



# **Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

**Public Forum #1**

**Meeting Notes**

**June 23, 2005**

**PUBLIC FORUM #1**  
**Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

**Thursday, June 23, 2005**

**Metro Hall Room 308/309**  
**55 John Street, Toronto**

**6:00 – 9:30 p.m.**

**SUMMARY NOTES**

**1.0 Public Open House**

The **Open House** portion of this event opened at 6:00 p.m. Members of the public viewed display panels showing different aspects of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, including the study area, project goals and objectives, timelines, and team members. A copy of the poster boards is found in **Attachment A** to these notes.

Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), and members of the consulting team were on hand to answer questions during the Open House. All participants received the following information as they signed in:

- Participant workbook
- Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Newsletter (Volume #1 June 2005)

**2.0 Welcome and Introductions**

**Adele Freeman**, Director of Watershed Management Division, TRCA, opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. and introduced participants to the project and highlighted the great potential to complete this project within the foreseeable future.

**John Wilson**, Task Force to Bring Back the Don Chair, welcomed the participants. This project is an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA) that will realize a vision created over a decade ago, driven by the community. The Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC) is spearheading this process using a very inclusive approach. Similar visions to renaturalize the Mouth of the Don have been expressed by various groups in various ways over the years, including: a Royal Commission; Forty Steps to a New Don (1994), The Report of the Don Watershed Task Force; A Time for Bold Steps (2000), the Don Watershed Regeneration Council Report Card; a poem from the Task Force to Bring Back the Don Visioning; Unlocking the Port Lands; Toronto Olympic Bid; Fung Task Force; and all levels of government. This project is a priority project for Waterfront Revitalization, and is also highlighted as a priority in the City's central waterfront policy document, Making Waves.

The mouth of the Don is a key habitat link and also provides many other benefits. The City of Toronto and its residents deserve this project to be completed. Why now? Three governments are in support of this initiative. This process will result in detailed specifications for the Mouth of the Don, and a plan that the community can embrace.

**Chris Glaisek**, TWRC, welcomed participants. Chris explained that the Mouth of the Don is a centre piece for the waterfront and all of the activities taking place along Toronto's waterfront. The TRCA brings great leadership and commitment to the project. He described the progress of related projects: West Don Lands, Flood Protection Landform, Don River Park, Kingston Subdivision Rail Bridge Extension, Gardiner Expressway, Lakeshore Boulevard and Keating Yard rail connection relocation, Port Lands, Commissioners Park, Don Greenway, Cherry Street Bridge Modifications, Queen's Quay Re-alignment, Lake Ontario Park, and the East Bayfront work.

**Nicole Swerhun** was introduced as the facilitator. Her role is to provide neutral, meaningful opportunities to influence this Terms of Reference process and the EA process that will follow. Nicole reviewed the agenda for the meeting, and the proposed roundtable discussion questions:

- How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?
- Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?
- Are the proposed goals and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?
- Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing? Topics covered?

Nicole then invited participants to introduce themselves, and identify their interest in the project. Fifty-one meeting participants signed in for the event. The list of project team members present at the event may be found in **Appendix B** to these notes.

### **3.0 Overview Presentation**

**Paul Murray**, Gartner Lee Limited, was introduced to set the stage for the process and this consultation meeting. A copy of the full presentation is found in **Appendix C** to these notes. Paul highlighted the following information during his presentation.

To expedite the progress at the Don Mouth, two projects are underway: Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project, and Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (this project). The first project, which was undertaken using the Conservation Authority's Class Environmental Assessment for Remedial Flood and Erosion Control Projects and the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)* Screening process, is largely complete. The Class EA and CEAA Screening have been submitted for review and are currently awaiting final government approvals.

Three components of the Lower Don River West Project are currently moving forward to the implementation stage. The Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC) is leading the decommissioning and demolition of a number of buildings and roadways in the West Don Lands which are necessary for the construction of a flood protection landform (FPL), which is a key element of the preferred alternative identified in the Class EA. ORC is also undertaking a soil and groundwater strategy to mitigate contamination in the area, and has released a Request for Proposals to undertake the actual detailed design and construction of the FPL. TRCA will be advising ORC throughout the design and construction process for the FPL.

