

4. Description, Evaluation and Rationale for “Alternatives To”

The *EA Act* requires proponents to assess two types of Alternatives including:

- “Alternatives To” the undertaking; and,
- “Alternative Methods” of carrying out the undertaking (the Project).

“Alternatives To” the undertaking are functionally different ways of addressing or dealing with the problem (e.g., different locations along the waterfront for the Project). “Alternative Methods” (or designs) are the different ways of carrying out the Project. For example, for the Project, this may include consideration of different locations within the Project Area for project components (e.g., trail alignment, shoreline alignment). This chapter describes how “Alternatives To” were considered in the EA.

4.1 Description of “Alternative To” the Undertaking

As per the approved ToR, TRCA has completed a “focused” EA. The consideration of “Alternatives To” has been satisfied through previous studies as detailed in **Chapter 2**, particularly the Integrated Shoreline Management Plan (ISMP), which provides “an ecosystem-based framework to ensure that shoreline management activities result in a clean, green, accessible, diverse, connected, open, affordable, attractive and useable waterfront.” These studies and plans also identify the need for integrating erosion protection works with habitat improvements and improved public access along the section of the Scarborough waterfront between Bluffer’s Park in the west and the mouth of the Highland Creek in the east. In addition, the Project builds on the previous shoreline erosion protection works undertaken in the Project Area.

As per the ToR, the only “Alternatives To” considered in this EA was the “Do Nothing” Alternative. The “Do Nothing” Alternative includes:

- Continuation of monitoring activities by TRCA;
- Implementation of existing plans for the area, including localized shoreline erosion control works, and retrofits/maintenance activities of existing shoreline works;
- Continuation of the natural bluff erosion process (shoreline erosion and bluff crest migration) for the sections of shoreline without existing shoreline protection works;
- Continued patchwork of formalized, informal and unauthorized public access to the waterfront and its associated risks; and,
- Ongoing park management by the City of Toronto at Bluffer’s Park, East Point Park, and other established park facilities within the Project Area, which include the addition of signage at the top of the Bluffer’s (where danger exists), on-going repairs and movement of fencing at the top of the Bluffs (where the Bluffs collapse), and management of informal pedestrian access down the Bluffs to access the shoreline (ongoing efforts to decommission and restrict access).

Implementing the “Do Nothing” Alternative will not satisfy the SWP Vision and Objectives nor will it address any of the problems and opportunities outlined in **Chapter 2**. However, given the length of the Project Area, the “Do Nothing” Alternative may have merit within the West, Central and East Segments. Therefore, the “Do Nothing” Alternative was considered along with the evaluation of the developed Alternative Methods, or “designs”, for each of the three Project Area Segments that are documented in **Chapter 5** and will be compared against the Preferred Alternative to identify the Project advantages and disadvantages documented in **Chapter 11**.