## Appendix Q

### Consultation Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q-1</th>
<th>Notices, Public Forums and Workshops, and Meeting Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q-2</td>
<td>Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting Materials and Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-3</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-4</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Minutes, Agency Correspondence and Meeting Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-5</td>
<td>History of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, Toronto Purchase Specific Claim &amp; Globe Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-6</td>
<td>Summaries of Meetings with Aboriginal Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-7</td>
<td>Port Lands Acceleration Initiative Consultation Process Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-8</td>
<td>Comments and Responses on the 2013 Draft EA Pre-submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q-1 Notices, Public Forums and Workshops, and Meeting Materials
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Site Walk #2 and Boat Cruise
Notice of Commencement and Site Walk
October 14, 2006
The Ontario Ministry of the Environment approved Toronto and Region Conservation’s (TRCA’s) Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP Project) in August 2006.

Toronto and Region Conservation, on behalf of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC), will proceed with an Environmental Assessment (EA) on the basis of the approved TOR for the DMNP Project. As we proceed with the EA, an alternative will be developed that will best transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more natural river outlet to the lake, while reducing the risk of flooding to 230 hectares of urban land east and south of the river.

Join us!

Join us at the mouth of the Don River on Saturday, October 14, 2006 to enjoy an interpretive site walk and boat cruise aboard the beautiful Island Princess, as part of our ongoing consultation in support of the DMNP Project. This FREE event will highlight many of the land and water-based issues that will be addressed when considering alternatives for a new mouth for the Don River. Representatives from several agencies and organizations will be on hand to discuss the rise of the new Don and to answer your questions. This event supports the TWRC’s mandate to renew and revitalize Toronto’s waterfront.

Saturday, October 14, 2006 • 1 to 4:30 p.m.
Meet at the parkette at the northwest corner of Don Roadway and Villiers Street. Parking is available at 95 Commissioners Street.

Some sections of the walk will occur on rough, uneven ground. Please wear heavy walking shoes or boots. The event will be held rain or shine, so please dress accordingly. RSVP to Michelle Vanderwel at 416-661-6600, ext. 5280, or mvanderwel@trca.on.ca

By TTC, take the 72A Pape bus either east from outside Union Station (Bay and Front streets) or south from Pape station to the bus stop at Don Roadway and Villiers Street.

For more information, visit: www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/default.asp?load=flood_protection
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SITE WALK #2 AND BOAT CRUISE
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Saturday, October 14, 2006

1:00 – 4:30 p.m.

SUMMARY NOTES

The primary purpose of this event was to generate public excitement by kicking-off the consultation component of the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project with a hands-on, on the ground (and on the water) information tour within the project study area, in order to show first-hand the range of possibilities and challenges associated with the project. The event participants were also presented with information regarding the industrial and natural heritage of the area, and shown the range of adjacent projects that are currently underway or will be undertaken in the near future.

177 people signed in at the meeting at the Villiers Parkette registration table. As participants arrived, they were divided into one of three groups and were provided with the following as they signed in:

- Route map showing the location of four stations within the Port Lands;
- Brief overview of the information to be presented at the four stations; and
- Feedback form to provide comments.

Tour guides led the groups through the four information stations located at Villiers Parkette, the corner of Commissioners Street and Don Roadway, near the corner of Cherry Street and Lake Shore Blvd. (470 Lakeshore Boulevard) and aboard the Island Princess (the tour boat for the event) which traveled between the Keating Channel and the Turning Basin of the Ship Channel. Experts led discussions at the various stations on the following topics:

- Hydraulics, hydrology and flood risk;
- Flora and fauna;
- Industrial history of the Port Lands;
- Soils and groundwater;
- Filmport Studios;
- Roadways and infrastructure;
- East Bayfront Precinct Plan;
- Toronto Transit Commission’s environmental assessments in the area;
- Ecological linkages between Tommy Thompson Park and the Don watershed;
- Fish and aquatic habitat;
- Toronto Port Authority operations; and
- Commissioners Park, Interim Sports Fields, Lake Ontario Park and the Port Lands Strategy.
All groups were welcomed to the event by Adele Freeman (TRCA) and Paul Murray (Gartner Lee Ltd.) while a concurrent electrofishing demonstration was featured at the Keating Channel adjacent to the Villiers Parkette. Summaries of the talks are included in section 1.0 of these notes.

The following points summarize the feedback received (18 comments received):

- 55% of respondents had no previous participation in the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
- 100% of respondents were interested or somewhat interested in attending future Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project events
- 78% of respondents would like to attend another site walk, with 60% interested in public meetings and open houses
- 100% of respondents found the site walk useful to understand the project
- Asked what was most useful or interesting about the event, respondents most often mentioned the opportunity to see the plans from the perspective of the land and the water, seeing the scale of the project, learning about the other projects in the area, and learning about the history and biology of the area
- Suggestions for future events included holding site visits in the spring or summer and trying to have smaller groups or more sound equipment to better hear speakers

*Please refer to the remainder of this report for more detailed notes.*
1.0 Presentations
SITE WALK NOTES

Saturday, October 14, 2006
INTRODUCTION

Paul Murray, Garter Lee Limited
Ken Dion, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

In July 2006, the Ministry of the Environment approved the Terms of Reference for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. The ToR establishes the framework for the studies and analysis that the project team will undertake during the Environmental Assessment process.

During today’s site walk, we hope to illustrate several key elements of the project that are presented in the ToR. First and foremost, the site walk is an excellent opportunity to become familiar with the southern portion of the project study area, which includes the Don Mouth from the railway bridge south to the lake and lands adjacent to the Lower Don River. The combination of a walking tour and a boat tour will provide many of you with a unique perspective on the study area.

Second, the site walk will also help demonstrate the need for this project. The ToR identifies three main problems with the Don Mouth as it exists currently, which are its lack of ecological function, its vulnerability to flood risk, and the derelict nature of this area. As a forward-looking document, the ToR identifies opportunities for addressing these problems through naturalization of the river mouth and flood protection measures. We have stations set up to discuss these problems and opportunities and outline how the Environmental Assessment intends to come up with solutions.

Naturalization and flood protection are the two primary objectives of this project and the solution that we develop during the EA must effectively address these two objectives, along with the other 5 objectives outlined in the ToR. The ToR presents a detailed methodology for developing a solution that will reshape the Don Mouth in a way that establishes and sustains the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

During the preparation of the ToR, the project team determined that there were three alternatives that could provide such a solution and that would need to be evaluated during the EA. The first proposes to discharge the flow of water to the Inner Harbour through the area currently containing the Keating Channel and the lands to the north. A second alternative proposes to discharge the flow south through the Port Lands to the Ship Channel, and a third alternative combines the first two, with one primary channel and one regional flood overflow channel.

The project team has recently begun the task of identifying a preferred alternative for naturalization and flood protection through a 5-step process. The first step involves developing detailed alternatives, or alternative methods, by combining the three discharge points described above with different cross-sections and habitat types for the river mouth. Once we screen out those alternative methods that are not technically feasible, we will refine the remaining methods by incorporating recreational opportunities, and integrating existing and proposed infrastructure and river options including the management of sediment, ice and debris, and navigation. The final step will involve a thorough comparison and evaluation of the remaining alternative methods to identify a preferred alternative.

At our upcoming public forum on December 5, we will present the project team’s findings from Steps 1 and 2. The focus of today’s site walk is to share information about the study area and the various challenges and opportunities it presents.
VILLIERS PARKETTE

Hydraulics, Hydrology, and Flood Risk
Don Haley, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

Flora and Fauna
Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee Ltd.
Hydraulics, Hydrology and Flood Risk
Don Haley, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

Flooding within the area of the Lower Don River has a written history dating back to the early 1800s, the principle causes being ice jamming and late fall flooding.

As recently as August of 2005, flooding occurred within this area resulting from a series of severe thunderstorms. While most of the flooding over the last few decades has resulted in mainly nuisance type flooding, the area is subject to extensive flooding under a tropical storm similar to Hurricane Hazel which occurred on October 15 and 16 of 1954.

For this area of the Province, the rainfall from Hurricane Hazel centered over the Watershed is used to define the limits of flooding. Under this rainfall, the river is anticipated to rise to levels which will exceed the channel of the river and begin to spill to the extent that the valley allows.

Upstream of Queen Street, the valley feature is narrow and will contain the flood although depths and velocities will be extremely high. South of Queen Street, the valley expands outwards to form the historical Lake Ontario shoreline and the flood expands outwards with it, spilling south and west into the downtown core of the City and eastward towards the beaches area. The elevated CNR lines aggravate this condition. (Flood protection works currently underway upstream of the CNR are designed to eliminate this flooding)

The area south of the CNR under the regulatory flood will also flood, but to depths much less than those upstream. The floodplain widens into a large spill area as it enters the Portland’s spilling well east and south to the Ship Channel. With upstream flood protection works, all flood waters will be directed south through the widened railway bridge over the Don River.