TRCA is also leading the detailed design and construction of the Kingston Subdivision Rail Bridge Extension works and the east bank flood mitigation works, both of which are identified in the Class EA for the LDRW Project. The development of detailed designs and the construction of the Bala Subdivision Underpass have also been added to the scope of work for the TRCA. An open house is located in Room 307 depicting a number of concepts for public review for each of these three project elements. It is anticipated that construction of the bridge extension works will initiate this fall and will be completed by the end of 2006.

This project, the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP Project), is being undertaken using an Individual EA process and CEEA Screening process. Paul introduced Ken Dion, TRCA, as the project coordinator for the DMNP. Any questions that arise outside of the consultation meetings can be directed to him. The lead members of the consulting team were then introduced, along with their respective roles:

Don Gorber, SENES Consultants Limited – overseeing the EA process

Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee Limited – leading environmental and naturalization components

Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Limited – leading the functional design.

There are many stakeholders who are interested in this process. It will proceed through the following steps:

1. Terms of Reference – to be completed by the end of the year.
2. Environmental Assessment – estimated to be completed by the end of 2007 after which time the plan will be submitted for approvals. This is a coordinated Individual EA and CEEA Screening process for which there are a number of components, including descriptions of: purpose of project; the environment; alternatives; the consultation process; mitigation works; and, various approvals that may be required.
3. Design and Construction – there may be a phased approach to the construction, which could start in one year and proceed for the next 5 years.

The consultation approach being followed at this stage includes:

- A Technical Advisory Committee consisting of approximately 50 members from all levels of government and key stakeholders - provides technical advice throughout the EA process;
- A Community Liaison Committee consisting of approximately 25 representatives of local interest groups and associations - provides advice regarding how the process should engage community;
- A general public process which includes 2 public forums, 3 working sessions and a site walk for the EA Terms of Reference stage. Additional public forums and working sessions will be devised as part of the actual EA phase for the project;
- Production of project newsletters and advertisements; and,
- A proposed technical design forum for the EA phase of the project.

The phases of consultation for this Terms of Reference process are: an introduction to the process (tonight's meeting); component discussions; and, Terms of Reference development.

**Deborah Martin-Downs**, Director of Ecology, TRCA, was introduced as the next speaker. She presented the *Project Goal*:

**To establish the form, features and function of a natural river mouth within the context of an urban environment.**

The project team is seeking public feedback on this goal. Deborah reviewed a number of local examples showing watercourse conditions: both current and historic and highlighted how the Don Mouth is different, due to the significant amount of urban encroachment, and historical land uses. Natural river mouths in the Lake Ontario basin typically exhibit the following features: low flow channel, some side channels/habitats removed from the main flow, ecological and cultural linkages up and downstream of the river, and shoreline and water interactions. The functionality of alternative arrangements of form and features for the Don River Mouth will be evaluated through the EA process.

Project objectives were also outlined, including: naturalization, flood protection, operational management (sediment, debris and ice), integration of existing infrastructure functions, support compatible cultural, recreational, and heritage opportunities, and coordination with other planning efforts.

The TRCA presented a number of "Alternatives To" that have been previously identified through earlier studies and reports. An EA identifies "Alternatives To" as being the range of possible solutions that will be evaluated throughout the process. For this study, the "Alternatives To" refer to different solutions for routing the flow of the Don River into Lake Ontario. These include: do nothing; river estuary with discharge into the inner harbour; river estuary with discharge through the port lands into the Ship Channel or Outer Harbour; river estuary with discharge into the Inner Harbour and through the Port Lands to the Ship Channel or Outer Harbour. For each "Alternative To"

being considered in the EA, a number of “Alternative Methods” (or designs) will be devised and evaluated to determine the best solution that will achieve our stated goal and objectives.

