided summarizing progress on Detailed Design and construction-related work.

Information gathered from the public and Stakeholders through these mechanisms will be incorporated into the overall Adaptive Environmental Management (AEM) cycle, as would other sources of monitoring data, as described in Chapter 8.