Developing a strategy and deal with the flooding South of the CNR is a key component of this Environmental Assessment. This project will address the types of works necessary as well as the land base required to contain the floodwaters. This will be undertaken in a process which merges flooding, ecological and socio-economic needs.
Flora and Fauna

Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee Ltd.

The coastal marshes of Lake Ontario have suffered as a result of many slings and arrows; all flung in the name of improving the quality of life for people in the Great Lakes basin. Changes have occurred as a result of deforestation of the watersheds; intensive agriculture; urbanization; construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway; dredging for harbours and ship passage; filling to control disease and insects; reclamation of wetlands for development.

The marshes of the Don River mouth once covered many hectares and appear to have been extensive mats of cattail, bulrushes and sedges that would have provided habitat for a plethora of birds, mammals, amphibians and fish. Marshes are among the most productive ecosystems in the world.

The goal of the Don River Naturalization project is to establish the form, features, and function of a natural river mouth within the context of an urban environment. One of the prime objectives is to recover a fraction of this lost immense biodiversity. But just as the historical biodiversity is irrevocably changed, so has the environmental basis for that diversity. The quantity and quality of the water, not only chemistry but the micro and macro fauna and flora and the ecosystems they support; even the chemistry of the air has changed. Therefore, the ecosystem that can be reclaimed at this site will be uniquely urban and adapted to the coast of Lake Ontario in 2006.

This EA process will look at the existing conditions to determine what building blocks are available to assemble a river mouth that is sustainable and, among other things provides habitat for a variety of urban tolerant species and looks for opportunities to create “stepping stones” to connect the wildlife of the Toronto Islands and the spit with those of the Don River watershed. Although recreation of a wetland would be a good target to compensate for those lost, due to the constraints of the modern world, a range of options will be considered that include not only wetlands, but also upland forests and meadows.
COMMISSIONERS / DON ROADWAY

History of the Area
  Michael Moir, City of Toronto

Soils/Groundwater
  Mike Longland

Film Port
  Frank Serafini
History of the Area
Michael Moir, City of Toronto

In the beginning, there was . . .
- Ashbridge’s Bay, approximately 1,300 acres of marsh, the largest wetlands in eastern Canada
- Wide variety of wildlife in the area
- Residential communities develop during the mid and late 18th century near the foot of Morse Street and Carlaw Avenue (including a boatbuilding factory) and at Fisherman’s Island, located just east of the East Gap

It seemed like a good idea at the time . . .
- Clumps of marsh broke free, floated into the harbour, and became a hazard to navigation
- Solution was the construction of the Government Breakwater during the 1870s, which ran south in a gentle arc from the Rolling Mills Wharf at the south side of the mouth of the Don River, to the area now known as Cherry Beach
- Not only did the breakwater restrain the marsh, it also contained the large amount of manure that drained directly into the marsh from the cattle byers of Gooderham and Worts
- Manure, combined with the outfall of sanitary sewers along the north shore of the bay, resulted in the serious deterioration of water quality and outbreak of disease
- Coghill’s dry dock built in mouth of the Don in the 1880s, and small industry established east of the breakwater and south of the river’s mouth by the early 20th century

If at first you don’t succeed . . .
- Concern over health problems and the drive for commercial and industrial expansion led to several plans for the reclamation of Ashbridge’s Bay, such as the design by Beavis and Browne in 1889 and the Grand Trunk Railway during the early 1890s
- In the short term, City Council accepted the recommendations of City Engineer E.H. Keating, which involved cutting a channel through the Government Breakwater into the harbour (now known as the Keating Channel) and a second channel through the sandbar on the south edge into Lake Ontario (Coatsworth Cut) to create circulation

Engineering on a grand scale
- Toronto Harbour Commissioners established in 1911, and given sweeping powers to plan, construct, and operate new waterfront to pay for itself through industrial and commercial development (including port operations)
- Waterfront Plan adopted by federal and municipal governments in 1912, which includes reclamation of Ashbridge’s Bay to create industrial district with residential neighbourhood and boulevard drive along its south edge
- Dock wall construction started in 1914, followed by reclamation using hydraulic suction dredges and straightening of Don’s mouth due to difficulties with neighbouring landholder
- Steel plant constructed north of the Ship Channel in 1917, but failed by early 1920s due to world market conditions; same problem thwarts plans for shipbuilding industry on Polson Quay
- Plans for residential development abandoned due to concerns about co-existence with industry; Fisherman’s Island residents expropriated in 1917
- District becomes the site for storage of fuel (oil and coal) and aggregate, recycling industries, incinerator, power plant, and other uses requiring large, open space, and proximity to city core while maintaining a respectful distance that was out of the sight of most residents
- Legacy of this land use history includes environmental contamination and deteriorating infrastructure
Soils and Groundwater

Michael Longland, Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture

Subsurface Environmental Conditions

Two areas, one north and one south of the Keating Channel, will be affected by the Don Mouth Naturalization and Portland Protection program. In terms of soil and groundwater quality, most is known at present about the area north of the Keating Channel.

This north site was for many years occupied by an oil refinery. The many large petroleum and petroleum product (gasoline and diesel, for example) storage tanks that occupied most of the site can be seen clearly on aerial photographs taken in the past (see example taken in 1965 over). The tanks were installed within secondary containment systems consisting primarily of perimeter berms.

At the time that they were built, the secondary containment systems were designed primarily to contain burning fuel in the event of catastrophic tank failures coupled with petroleum liquid ignition. Usually, these berms were effective in preventing released petroleum liquids from flowing laterally – but not vertically. Only in relatively recent years has the need to line aboveground petroleum hydrocarbon storage tank secondary containment systems been accepted and, in some cases, regulated.

Spills likely occurred quite frequently at petroleum refineries in the past. One classic spill scenario involved tank overfilling. Most petroleum and petroleum product storage tanks have vents that prevent the pressure within the tank headspace from exceeding atmospheric during filling. This was necessary as the tanks were not designed as pressure vessels. These same vents allowed petroleum liquids to flow from the tank if pumping continued for even a short time after filling of the tank was complete. Modern petroleum liquid storage tanks are typically equipped with overflow prevention systems so that overfilling is now much less of a problem.

Spilled petroleum liquids tend to flow overland to low points then infiltrate the subsurface. Unless the secondary containment system is equipped with a liner system to prevent it, the liquids will continue to move downward until they encounter the water table. The water table within the subject lands is approximately two metres below the ground surface. At the water table, the liquids tend to “float” as their specific gravities are less than that of water. In zones that become saturated with these liquids, the floating lenses formed tend to flatten under the force of gravity with consequent lateral movement of the lens edges.

Subsurface investigations were performed at the site during the 1990s. During 2006, the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation commissioned further investigations to confirm and update the earlier investigation findings. The investigations consisted of digging test pits and drilling boreholes. This allowed both qualitative and quantitative assessment of the subsurface conditions. Qualitatively, the conditions could be assessed by directly viewing the subsurface in the case of test pits and examining soil samples in the case of boreholes. In addition, soil samples were analyzed in commercial laboratories for parameters associated with petroleum hydrocarbons (as well as other commonly-analyzed parameters). The qualitative investigations indicated that, for the reasons indicated above, the soils within a metre (and sometimes considerably more than a metre) of the ground surface are generally free of impacts. The quantitative investigations revealed that soils at and near the water table are impacted with petroleum hydrocarbons at concentrations exceeding standards considered by the Ministry of the Environment to be acceptable for sites where sensitive redevelopment is planned.
To permit the quantitative assessment of groundwater as well as soil quality, small-diameter wells known as monitoring wells were installed within the boreholes. These were designed to allow the detection of residual petroleum liquids as well as the extraction of groundwater samples for testing. Residual petroleum hydrocarbons were detected at a few of the sampling locations. Groundwater flowing across the site boundaries was found to generally conform with Ministry of the Environment standards, reflecting the low solubility in water of most of the compounds constituting petroleum and petroleum products.

Naturalization of this area may require the removal of the upper one metre or more of soil. As indicated above, the upper soil layer is generally free of impacts. It is likely this soil will prove useful for landscaping purposes. As the soil below this upper layer is impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons, some means of protecting the health of people using this area as well as the natural resources within and near this area will be required. Risk assessments will be required to confirm that the protective measures will be effective in controlling exposure.