A number of study areas were identified for this project: the area considered for naturalization; the area at risk to flooding; and the surrounding area that may be influenced by any works that will be conducted for this project. Additional considerations for this study will include soil remediation, storm runoff, climate change, and West Nile virus.

After the presentation, the following questions were asked for clarification.

- *What is the northern boundary of naturalization study area?*

This was written into TWRC contract. The boundary extends from the mouth of the Don (Keating Channel) and the wetted zone of the river channel and immediate banks up to about Riverdale Park, just north of Gerrard.

- *When this process is finished and there is a final recommendation to the province, what happens if the province says the solution is too expensive? Is this an iterative process?*

Yes, this is an iterative process. We hope that the submitted EA will be fully supported by the various interests in the area with the appropriate level of public investment. Cost will be only one of many criteria considered in the evaluation.

When a submission is made, government agencies review it and the Minister of Environment makes a decision to either reject the EA, ask for more work to be done, refer it to a public hearing process, or approve it. The EA Act also contains the provision to offer mediation should there be conflicts.

- *With respect to the barrier to spillway flows south of the Ship Channel, are we willing to fill in the middle third of the ship channel to allow water to flow into the Outer Harbour? Are we willing to deal with this barrier?*

It is too early to determine the feasibility of this option. We must coordinate all of the efforts on the waterfront. This project has to work scientifically. We have to evaluate technical feasibility of all of the options within the EA. This option has been out there for a number of years. During the EA, it will be evaluated.

- *Many EAs have failed because of how alternatives are broken down into sub alternatives. This process needs to consider an alternative to the commonly used matrix evaluation process.*

During this EA process, there will be an entire session dedicated to discussing the evaluation of alternatives.

## **4.0 Facilitated Roundtable and Plenary Discussions**

Nicole Swerhun introduced participants to the smaller breakout group process. CLC members who would facilitate table discussions identified themselves. If stakeholders needed additional time to answer the focus questions, they were invited to use the work book to record and submit comments in the following week. Participants joined small group discussions. Reporters were identified for each table.

Following the roundtable discussions, the following findings were reported back to the larger group in a plenary session.

### **Group #1**

*How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?*

- Current uses: biking and walking on the trails
- Future: improve winter trail maintenance, provide a shuttle bus from existing TTC to from the Mouth of the Don, provide nature walks for families, connect with future Lakeshore LRT, integrate with Paddle the Don, improve fishing opportunities, improve wildlife viewing, improve aesthetics to encourage return visits, improve visual appearance of the Don Mouth from the DVP

*Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?*

- Study area should be widened through the Narrows by expanding onto abandoned rail beds.

*Are the proposed goal and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?*

- Goals are satisfactory.
- Support was expressed for the addition of the word “inviting” heritage to objective 5.

*Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing?*

*Topics covered?*

- The newspaper ads could have maps, not just words, to show people the location of the Port Lands.
- Bring back the fishery, ferry boat from Toronto Island to Cherry Beach area.

## Group #2

*How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?*

- Current uses: Mouth is not used very much, a few activities do occur in this area but they are insufficient
- Future uses: Want ability to observe fish, bike, walk, and hike.
- Question: How much naturalization can you actually do in that small space?
- Question: Is there a possibility for community gardening within the area?
- A quiet space to write, paint, and learn about past would be appreciated.
- Trees (a diversity of species) should be planted.

*Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?*

- Do we really have enough land for naturalization? Can you really do it in such a small space – we should obtain more land.

*Are the proposed goal and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?*

- It will be difficult to accomplish the defined goal with such a small study area.
- More discussion around complexity and diversity of habitat should be incorporated into the goal.
- Naturalization should be sustainable.
- Species diversity of plants and trees should be incorporated.
- Objectives – establish a river mouth delta. Is there enough space to do this appropriately? Should the area be expanded?
- Integrated existing infrastructure: Develop and design infrastructure so it can be moved when appropriate.
- Support additional recreational opportunities: this project could be useful in expanding opportunities.
- There should be access by the public to the area in appropriate places – be careful not to destroy what has been done previously.

*Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing? Topics covered?*

- Assuming working groups are open to the public – yes, the proposed opportunities for public consultation are appropriate.
- When will alternatives be narrowed to a preferred choice? (*During the EA phase of the process, following the TOR phase.*)
- Plans and designs of Commissioners Park and East Bay Precinct Plan need to be done in conjunction with this project.



### **Group #3**

*How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?*

- We will e-mail responses in.

*Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?*

- We will e-mail responses in.

*Are the proposed goal and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?*

- Our group talked about conflicts of interest between ecosystem interests and human needs. We suggest adding an extra point to objectives: Value the river for its own sake, not only what it does for humans.
- In Goal, after “urban environment”, add “and from an ecosystem perspective”.
- Would like to have “form, features, and function” defined.
- Objective 3: under operational management, there will be trade-offs, the mix needs to be balanced between “leave it to nature” and a “human fix”.
- Clarify definition of “reasonably moved” in objective 4.
- Objective 4: Integrate existing infrastructure functions: include moved OR REMOVED. Not every road is sacred.
- Incorporate adaptive management as needs may change over the years.
- Support addition of “no motorized toys, except for motorized wheelchairs”. All trails have to be accessible to all users and integrated with existing trail systems, and not conflict with wildlife.

*Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing? Topics covered?*

- The group likes the idea of themed working groups, but would like a flexible process - if issues arise there may be a need for special meetings.
- The group foresees disagreements on various points. There should be some mediation process built in to the process.

### **Group #4**

*How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?*

- Current uses: biking, hiking and using the vicinity for viewing birds and wildlife. High speed driving also occurs in the area.
- Future uses: always keep in mind how other living species need to use the mouth of the Don. Passive use of the area i.e. viewing wildlife, small boats, nonmotorized water or land vehicles ONLY.
- Question: Is driving through at high rates of speed still a desired future use?

*Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?*

- The study area should encompass some or all of eastern Ship Channel in order to fully evaluate all alternatives.
- At least the edge of the channel should be considered for naturalization.
- The Don Greenway piece seems to extend west, but there isn't much to the east – should that be extended east?
- Support was expressed for extending the study area to Riverdale Park.

*Are the proposed goal and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?*

- Goal: The group expressed concern about use of term “urban environment” as this may evoke an undesirable approach. Replace this with “city environment”.
- Objectives: 4: This study should contain the possibility of pursuing the removal of infrastructure.
- Objective 6: Would like to see stronger word than “coordination” with other projects. Need to try to influence other projects in an ecologically responsible way to maximize success of this project.
- The approach should include connections to sustainability issues.
- Need to pay attention to and incorporate creative remediation processes such as bioremediation.

*Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing? Topics covered?*

- Particular interest was expressed in coordinating with the City of Toronto's Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan implementation process.
- The schedule for first two phases is reasonable and looks good.

## **Group #5**

*How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don? How would you like to use it in the future?*

- Some repetition with other groups' responses.
- Concern that private land owners adjacent to area can't do much with their lands (ie. Home Depot).
- Current use: use it to gain access to Port Lands.
- Future uses: There should be a focal point (maybe a restaurant), make linkages for animals and people, culture of industry (maintain historic context by keeping industry).
- The area should be culturally different than other areas of the city.
- The area should create some employment opportunities.
- There should be trails, but they shouldn't be the prime focus.
- There should be a land channel to provide access for animals to the waterfront.

*Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study area?*

- Difficult to separate mouth of Don from adjacent lands. However, it appears to be an appropriate study area.

*Are the proposed goal and objectives appropriate for this project? What edits, if any, would you suggest?*

- Negotiation with private land owners for use of land should be an objective.
- Objective 5: The concept should be expanded to include other alternatives, such as a series of complimentary channels.
- Improve access from east.

*Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of timing? Topics covered?*

- No feedback was offered.

Participants were reminded that if they wished to add anything to the comments made at the meeting, they could write it down, and send it in. All of the written comments are also part of the written record.