As groundwater flowing from the site is generally not impacted at levels exceeding Ministry of the Environment standards, the impact of the subsurface petroleum hydrocarbons on nearby aquatic ecosystems is unlikely to be a critical concern. The residual petroleum hydrocarbons found at some locations within the subject area will likely have to be removed. Mechanical systems that do not require soil removal are often used to extract subsurface liquids of this type.

As part of the environmental assessment program, various options for achieving the naturalization and flood protection objectives will be considered. The problems presented by the subsurface conditions associated with the lands both north and south of the Keating Channel will be fully taken into account.
FILMPORT

FILMPORT & THE NEW DON

The District

- Our mandate is to create a landmark film and television production complex and raise Toronto’s profile as a global film/media center.
- Located between Lakeshore Boulevard to the north, the ship channel to the south, Don Roadway to the west and Bouchette to the east.
- FILMPORT will revitalize barren land previously used for tank farms by the petroleum industry.
- FILMPORT to be a 550,000 SF state of the art production facility plus 1 million SF media district for producers, broadcasters, production companies and knowledge based industries complimented by restaurants, retail, entertainment venues and public spaces.
- Phase 1 (currently under construction) is 23,500 square meters (260,000 SF); contains 7 sound stages ranging from 10,000 SF to 45,500 SF, 86,000 SF of office space and 25,000 SF of shop space.
- Features the largest sound stage in the world and state of the art support features in communications, security and systems management.
- Future phases include office building complex for film and media related industry, support spaces for film and media equipment industry, retail and entertainment uses and prestige space for media industry leaders.

Relation to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection

- Buildings have been elevated to prevent flood effects under present conditions.
- Building locations and elevations for present and future phases will help accommodate the alternatives for the new mouth of the Don River including the Don Greenway extending south from Commissioners Park to the ship channel.
- The public entrance to the studio lot will be located on the future Don Roadway across from the Don Greenway and will become an internationally recognized symbol for FILMPORT.

Greening FILMPORT

- Roof storm water used for irrigation of landscaped areas.
- Bio-swales used as a natural means of treating storm water runoff.
- Green walls and living fences designed to grow and enhance the streetscape used throughout the complex.
- Reusing and renewing materials for construction intended to reduce use of non renewable resources and divert materials from landfill.
- Diversions include crushing concrete for reuse, mulching shrubs and bush, composing grubbed materials, use of engineered fill from site and recycling construction packaging and materials through separation on site.
- Some sustainability options include use of green roofs and the possible use of solar panels and co-generation for peak-shaving.

Contact Information

- Ken Ferguson (416) 406-1235 #2225
- Frank Serafini (416) 406-1235 #2382
- Web site www.filmport.ca
KEATING CHANNEL WEST

Roadways and Infrastructure
Jim Gough, Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture

East Bayfront
Angus Cranston, City of Toronto

TTC Environmental Assessments
Bill Dawson, TTC

Linkages between Tommy Thompson Park and Don Watershed
Ralph Toninger, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)
MEMORANDUM

From: Jim Gough, TWJV

Subject: Infrastructure Presentation Outline, Don Mouth Site Walk

Active EAs and Studies

1. The Transit EA is underway for 3 projects involving streetcar service on an exclusive right-of-way. This is an individual EA, involving development of Terms of Reference for all 3 projects, and completion of the EA for two of these:
   - Queens Quay Streetcar Extension from Union Station to Small Street (just east of Parliament)
   - West Don Lands Streetcar service, extending from the King Street service either via Front Street or Cherry Street, to a terminus just north of the rail corridor
   - Port Lands Streetcar service, extending the Queens Quay and/or West Don Lands streetcar services into the Port Lands
   - The Queens Quay and West Don Lands projects will proceed through the full individual EA process now; the Port Lands Streetcar EA will be completed at a later date
   - Terms of Reference have been submitted to Ministry of the Environment for review
   - The key issue for the Don Mouth area is how these transit services will connect through this area along Cherry Street
2. Queens Quay Extension/Lower Don River Roads EA. This study will define the road needs in the area between Parliament Street and the Don Roadway, addressing:
   - Extension of Queens Quay from Parliament to Cherry Street
   - Alignment of Cherry Street from the rail overpass to Villiers Street
   - Connections between Cherry Street and Queens Quay/Lake Shore Boulevard
   - Alignment of Lake Shore Boulevard east to the Don Roadway, and bridge over Don River
   - Cherry Street bridge capacity and alignment requirements over the Don River
   - This is a complex project in terms of defining a functional road network as well as a well-designed urban space that builds on whatever the recommendation for the Don Mouth may be
Issues to Consider

1. Short spacing on Cherry Street between the rail overpass and the (relocated) Don River, in which Lake Shore Boulevard and the proposed intersection of Queens Quay must be accommodated, together with an appropriate profile for accommodating the bridge over the River;
2. Width of the Cherry Street bridge into the Port Lands – is one bridge sufficient for travel demands by auto, transit, bike and walking? Should there be a second bridge, perhaps exclusively for one or two modes (e.g. bike/pedestrian or transit only)?
3. Potential Broadview Avenue extension into the Port Lands (as per City Secondary Plan);
4. Clear span of the bridge(s) required over the Don River, and the relationship of this issue to the Cherry Street profile;
5. Re-alignment of Lake Shore Boulevard to create a separate road from Cherry Street and a more typical grid intersection with Cherry Street;
6. Accommodation of rail spur linking from Redpaths to the east side of the Don River;
7. Potential changes to the Gardiner Expressway and Lake Shore Boulevard, ranging from “Transformation” (leaving it in place and changing some of the ramp locations to reduce interference with pedestrian/cyclist movement) to removal of the Gardiner in this area and introduction of the “Great Street / Waterfront Boulevard”.

Jim Gough, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Transportation Planning

EA/TRCA memo site walk.doc

Draft Scope of Work: Lower Don River Area Road Network EA
East Bayfront
Angus Cranston, City Of Toronto

- **Background:** Preparation of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, work leading up to the adoption of the Central Waterfront Plan in April, 2003

- **Progress with the creation of Precinct Plans**
  - adoption of the East Bayfront West Precinct Plan – December 2005
  - other plans adopted include the West Don Lands and Commissioners Park

- **Outline of Consultation with the Public and Landowners 2006**

- **Adoption of the East Bayfront West Precinct Zoning By-law (1049-2006)**
  - adopted by City Council at its last session on September 27, 2006

- **Significant components of the By-law for this area**
  - the bylaw provides for 2 major types of land use – open space and mixed use development including residential uses and employment with ground floor animation uses along the park/open space edges and the north side of Queens Quay East and defines building envelopes and setbacks rather than density
  - the proposed by-law recommends that a holding classification be placed on all the lands until the land owners can demonstrate their ability to meet the Section 37 conditions – many of these are “green” criteria including the provision of district heating, compliance with storm water management programs and providing a minimum of LEED Silver standard buildings
  - all developers will be asked to pay a Section 37 contribution for the residential component of any development
  - all developers must agree to participate in a Design Review Panel process to try to elevate the quality of buildings within the Waterfront

- **Next Steps**
  - staff will be working at the creation of Design Guidelines to be available for public review over the course of the next couple of months
  - staff continues with the approval processes related to appeals of the Central Waterfront Plan and any appeals of the Zoning By-law 1049-2006
  - work on the East East Bayfront Precinct will commence shortly for the lands to the east of Parliament Street as well as Environmental assessment for the transportation connections in the area
  - proposal calls for the development of the publicly owned lands will be proceeding soon

- **More Information**
  East Bayfront Precinct Plan - [http://www.toronto.ca/waterfront/reports.htm](http://www.toronto.ca/waterfront/reports.htm)
  East Bayfront Zoning By-law - [http://www.toronto.ca/waterfront/index.htm#more](http://www.toronto.ca/waterfront/index.htm#more)
TTC-TWRC Waterfront Transit Environmental Assessment Studies

TTC-TWRC Transit Environmental Assessments Project Team

The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC), in conjunction with the TWRC and the City of Toronto, is proceeding with Environmental Assessment (EA) studies to identify the transit improvements required to support planned development in the West Don Lands and the East Bayfront precincts. The studies will identify a preferred approach to providing an effective transit network to serve these new waterfront communities.

Transit in these precincts will be interconnected and connect with future transit service in the Port Lands precinct to eventually form a continuous system linked to the downtown core, the subway system, the grid of local transit routes in the area and the GO commuter rail system. Full development of the three precincts is expected to generate twice as many daily transit users as are currently on the 510 SPADINA streetcar, one of the busiest streetcar routes in the City.

City Council has approved a transportation strategy for the waterfront communities with a particular focus on encouraging walking, cycling, transit use, and water transportation. The strategy includes:

- A “Transit First” approach to provide for the early construction and operation of planned higher-order transit services;
- Exclusive streetcar rights-of-way for the proposed waterfront transit network;
- Extensions of the existing bus and streetcar network into the waterfront area to provide numerous north-south connections.

Achieving Council’s objectives, along with the TWRC’s objectives of excellence in sustainability and urban design, will require that high quality transit services and facilities be provided which are effectively integrated into the fabric of the community. Terms of Reference for the EA studies, one for each precinct, have been submitted to the Ministry of the Environment. The stated purpose of each project is:

To determine the transit facilities appropriate to serve the long term residential, employment, tourism and waterfront access needs in the study area while achieving the City’s and TWRC’s objectives for land use, design and environmental excellence.

The EA studies will address a range of corridor, transit technology, and right-of-way treatment options for each study area. As part of each study there are Community Workshops planned for January and May 2007 to develop and assess alternatives.

The results of the studies will be presented to City Council and the TWRC Board for approval before formal submission to the Ministry of Environment, which is planned for late in 2007. If approvals proceed as expected, new transit facilities could be completed and in operation in the West Don Lands area as early as 2010 and in the East Bayfront area in 2013.

October, 2006
**Tommy Thompson Park**

Located on the Toronto waterfront, Tommy Thompson Park is a unique urban wilderness that offers many public recreational opportunities in the heart of the city.

The park is located on a man-made peninsula that extends five kilometres into Lake Ontario. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners began construction of the spit in the late 1950s and, since that time, it has been the site for the disposal of dredged material from the Outer Harbour and surplus fill from development sites within Toronto.

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority currently owns the land and water bodies included in Tommy Thompson Park. Those areas still under construction are owned by the Ministry of Natural Resources and are leased to the Toronto Harbour Commission. The TRCA is responsible for the development and implementation of the "master plan" and the annual operating program, which includes both biological and public interest activities.

One of the most significant features of Tommy Thompson Park is the colonization and succession of various plant communities. These wetlands, meadows and forests now support many threatened and unusual species.

The park has become well known as a significant nesting and staging area for a wide range of birds and other wildlife. In total, more than 290 bird species have been observed on site. Of these, 45 are known to breed here, including ring-billed gulls, herring gulls, common terns, black-crowned night herons and double-crested cormorants.
The ecological approach to development of Tommy Thompson Park has been
guided by the principles of conservation by design. These principles are defined
as the purposeful act of designing for a variety of wildlife habitats to assist in the
restoration of rare, endangered or significant plant and animal communities.
Natural succession is the key concept behind the philosophy of conservation by
design.

The Natural Area Enhancement Plan will be designed to facilitate the growth and
natural development of indigenous plant and animal communities. Planting and
seeding will be done to inoculate areas with vegetation adapted to the specific
environment. These areas will then be left to grow, reproduce and spread
naturally and unhindered as much as possible. The Natural Area Enhancement
Plan will focus on both terrestrial natural area and aquatic habitat enhancement.
BOAT CRUISE

Fish and Aquatic Habitat
Deb Martin-Downs, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

Port Authority Operations, Inner Harbour, Ship Channel
Michael Riehl, Toronto Port Authority

Commissioners Park, Interim Sports Fields, Lake Ontario Park, Port Lands Strategy
Chris Glaisek, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC)
Fish and Aquatic Habitat
Deb Martin-Downs, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

Are there fish in the Don? Yes! There are a variety of species, including forage (fish that are food for other fish) and sport fish (fish that food for people). We have low numbers of sport fish, such as northern pike, walleye and salmon or trout; higher numbers of more tolerant species such as white sucker. Of interest is a recent find of some juvenile walleye, which we suspect may have been reproduced in the Don and if that is the case, it is very promising and suggests that some of the habitat works we have been introducing in the lower Don may be paying off (e.g. creating rocky ramps at old weirs).

Why are there so few sport fish? The low numbers of sport fish in the Don is related to the type of habitat and water quality in the river. Fish like pike need a wetland to spawn in. They spawn over flooded vegetation in the spring and then the young move into adjacent deeper waters when large enough. Historically, there was a wetland at the mouth of the Don and pike were common in the river, according to Mrs. Simcoe. Walleye spawn on shoals in the lake, or in rapids. The young are transported into slower moving waters with a good food source for growth. While walleye like water that is a little murky (they have sensitive eyes), they also need a good food source in the water column, like algae and zooplankton. If there is too much sediment in the water it limits light such that algae, which are plants, cannot grow. Zooplankton, which depend on algae to grow, will also be limited. Many fish need to see to catch their dinner, particularly the sport fish.

Salmon, Atlantic that is, used to be abundant in Don until they were extirpated in the mid-1800s. This loss was related to dams blocking their upstream movements and changes in water quality when forested lands were converted to agricultural lands and into the Town of York. Degradation of water quality in the Don started in 1794 and continues to today. Salmon and trout spawn in the river upstream on gravel river beds. While today we have removed dams to allow pacific salmon and rainbow trout to access the Don, the water quality is such that they cannot spawn successfully. We also have added a lot of sediment to the river beds upstream such that they are not good for incubating the eggs. Sediment settles on the eggs and smothers them.

What Causes the Poor Water Quality? You are hearing now about the role that sediment plays in fish habitat. Sediment comes from many sources, including erosion within the river, delivered from exposed soils at construction sites, and from our streets where, for example, sand is applied during winter. Sediment concentrations in the river are higher when it rains. The river can be very clear during dry weather. Runoff to the stream carries other pollutants to the river, such as oil and grease, bacteria, salt, pesticides, fertilizers. So concentrations of these contaminants also increase when it rains. In addition, there may be spills on roads and industrial areas any time, which may be toxic to fish.

So What do we Need to Consider for a Naturalized River Mouth? To provide habitat for the fish that are in the Don and the Harbour, the edge of the river much be more gradual and have wetland vegetation. Fish need shade for cover from predators, as well as other cover types, such as rocks and logs. Fish need food, so there must be a variety of habitat types for forage fish, algae, plankton and benthic invertebrates. The water needs to be cleaner, and plans are in place with the City of Toronto, to tackle wet weather flow and its effects on water quality. The fish need refuge, away from the floods, away from people, away from sediment and its contaminants. Fish that move through the mouth to access habitat upstream need to have good habitat to go to. This is not part of this project but the wet weather flow plan and fish management plans for the Don will identify needed upstream naturalization.
In 1972, Canada & the USA signed an agreement to ban the open water disposal of polluted sediments.

Ministry of the Environment (MOE) asked the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) to design a Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) for the disposal of polluted sediments dredged from the Keating Channel (KC).

Design & construction of the Endikement as an extension of the Leslie St. Spit (1979-today).

CDF consists of 3 cells (#1 filled in 1985; #2 in 1997; #3: 60 years to go).

Disposal of the dredgeate into the CDF carried out pursuant to the Keating Channel Environmental Assessment (1983).

Keating Channel Debris Management

Quality of sediments flowing into the KC & Inner Harbour:
Early polluted sediment produced by agricultural & industrial activities. Before 1914 accumulated in Ashbridge's Bay. Since 1914 accumulated at NE section of Harbour after Don River realigned.

Since the 1960's, sources of contaminants: Don River, storm sewer and combined sewer overflow discharges.

Studies identify source control, for Waterfront and watershed of the Don River, as the most effective means of improving the conditions in the Inner Harbour. (Golder Associates Ltd., 2001)

KC has provided the opportunity of managing the flow of sediment originated in the Don River watershed.

Volume of sediment in recent years: 40,000 m³/Yr (approx.)
Cost: $450,000/Yr (approx.)
Share: Toronto Port Authority (1/3)
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (2/3)

The "Keating Channel / Leslie Street Working Committee" with representatives of TPA, TRCA and the City of Toronto oversee the project.

Regular removal of floating debris using two control booms.
Increased debris following storm events.
Annually the debris collected is approximately 400 tonnes.

For the May 12, 2000 storm: 337 tonnes of debris (most of it at the expense of TPA).
Commissioners Park

TWRC is now planning Commissioners Park, a 41-acre waterfront park located in the Portlands between the Keating Channel and Commissioners Street. The park is being designed to be both a waterfront landmark and an active recreation space that will help meet existing demand for playing fields and park space as well as the future needs of new waterfront communities in the West Don Lands, East Bayfront and Portlands.

The diverse landscape of Commissioners Park will accommodate a range of activities: larger fields for recreational sports, forests for causal walks, groves for intimate gatherings. These features along with views back to the downtown core will make Commissioners Park one of the best in the city. The history and ecology of the site and the Don Greenway are also important elements of the park design.

Vision Statement: The park design must provide for a high quality, urban, active recreation park incorporating social, environmental and financial sustainability principles, and must consider the emerging nature of the surrounding context.