## **5.0 Closing Remarks, Next Steps and Next Meeting**

**Steve Willis**, Marshall Macklin Monaghan/TWRC, told meeting participants that at the last CLC meeting, they were asked to put together a plan that showed all of the activities going on along the waterfront. A draft has now been completed and is on display. Any comments or suggestions for improvement would be appreciated. This is meant to be a communications tool and feedback is invited.

**Adele Freeman** described a site walk tentatively scheduled for Saturday, June 18. This wasn't advertised. Stakeholders suggested advertising this event and inviting the broader community to participate. During the walk, consultants will be located at various stations and provide participants with an overview of project considerations. Stakeholders advised that a weeknight was preferable to a Saturday for the walk. Transit access should be noted on the advertising. TRCA may consider providing a shuttle from a central point.

Adele thanked participants for their questions and input and encouraged people to mail in any additional comments they might have. Comments should be forwarded to Ken Dion, TRCA.

Copies of the panels from the open house and the meeting summary will be posted on the TRCA website. Comments are appreciated and taken seriously. The TRCA and the consulting team will be working towards incorporating stakeholder ideas into the final document.

Stakeholders were thanked and the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Prepared by:  
Tracey Ehl, Principal

**E H C**



Ehl Harrison Consulting Inc.  
(905) 825-9870  
tracey@ehlharrison.com



# **Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

**Public Forum #1**

**Appendix A  
Poster Boards**

**June 23, 2005**



# **Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

**Public Forum #1**

**Appendix B  
List of Project Team Members**

**June 23, 2005**

## **TRCA Project Team members**

Ken Dion  
Adele Freeman  
Don Haley  
Deborah Martin-Downs  
Aish Ramakrishnan  
Amy Thurston

## **Consulting Team Project Team members**

Phil Bosco	Gartner Lee Ltd.
Dale Leadbeater	Gartner Lee Ltd.
Paul Murray	Gartner Lee Ltd.
Joe Puopolo	Gartner Lee Ltd.
Don Gorber	SENES Consultants Limited
Dave Maunder	Aquafor Beech Limited
Nicole Swerhun	Facilitator
Tracey Ehl	Ehl Harrison Consulting Inc. (Meeting Notes)

## **TWRC**

Steve Willis  
Bob Webb  
Chris Glaisek  
Kristin Jenkins  
Mark Wilson, Chair



# **Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

**Public Forum #1**

**Appendix C  
Presentation**

**June 23, 2005**





# **Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project**

## **Public Forum #1**

### **Appendix D Public Workbook Summaries**

### **June 23, 2005**

## Appendix D: Public Workbook Responses

### Summary of Answers from Participant Workbook

#### 1. a) How do you and others currently use the Mouth of the Don?

- Cycling (10)
- Volunteering with the City of Toronto and BBD Stewardship at Riverdale Farms and Don Narrows
- Driving by/over apparently stagnant looking body of water (5)
- Canoeing (2)
- Walking/ Hiking (9)
- Wildlife Viewing (including but not limited to bird watching) (3)
- It is sterile land
- Access to Port Lands.
- Fish use it for spawning

#### b) How would you like to use it in the future?

- Cycling (3)
- As a focal point, possibly from a restaurant (2)
- Linkages
- Riding
- Canoeing (6)
- Fishing (4)
- Learning about historical elements (i.e. Natives)
  - Maintaining the historical culture of Industry i.e. Silos (active/inactive) representing earlier 20<sup>th</sup> century (2)
- Be able to see it as culturally different from other areas of Toronto
- Use it to create employment opportunities
- Make it accessible to everyone
  - Land channel to provide animals access to waterfront
  - Local shuttle bus from parking area
  - Lakeshore LRT to Port Lands
- Go on nature walks (6)
  - Have winter trail maintenance (2)
  - Trails should be available, but not a prime focus
- Make the area more inviting to passer-bys (2)
  - More nature study opportunities should be available
  - More water-colour painting should be available
  - Family-oriented activities should be arranged
  - Want to see it as convenient and inviting for people to get out of the car and enjoy the beauty of the river and river banks and activities (walks, picnics, etc.)
  - Be able to see interpretive signs, technological art
  - Have benches to sit at
- Sighting wildlife (4)

- LRT/TTC system implemented– have a street car from Queen’s Quay
- Always keep in mind how other living species need to use it (2)
  - Passive activities should be emphasized– viewing/ small boats in canals (2)
  - Non-motorized use of water, paths and adjacent green spaces (4)
  - As little development as possible should occur
  - Quiet space
- Experience a naturalized environment (4)
  - Plant more trees – range of species(2)
  - Have a garden (2)
  - See a flowing river with people enjoying it (greater activity in the area)

**Questions/Considerations:**

- Could that Lower DVP ever disappear? Is it necessary? (2)
- Should we have rental concessions?

**2. Are the proposed study areas appropriate for the project? What feedback, if any, do you have regarding the proposed study areas?**

- Flood Study Area and Local Study Area seem appropriate however the purpose/scope of the Local Study Area should be made more clear (2)
- Naturalization area:
  - more emphasis should be placed on the Don Narrows; connecting it to the naturalized mouth (2)
  - Extension up (wider along) the narrows to include whole Ship Channel and water under Bailey Bridge on Unwin Avenue. (3)
  - Should some or all of the eastern part of the Ship Channel be included in order to fully evaluate the identified alternative? → include naturalization along Ship Channel edge
  - Include additional 200m on east side of Don Greenway (north of Ship Channel) in naturalization study area. (3)
- Promote the natural flow of the river, water hitting at right angles is unnatural.
- Any abandoned rail lines should be considered.
- The study area includes all of the land east of Parliament Street to Cherry Street and south of Lakeshore Boulevard. Home Depot is the owner of 13.3 acres of this land. In the handout, there were four Preliminary Concepts shown. None of these have any requirement for land west of Cherry Street. Also, the EA will be studying the location of the new Cherry Street Bridge and this is shown on all plans to be east of the existing bridge. Therefore, Home Depot believes that this entire area of land should be deleted from the Study Area.
- Either concept 3 or 4 would be best suited for flood protection.
- Must ensure that enough reforestation upstream is also taking place to minimize the downstream consequences since downstream options would still not accommodate as much outflow as was the case prior to the original infilling and re-channeling of the Don.
- Good work. (2)

**3. a) What edits, if any, would you suggest regarding the goal of this project?**

- Instead of “within the context of an urban environment” change to “within the context of the environment in a natural city” (3)
  - Concern that reference to urban environment will limit the level of a possible natural environment (2)
  - Change urban to city.
- This section needs to talk about continuation and complexity and diversity of habitats
- This section needs to more clearly identify what is meant by the word “naturalize”
- Incorporate the word “sustainable” into the goal. (2)
- Mention plant species, fish, birds, mammals, insects with reference to what we are trying to accomplish.
- Good. No edits. (3)
- Add "and from an ecosystem perspective." after urban environment. (2)

**b) What edits, if any, would you suggest regarding the objectives of this project? (Objectives are numbered 1-6)**

**Objective 1**

- Please define the term “naturalization” (2)
- Good.
- Include words like habitat, diversity, etc. in the objective.
- Should the word be "rehabilitation"? Can the difference be defined somewhere? (2)

**Objective 2**

- Good.

**Objective 3**

- Discuss monitoring of pollution (2)
- Acknowledge trade-offs between nature and human convenience and get mix right
- Make sure it is not ‘over-managed’

**Objective 4**

- Consider what changes in infrastructure could be made (2)
- Wording needs to change (2)
  - Re-express as :Adapt and develop a design that allows infrastructure moved when the naturalizing happens
  - Things that appear “unmovable” may appear more moveable later so be careful to include that in the objective.
  - Add "or removed." after word "moved."
- Reasonably moved in what time period?

- Consider: Integrate if necessary but allow possibility of relocating or removal at a later date eg. Gardiner or rail lines
- Good.
- Define criteria for "reasonably." (2)
- Incorporate commitment to "adaptive management" into the objective. (2)
- Discuss negotiations with private land owners on use of land in the objective.