Lake Ontario Park

Located along the Outer Harbour between Cherry Beach and Ashbridges Bay, Lake Ontario Park is one of TWRC’s signature projects. The park is included in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and will be a landmark park not only for a newly revitalized waterfront but for the city as whole.

Developing Lake Ontario Park early on in the revitalization process demonstrates the corporation’s commitment to a green, sustainable waterfront. The project has brought together the key organizations with an interest in the park - Toronto Region and Conservation Authority, Parks Canada, City of Toronto Parks and Recreation and the Toronto Port Authority.

Transitional Sports Fields

In 2004, TWRC received $5 million to develop transition sports fields in the Port Lands. The project is supported by the federal, provincial and municipal governments. The City of Toronto’s strategic plan for parks and recreation, “Our Common Ground,” identifies the need for playing fields as a top priority, especially in the south end of the city. The fields are in keeping with TWRC’s mandate to expand recreational opportunities on the waterfront.
Two regulation sports fields are being built on the south side of Unwin Avenue just west of Regatta Road. This area falls within the boundaries of the future Lake Ontario Park. With a life of about 10 years, these sports fields are considered transitional. The number and location of permanent playing fields will be determined through the Lake Ontario Park Master Plan.

Additionally, by 2010, Commissioners Park will be complete. This park will include four regulation size playing fields.

Site preparation work for the transitional sports fields will begin in January 2007 and construction will be complete in the spring—in time for the 2007 children’s soccer season.

**Don River Park**

**Overview**

Don River Park will be an active, vibrant and inviting neighbourhood park serving the West Don Lands community, the City and visitors. It will transform an abandoned and contaminated post-industrial site into a dynamic, re-natured public park that is animated year-round. It will invite the city to the Don River and enhance the experience along the river’s edge.

**Landscape**

Don River Park will create a large inviting greenscape within the regenerating city fabric – renewing site while integrating vital urban infrastructure elements and responding to their scale. Unfolding and robust topography will build on the elevation already provided by the Don River flood protection landform that will transect the park. The landscape will open sightlines to Toronto’s skyline and Lake Ontario and create a sense of scale and grandeur that expands the park. A mix of tree groves, open lawns, diverse plantings and a marshland water feature fed by captured stormwater will create an environment inspired by a woodland meadow and the site’s vegetative history.

**Program**

Within Don River Park’s 18 acres, a variety of spaces and programmatic elements will invite people of all ages to enjoy the park at all times of the year.

- Along the Don River, renewal of the multiuse trail system and new access under the Bala railway corridor will enhance the experience at the water’s edge.
- On the river side of the landform, a 21st century urban meadow will provide a unique landscape in which to wander, explore and discover.
- Active play will be central to the new park including water play, a skating area, a multi-use sports field, a skateboard park and new playground equipment geared to a range of ages. The park’s hills and lawns will be ideal for tobogganning, Frisbee, catch or a whole range of informal sport.
- A network of trails will connect more active areas with places to sit, picnic or enjoy the landscape.
At one of the highest points, a pavilion, an informal amphitheater and a fire element will allow visitors to: take in views to the River, the city and the waterfront; get shelter from the weather; access facilities; and, perhaps even enjoy a cappuccino or an ice cream.

**Timing and Milestones**

The Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation has engaged the team of Michael van Valkenburgh Associates, the Planning Partnership and Ken Greenberg to design Don River Park. The following is the schedule for completing the park.

Feb 2006 – Sept 2006 Concept Design  
- 3 public forum events  
- Design workshops with 300 students from 5 local elementary schools  
- Regular stakeholder meetings

Sept 2006 – Feb 2007 Detailed Design  
- Ongoing community and stakeholder consultation

Feb 2007 Construction tenders issued

March 2007 Construction begins

Summer 2008 Park Construction Complete
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Site Walk #2 and Boat Cruise

Appendix A
Route Map

October 14, 2006
SITE WALK #2
October 14, 2006
Don Mouth Naturalization and
Port Lands Flood Protection Project

LEGEND

Information Areas
#1 - Villiers & Don Roadway Parkette
#2 - Commissioners & Don Roadway
#3 - Keating Channel West
#4 - Boat Cruise

- Site Walk Route
- Boat Cruise Route

Boat Launch Areas
TP - TEDCO Property
KCP - Keating Channel Pub

- DMNP Study Area
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Site Walk #2 and Boat Cruise

Appendix B
Public Feedback Summaries

October 14, 2006
Site Walk Feedback SUMMARY (18 responses)

1. Have you PREVIOUSLY participated in any of the following activities held as part of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended a public meeting and/or working session</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received project newsletter</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have NOT previously participated in DMNP Project</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Would you be interested in attending future public activities/events related to this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you are interested in staying informed and/or contributing to this project, what type of activities/events would be MOST APPEALING to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another site walk</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meeting or working session</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House/Informal Drop-In to review displays and talk to team members</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Several respondents suggested that all events would be equally appealing.
- One respondent who suggested another site walk specified that it be a different walk from that of Oct. 14.
- One respondent who suggested an Open House specified that discussions and meetings with team members are essential components of this event.
- One respondent did not find the informal drop-in sessions as good as the other activities. They wanted to hear what other "non-members" have to say ("it's easier to get a clearer picture, see different viewpoints and I find that I walk away with a better grasp of the options available").

4. Did you find the site walk, including boat tour, useful in assisting your further participation in this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful Level</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it was useful</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it was not useful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you find MOST USEFUL/INTERESTING about the site walk and boat tour?

- Presentations on the industrial history and on the flora and fauna aspects
• On the ground experience is always useful especially if accompanied by sound comment.
• Learning about the amount of silt and debris that has to be dredged from the Don River.
• The 'from the water's edge' perspective I gained.
  (Brings a whole new dimension to the topic.) The live fish were a nifty twist as well.
• Getting a perspective on the scale of the problem
• Learning about the whole project, the ecosystems, future projections and the political implications of the development
• It was good to see the actual size of the location relative to the rest of the City
• Fantastic learning…actually standing on the land we were talking about
• The entire thing -- the presentations were good -- the background information re flood plains, fish, development all good. I learned a lot that I didn't know before. Primarily from a development perspective, what was necessary in order to build/develop in the area, given issues of flooding, etc.
• Most useful was the history of the Ports over the past 100 years.
• The boat tour
• To hear about and see realistic changes occurring e.g. Filmport Development
• To see the area from ground and water level in person. The magnitude of the undertaking and the importance of getting it right now much more clear to me
• It was good to get out on the site and to see what exactly was being proposed, what infrastructure is currently there and what would have to be altered. By being onsite it helped to make things more concrete and to see the ultimate vision. Although I have driven by the area, and gone along the bike path I found the tour opened my eyes and gave me new insight into the area.
• The boat tour gave me a live perspective of the scale and size of the canals; the tour further enlightened that perspective.
• To see and hear first hand what is planned and what is being done now.
• The vastness of the area, little visited by the public – also plans that are occurring, also the area view from the water
• Intro lecture and boat tour

6. Do you have any suggestions about OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE the site walk/boat tour?

• Washrooms
• I'd suggest slightly smaller groups so it is easier to hear the presentations
• I'm not sure it's the best use of your resources, even though it's very informative and enjoyable for participants
• It could be done in Spring or Summer time
• Modify start times for different walking groups as schedule was a bit slow on way back from boat tour
• Can you control the weather?
• Walk and boat tour could be held in warmer weather
• I'd suggest slightly smaller groups so it is easier to hear the presentations
• Warmer time of the year
• I find anecdotal and historical data, stories add a lot to a walk like this. More of this could add more interest and knowledge about the area
• The organization in the parkette could have been better
The fish display was terrific but it was hard to see and hear with the crowd milling around. Putting such demos on a raised bit of scaffolding so that everyone can see would have improved the experience.

Similar displays of both local flora and other fauna would be interesting.

It was hard to hear organizers both at the parkette and on the boat, a better loudspeaker system would have enhanced the experience.

Surprised that when checking in the list of participants was listed alphabetically by first name rather than by the more usual last name.

No it was very well done.

It was difficult to hear the speakers despite the microphone (there was traffic, conversations, background noise).

One big one – washrooms.

Difficult to hear/see other speakers (other than the intro lecture, i.e. need microphones for all speakers).

Additional Comments?

I hope some of that material on the industrial history and flora and fauna can be presented at the next public meeting for people new to the project.

Looking forward to seeing more graphic representations of the various redevelopment ideas while hearing some analysis and overview information from the experts, I see several illustrations on the Web from time to time, but a browser view is not the best way to see the true scope of such projects.

I approve of, and appreciate, consultation, but it's more important to get things moving and if running these consultations drains your resources, please do the more important things first.

Very much enjoyed info/work session and Don River walk-boat tour & info. Beautifully organized.

Why has it taken so long to do the environmental studies? Why has there been so little action taken in the past 7 years, I have booklets from 1999 for suggestions of the Ports and none of the projects have started.

Most appreciative to the team for putting on info sessions/walks, good to get public interest and feedback on such a visible waterfront project.

I was very impressed with the tour and feel that whoever organized it did a fantastic job. The boat tour gave a unique perspective to the area and the speakers and timing were well thought out. There were many people who participated that hadn't occurred to me as having a vested interest in the project but who were all relevant players and it was good to hear from them. I very much appreciated getting the packet of information to take home and review what was said. Well done.

Excellent panel of speakers and representatives, spoke at my level (“layman”). Thanks for the tour.

Would like to have similar tours of the other harbourfront projects, and would love to see the new film studio as it develops.

I think the trip was useful as a background for participating in public meetings – you have seen at least part of the area being discussed.
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Public Forum #3
Notice of Public Forum

December 5, 2006
In August 2006, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) approved the Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference (TOR) submitted by Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP Project).

Toronto and Region Conservation, on behalf of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC), is proceeding with the Environmental Assessment. The study will identify the alternative that will best transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more natural river outlet to the lake, while reducing the risk of flooding to 230 hectares of urban land east and south of the river, and incorporating opportunities for public use and enjoyment.

Join us at a Public Forum and Open House where you can:

- View the results from the technical screening of alternatives.
- Learn about how the alternatives will be further refined.
- Comment on the proposed evaluation criteria that will be used to select a short list of alternatives.
- Speak with the project team.
- Be updated on related projects.

This event supports the TWRC’s mandate to renew and revitalize Toronto’s waterfront.

**Tuesday, December 5, 2006**
Registration: 6:15 p.m., Open House: 6:30 to 9:00 p.m.
Presentation/Public Forum: 7:00 to 8:30 p.m.
Metro Hall, 55 John Street, Rooms 308/309 and 304

For more information, contact Michelle Vanderwel at 416-661-6600, ext. 5280, or mvanderwel@trca.on.ca
For more information on the project, please visit:
www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/default.asp?load=flood_protection
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Environmental Assessment

Public Forum #3
Meeting Notes

December 5, 2006
SUMMARY NOTES

The purpose of the meeting was to share information and seek feedback on key aspects of the project, including:

- The long list of alternatives considered for redesigning the Don Mouth, and the 14 alternatives that passed the first technical screen;
- The criteria that will be used to reduce the list of 14 alternatives to a list of approximately 5 for more detailed study; and
- The progress being made on adjacent and related projects, including the Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project, the Don River Railway Bridge Extension and Bala Underpass, the Don River Park, and an international design competition that is being planned by the TWRC for Toronto’s Lower Don Lands.

126 people signed in at the meeting, and the following points summarize the feedback received:

- Participants had a number of questions for members of the project team during the Open House. They focused a range of topics, from the original location of the Don River mouth, to the amount of debris coming down the river, and future bridges that may be required. People expressed amazement at the volume of water flowing down the Don River during a regulatory flood, particularly when compared to the regular flow.
- In response to the 14 alternatives that passed the first technical screen of the EA process, few questions or objections were expressed. There were two people who wanted to see the list of alternatives expanded, and others looking for more information on how the sediment will be managed.
- Feedback on the technical screening process and evaluation criteria was generally positive. A few refinements were suggested (this feedback was received in written comments).
- Feedback on TWRC’s design competition for the Lower Don Lands was well received, with a request to ensure the public has an opportunity to contribute their ideas to the competition as well.

Please refer to the remainder of this report for more detailed notes.
1.0 Public Open House

The Open House portion of this event opened at 6:00 p.m. Members of the public were invited to sign in and to view display boards showing different aspects of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA), members of the consulting team, volunteers with specialized knowledge of the area, and the leads of a number of other projects that will influence and be influenced by this Project were on hand to answer questions during the Open House. All participants received the following information as they signed in:

- Meeting agenda and participant guide;
- Map of the Open House displays; and
- Copy of the presentation and key questions sheet.
- A list of comparative evaluation criteria with accompanying comment columns was also made available during the open house.

The following information was also available to participants.
- Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Newsletter, Volume #4 November 2006
- Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Newsletter, Volume #3 August 2006
- Moving Toward the Living City Strategic Plan Summary (TRCA)

All of the meeting materials listed above are available on the TRCA website at: http://www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/default.asp?load=whats_new

The open house display boards were distributed in three rooms. In Room 302, there were displays describing the study, as follows:
- Cross-sections and habitat types that are being considered;
- Technical screening of alternatives;
- Proposed evaluation criteria;
- Next steps, including proposed evaluation criteria for comparing the short list of alternatives.

Also in this room were displays on:
- Water quality;
- Benefits of the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan (City of Toronto).

In Room 303, displays were set up describing:
- Keating Channel operations (Toronto Port Authority);
- Industrial history of the Port Lands (York University);
- Filmport Studios (Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO));
- Fish and wildlife (TRCA);
- Soils and groundwater (Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture); and
- Roads and infrastructure (Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture).
In Room 308 of Metro Hall, there were displays boards describing
- The Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project (TRCA),
- Projects by the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC).

A copy of the poster boards is found in Appendix A to these notes. Appendix B to these notes contains a synopsis of the questions that were asked during the open house portion of the meeting, as reflected by project team specialists.

126 participants signed in at this event.

2.0 Welcome and Opening Remarks

Nicole Swerhun opened the presentation portion of the meeting at 7:10 p.m. She outlined the materials that were available at the sign-in desk, and invited people to fill out the Participant Guide with their comments on the project. Nicole introduced those who would be speaking at the meeting, including:

- Ken Dion, TRCA – Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project
- Adele Freeman, TRCA – Introduction to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
- Paul Murray and Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee – Starting to Make Decisions About the Don Mouth Design

A copy of these presentations can be found in Appendices C and D to these notes. The following section provides an overview of the presentations that were given. A complete list of project team members present at the meeting can be found in Appendix E to these notes.

3.0 Presentations

Ken Dion (Project Manager, TRCA) provided an update on the Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project (LDRW Project) – see enclosed presentation in Appendix C. A Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process was conducted to determine how to best provide flood protection to the Lower Don River West area. The Class EA resulted in the selection of an option with 5 key components:
- a landform along the west side of the Don River, preventing the westward flow of floodwaters into the downtown area (site preparation is currently underway and being led by Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC));
- westward extension of the Railway Bridge over the Don River Bridge in order to provide sufficient capacity under the bridge for the additional floodwaters that will be pushed back into the Don River following the construction of the landform upstream (construction is currently underway and being led by TRCA and CN);
- minor changes to a utility bridge upstream to improve local hydraulic conditions at Old Eastern Avenue (currently not a priority to proceed);
• a low-lying floodwall and dyke on the east side of the river, south of the railway crossing over the Don to accommodate the slight increase in water levels (~7 to 8 cm) that would occur south of the tracks as a result of the landform and railway bridge extension upstream (currently not a priority to proceed);
• continued dredging in the Keating Channel as per the conditions outlined in an earlier EA conducted in 1983 by TRCA.

In addition to the flood protection works associated with the LDRW Project, the TWRC assigned TRCA with the responsibility of constructing a pedestrian/cyclist underpass under the tracks (Bala Subdivision) that veers north along the west side of the Don River, in order to provide a connection between the existing Don Watershed Trail and the future West Don Lands Community and Don River Park (which will be constructed on top of the landform).

Ken provided a series of timelines and photos of construction progress for the two key flood protection components (Flood Protection Landform and Don River Railway Bridge Extension) that are proceeding as well as the Bala Pedestrian Underpass.

For the Flood Protection Landform (construction being led by ORC) and associated Don River Park (design and construction will be led by TWRC):
• All existing structures will be demolished in the WDL by December 22, 2006 in preparation for the landform.
• Municipal infrastructure that cannot be removed will be protected between February and May 2007.
• Compression of loose peaty soils will begin in February or March 2007 and will continue until May or June 2007.
• Construction of the Landform will proceed throughout Summer 2007 until Spring 2008.
• Construction of Don River Park will begin in areas where the Landform construction has been completed. Anticipate that the Don River Park will be built by Fall 2008.