### **Objective 5**

- Use a more assertive word in place of support. Consider: encourage instead.
- Expand concept to include "other" alternatives for example a series of channels for complementary water uses
- Insert "compatible [and inviting] recreational" into the objective.
- Good – no changes necessary.
- No motorized toys (e.g. skidoos, ATC's)
- All trails fully must be fully accessible to wheelchairs, strollers, etc.
- Trails must be wide enough for pedestrians and bikers and bladders, as well as connected to other trail systems and not interfere with needs of wildlife. (2)

### **Objective 6**

- Insert "Coordinate with [and influence in an ecologically responsible way].....[to ensure these objectives] into objective (3)
- This project could expand on the recreational, cultural, and heritage opportunities.
- Make this statement more concise.
- The Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation has already engaged Koetter Kim and spent considerable resources on the planning of the study area that Home Depot wishes to be deleted. The planning of this area is already considerably advanced and does not need to be included in the EA. This planning is best done through the normal planning process through the City of Toronto, with the EA informed of the outcome.
- Should be worded in such a way that the DMNP is presented as the means of revitalizing the waterfront, rather than it taking a back seat to 'reasonably foreseeable infrastructure'.
- Good – no changes needed. (2)
- Connect to sustainability issues in adjacent areas.

### **Adding to Objectives:**

- Humans should be part of the environment and not be the dictator/manipulator
  - Value the river for its own sake, not only for what it does for humans.

- Access should be available to the Public to the Mouth at the appropriate locations.
- This list of objectives should serve as an impetus for a connection to sustainable initiatives in adjacent areas.
- Define terms "form, features, and function" in objectives.
- Consider: creative remediation and/or bio remediation (Is there an opportunity?)
- Good – overall no changes necessary.

**Question 4: Do you have any feedback on the overall work plan for the project? In particular, are the proposed opportunities for public consultation appropriate – in terms of their timing? Topics covered?**

- Overall good – topics covered and timing are acceptable. (2)
- Great idea to have themed working groups (3)
- Commissioner's Park and East Bay Front initiatives need to be done in conjunction with the naturalization of the Don (2)
- Liaise with Wet Weather Flow Master Plan Implementation process (2)
- Use an alternative to matrix based decision model - two possibilities outlined
  - Utility Theory: this is a nonlinear method which can better reflect actual effects of each alternative being considered
  - Strategic Management Decision Making: this method evaluates trade-offs between alternatives using discussion and consensus of multiple criteria
  - In either case, each subvariant of each alternative must be separately evaluated.
  - Separate screening criteria should not be used because both of the methods above are nonlinear and automatically include all strong negative impacts – using screening criteria will result in only considering some negative impacts as strong impacts and undervalues the other strong impacts which were not treated as screening criteria.
- Consultation schedule should be flexible in case issues arise that need extra meetings. (2)
- Provide mediation in case of sharp disagreements during meetings. (2)
- The current plan shown on Page 6 is to submit the Terms of Reference ("ToR") to the Ministry early Q2 of 2006. The EA will not be completed until the end of 2007. The estimated amount of time for the Ministry to issue its final approval is 9 to 18 months (the end of 2008 to middle 2009). There could also be a public hearing and mediation caused by others that would delay the process beyond this time. (Unlike Class EA's whose regulations are clearly set out, there is no process specified for Individual EA's.) Clearly, development of the Home Depot lands can occur far earlier than this plan.
- More publicity is required for this project. (2)

- General public needs more information in the form of maps and pictures.

**Other Comments:**

- Bring back a fishery.
- Maybe have a ferry that goes to the Toronto Islands from Cherry Beach (2)
- “Please walk on the grass!” – have inviting words and include the concept into design and implementation.
- Promote Tommy Thompson Park during project.
- This was a good introduction meeting.
  - Appreciated the emphasis on achieving the dream/vision.
- Continue to welcome all comments and ideas but continue to guide participants to when their ideas will be addressed.
- Encourage consultants, City, Provincial, and Federal employees to join the small group discussions with the citizens.