For the Don River Railway Bridge Extension and Bala Underpass (led by TRCA and CN):
• Construction of the northern half of the Bridge was completed at the beginning of October 2006.
• Construction of the western half of the Bala Underpass was completed December 1, 2006.
• Construction of the southern half of the Bridge should be completed at the end of March 2007.
• The new river channel will be excavated between March and May 2007.
• Bala Underpass construction will begin approximately April 2007 and should be completed by June 2007. NOTE – Bala Underpass will not be opened until Don River Park has been completed in Fall 2008.
• Final landscaping likely to occur throughout June and July 2007 with irrigation activities to continue throughout the summer.
• Don Watershed Trail targeted to open in July 2007.
Adele Freeman (Director, Watershed Management Division, TRCA) welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked participants for attending. She explained that the Terms of Reference for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project was approved by the Minister of Environment in August 2006. The Environmental Assessment is now underway. The TRCA is undertaking this project on behalf of the TWRC and the three levels of government. Adele introduced Paul Murray, Gartner Lee, to provide an overview of the project.

Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Ltd., introduced key members of the consulting team, described their area of expertise and invited people to direct their feedback to these specialists.

Paul’s presentation provided a review of the Terms of Reference; the outcomes of Step 1 (development of a long list of alternatives); the outcomes of Step 2 (identification of a short list); and the process for undertaking Step 3 of this study. Paul highlighted the following information during his presentation.

Paul described the study area, which includes the Don Narrows and the Don River. The Goal of the project is: “to establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.” Seven objectives have been established to support this goal. A visualization of the area at risk to flooding east and south of the Don was also depicted.

In Step 1 of the process, a long list of alternatives was developed based on discharge points, river characteristics, channel shapes, and habitat types. Four alternative discharge points were considered:

- Discharge 1 is the Do Nothing Option that is required in all EAs;
- Discharge 2 has a single channel discharging into the Inner Harbour;
- Discharge 3 has a single channel discharging into the Ship Channel;
- Discharge 4W has a primary channel discharging into the Inner Harbour with a secondary spillway that directs flood flows into the Ship Channel;
- Discharge 4S has a primary channel discharging into the Ship Channel with a secondary spillway that directs flood flows into the Inner Harbour.

A graphic was shown depicting the difference in discharge between the full spectrum of anticipated flood events ranging from the typical base flow conditions (1-4 m³/s), the 2 year storm (~200 m³/s), the 100 year storm (~500 m³/s), and the Regulatory Flood (~1800 m³/s) that the preferred alternative will need to be able to accommodate to meet the flood protection and naturalization goals for the project. The current turbidity levels hinder plant growth and over 40,000 tons of sediment is trapped annually in the Keating Channel.

Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee Ltd., was introduced and discussed the habitat aspects of the project. The project team looked at all of the possible types of vegetation that could be sustained in the study area. They looked to the north shores of Lake Ontario.
for examples. It is recognized that this is a unique process, as the location of the mouth and its associated soils and fish communities have all changed from the period of the Ashbridges Bay marsh.

The types of cross-sections for the river channel that are being considered are:
- Lacustrine environment (wide and shallow, similar to a lake in cross-section)
- Created wetland
- Natural river channel (one narrow channel with sloping valley sides)

Combinations of these cross-sections are also being considered:
- Lacustrine/natural river
- Lacustrine/created wetland
(See Appendix D for diagrams illustrating each of these cross-sections)

The kinds of habitats that are being considered are:
- Submergent marsh – requires permanent flooding to survive; maximum depth of 0.5 metres for submergent plants to survive because the waters are too murky below this point; provides little resistance to water flow.
- Emergent marsh – requires semi-permanent flooding and protection from disturbance; provides little resistance to water flow.
- Meadow marsh – requires seasonal flooding for more than 45% of the growing season; provides little resistance to water flow.
- Thicket swamp – requires seasonal flooding for less than 45% of the growing season and protection from disturbance to survive; provides moderate to high resistance to water flow.
- Treed swamp – requires seasonal flooding for less than 45% of the growing season and protection from disturbance to survive; provides moderate to high resistance to water flow.
- Upland forest – limited tolerance for flooding; provides moderate to high resistance to water flow.

In Step 1 of the process, each discharge point, cross section, and habitat type (vegetation community) have been considered in combination as possible alternatives for the Don Mouth.

In Step 2 all of the alternatives were considered and screened for: the ability of the vegetation communities to survive (naturalization) and the ability of the channel to convey water during a flooding event (flood protection).

During the screening, it was determined that the lacustrine environment would not work for any of the habitats due to not being able to meet the objective of naturalization, flood protection or both. It was also determined that for the single-channel alternative discharge points (#2 and #3) the natural river channel cross-section would not meet the naturalization or flood protection objective, depending on the type of habitat. For the two-discharge point alternatives (4W and 4S), it is assumed that there will be a primary channel that contains water in some form all of the time, and a secondary channel that will only likely convey river water during flood events with a return period of at least 10
years or more. In the two discharge alternatives, there is a greater range of opportunities for creating more diverse and more robust natural habitats while still meeting the flood protection objective. Fourteen alternatives met both the flood protection and naturalization criteria and will be carried forward for further development and evaluation.

Paul Murray described the next steps in the EA process. There are 14 alternatives that will be carried forward between discharge points 2, 3, 4W and 4S. Option 1, do nothing, must also be carried forward, resulting in 15 alternatives being carried forward.

Step 3 of the process includes describing the 14 alternatives in more detail. Step 4 will focus on reducing the list of alternatives. In Step 4, a set of criteria will be applied to allow an evaluation of the various options. This evaluation will speak to the issues and trade-offs between alternatives. This will result in a list of approximately 5 options for consideration.

Paul described the evaluation criteria. The framework for the evaluation includes a series of objectives, and related components, criteria, indicators, and rationale. A proposed criteria chart was distributed and feedback invited. Once the criteria are identified, a matrix is developed to compare each of the discharge points, the associated cross sections and habitat types relative to each other. The project team will also be listing the trade-offs for each alternative. In Step 5, one of the alternatives will be selected. Step 6 involves assessing this alternative and then a functional design will be developed for it.

Paul outlined the project timelines, including the various points of formal public contact. The project is now at the end of Step 2. After incorporating public feedback on the criteria and proceeding with the analyses, the team expects the next public meeting to be held at the end of Step 4. This is anticipated to be spring 2007.

The intent is to submit the Environmental Assessment in the spring of 2008.

### 4.0 Feedback on the Presentation

Nicole Swerhun invited general questions of clarification. Questions are noted below in italics, followed by the response from the project team.

Q1. Please clarify the relationship between this project and the Commissioners Park project. Is there any overlap between the two? Has the Commissioners Park project resulted in the removal of the “two channel” options from consideration in this project?

The project team is using the Terms of Reference that was approved by the Ministry of Environment as a road map for this Environmental Assessment. The study area is
described in the Terms of Reference. There is a portion of the park overlaid by the study area while the remainder of Commissioners Park lies south of the study area. One of the objectives of the project is to make the project work with the rest of the revitalization of the Port Lands, and the project team is working with others to ensure coordination of efforts.

Q2. Mayor Miller has expressed his support for water quality and this project. In order to undertake ecological restoration, the project team needs to understand the historical conditions. The circulating channel should be added as a discharge point. An excerpt from “The Town in 1810” was submitted, along with an article from the Toronto Star.

These submissions can be found in Appendix F to these notes.

Q3. The process of evaluation might work because trade-offs are being considered, in addition to the matrix. A problem with this type of process is that not enough alternatives are considered in the long list. In this project, the project team made the assumption a split channel was not going to be considered. People think that option 4 involves a split channel. You need to put the split channel back in to the initial long list.

The project hydrologists say that the amount of water available is relatively small and is not sufficient to have a constant flow of water through two channels. This position was framed within the Terms of Reference.

Q4. My question is about the flow of the river. Currently, there are some interceptors proposed upstream as part of the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan that will affect the quality and quantity of the flows received downstream. Have they been factored in?

From a quantity side, yes, they have been factored in. For the purpose of this EA, we presume that the quality improvements will take place.

Q5. Can you explain how the new alignment of the Keating Channel will address the debris and sedimentation? (discharge 2 option)

We haven’t yet established the location of the channel nor have we presumed that we would utilize the existing Channel. It may be filled in, for example. In the next steps, we need to determine how to trap debris along with the best alignment for the Channel.

Q6. Does Discharge Point 3 include a series of bridges over the Don?

We will inform and be informed by other projects in the area. In the event that either Discharge Point 3 or 4S is selected, some form of bridge will be required. However, it still needs to be determined whether the bridge simply crosses over the regularly wetted channel, or whether the bridge would extend over the entire created floodplain.
Q7. How will you control sediment to prevent negative impact on the wetlands? 
Cattails will grow in many environments. If we want diversity, how will you 
lubricate the wetlands, especially if they have to be in an elevated state?

Members of our project team, Baird and Aquafor Beech, will be describing where and 
how sediment will be managed. We think heavy sediments will likely be managed at the 
point of the CN bridge. The lighter sediments will continue south into the new wetlands 
which will require species selection and channel topography conditions that will allow 
vegetation to survive. We are trying to provide as much variability in the various cross 
sections so that as we go through the next steps, we can determine which robust plants 
match best with each cross section.

5.0 TWRC Presentation

Nicole introduced Chris Glaisek, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC), 
VP Planning and Design. Chris described the Don Mouth project as a monumental 
effort to revitalize the river. This is one of the biggest initiatives that TWRC will 
undertake, yet it is relatively unknown by the broader public.

Chris outlined the various projects that are currently to be undertaken by TWRC (Don 
River EA; the Don River Borderlands (area east of Parliament); Queens Quay road 
alignment; Transit EAs; Commissioners Park). The TWRC is trying to define a process 
for looking at all of these projects holistically. An international design competition is 
going to be introduced in the coming months. A firm will be given the various project 
terms of reference and asked to develop a concept that will inform all of the studies. 
This will be “a common ground” that currently doesn’t exist. The goals for this 
competition are:
1. Naturalize the mouth of the Don River
2. Develop a continuous riverfront park system
3. Provide for harmonious development
4. Connect waterfront neighbourhoods
5. Prioritize public transit
6. Expand opportunities for interaction with water
7. Promote sustainability

This will be a two-stage juried international design competition, with a request for 
qualifications release on December 14, 2006 and jury recommendation of concept(s) on 
April 11, 2007. We are trying to accomplish this within the same timeframe as the Don 
EA. (Editor’s note: more information is available on the TWRC website at: 
http://www.towaterfront.ca).

Q8. Can the public be invited as observers to the Request for Qualifications process 
openings and question periods? Can you extend this to Coatsworth Cut, as
there seems to be a conflict between what the City is doing and what is being done on Lake Ontario Park.

We are planning to have a Citizen Liaison Committee to assist with the mid-term reviews. Further public involvement will be considered.

Q9. A group of citizens went to the board of the TRCA to talk about integrating the various aspects of all of the projects (i.e. roads, rivers, habitat, buildings). To set up a new process and exclude the public is not appropriate. We want to see ideas that the public has discussed reflected in the designs. How will the public be involved in the real process?

This is not a separate process. We will be working within the framework of the current EAs and we will be involving the public. We are open to all ideas being considered. A Citizen Liaison Committee will be a part of this process.

Q10. This project should consider the green infrastructure first, the habitat, and then design the roads/infrastructure/buildings after that. Habitat has to be the prime objective.

Agreed. This is reflected in the seven objectives that were outlined.

Comment. This is an excellent idea. There are a number of EAs going on right now, and it is critical to have an overall coordinating vision.

Comment. The potential to create linkages between the projects is exciting. There seems to be too much development in the plans for the Port Lands.

Comment. You need to fit the urban context into the river domain.
6.0  **Closing Remarks**

**Adele Freeman** thanked all those who attended and provided comments at the meeting. Participants were invited to spend some time with the project team members at the open house displays to offer their comments. Additional comments should be sent in before December 21.

The presentation portion of the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. The Open House portion resumed and continued until 9:30 p.m.
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Study Area

The Project Study Area consists of two parts: the Don Mouth from the railway bridge to the harbour, and lands adjacent to the Lower Don River from the railway bridge north to Riverdale Park. Within the Don Narrows, only improvements within the near-channel area to be considered.

The lands east of Parliament Street and south of Lakeshore Blvd, and the small island at the entrance to the Keating Channel have been included to ensure that there is sufficient area to look at options for the Don Mouth. A 300 metre wide corridor immediately north of the Don River Roadway, which includes the area for the proposed Don Gateway, connects the Keating Channel to the Ship Canal to address previously identified alignments for the Don River.
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River Characteristics

Flow Rates During Flood Events

Precipitation events of variable intensity alter the flow rates in the Don River.

The Don River must accommodate changing flow rates that range from normal conditions (4-4.5 cubic metres per second) to those experienced during high intensity hurricane events (near 1,700 cubic metres per second).
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River Characteristics

Turbidity, Sediment, and Water Quality

Light availability, which is often measured as turbidity, can affect the survival of aquatic vegetation. Light availability is impacted by the amount of sediment and other debris in the water, wave action, and wind effects. Current turbidity levels at the mouth of the Don River present light from penetrating more than 0.25 metres deep.

The Keating Channel traps 40,000 tons of sediments annually, which represents approximately 80-85% of the total sediment in the Lower Don River. To effectively convey the regulatory flood, sediment in the navigation Don Mouth must be managed upstream of the Keating Channel.

Water quality improvements through the watershed will be important in upstream initiatives, such as the Wet Weather Flow Water Plan.
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Step 1

Generic Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Lacustrine Environment (L)

"Like a lake" in its shape

Lacustrine Environment (L)

Created Wetland (CM)

Natural River Channel (N)

Lacustrine / Created Wetland (LCW)

Lacustrine / Natural River (LR)
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Step 1

Habits (vegetation communities)
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Habitats (vegetation communities)
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Step 2 Screening Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>LCW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ means: Cross-section conveys Regulatory flood
- Vegetation communities do not impede water flow
- Average water level is shallow enough to promote plant growth
- Vegetation communities are not susceptible to climate change

Don Mouth Naturalization And Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Step 3 Describe the Alternatives

- Contaminated Soils
- Navigation
- Management of Sediment, Ice, Dikes
- Infrastructure
- Flood protection requirements
- Optimized Habitat

Don Mouth Naturalization And Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Step 4 Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Objective: 1. Development of the flood protection system
- Component: 1. Wetland restoration
- Criteria: 1. Shopping accommodation to enhance diversity (presence) of vegetation communities

- Objective: 2. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 2. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 2. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 3. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 3. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 3. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 4. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 4. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 4. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 5. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 5. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 5. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 6. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 6. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 6. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 7. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 7. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 7. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 8. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 8. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 8. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 9. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 9. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 9. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration

- Objective: 10. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Component: 10. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
- Criteria: 10. Potential for additional recreational opportunities as a result of wetland restoration
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Feedback and Frequently Asked Questions during Open House

Station 1: Industrial history of Port Lands, Michael Moir, York University
Questions were asked mainly about the original course of the mouth of the Don and the evolution of the contour of the area.

Station 2: Keating Channel Operations, Ken Lundy, Toronto Port Authority
Most people viewed the visuals to get a feel for how much material needs to be managed, rather than asking questions. There was more interest in “floating material" than in sediment.

Station 3: Filmport, Hon Lu, TEDCO
Questions were mainly on the future of the Don Roadway, Commissioners Street and the bridge over the Ship Channel. Interactions with the Don Greenway were also a topic of interest.

Station 4: Water Quality, Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee
One comment that was noted was that there was not enough land to make effective habitat of the mouth of the Don.

Station 5: Fish and Wildlife, Deb Martin-Downs, TRCA
There were few questions, but some focused on Tommy Thompson Park and some on the cormorants. General questions on handling of invasive species were also noted.

Station 6: Flooding and Flood Protection, Sameer Dhalla, TRCA
Questions tended to be very general. People expressed amazement at the volume of flow during the regulatory flood.

Station 7: Soils and Groundwater, David Dubois, CH2M Hill
Participants asked about the percentage of development being planned for the area. Also, questions before the presentation focused on whether the final decision on the river route was made.

Station 8: Roads and Infrastructure, Jim Gough, Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture
There were few questions asked. People felt positively about the relocation of Lakeshore Road. One interesting suggestion was that if the Keating Channel were filled in, this area could then be the location of Lakeshore Road.

Station 9: Outcomes of Steps 1 & 2 and Next Steps of the Environmental Assessment, Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Ltd
There were no questions of note for this station.
Station 10: Benefits of Wet Weather Flow Master Plan for Don Watershed, Bill Snodgrass, City of Toronto
Noteworthy questions were:
- How much will water quality improve? (Graphs were shown)
- What influence does this water quality improvement have on wetland design (Response: none)
- What are the Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan projects which are moving forward? (These were explained)

Station 11: Adjacent Projects, Pina Mallozzi, Tanya Bevington and Brenda Webster, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corp.
There were no questions of note for this station.

Station 12: Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project, Ken Dion, TRCA
There was one concern related to consultation related to the Toronto Humane Society as part of the Class EA process that was undertaken in 2003 and 2004.

Two individuals were curious about the planning process that was taken during the Class EA as they were new to the process. Very keen to see work progressing.

Remaining questions pertained to timelines for construction completion, whether members of the public could arrange site visits, and whether the photos could be distributed for their memberships. Overall, there was a very strong positive reaction towards the project.
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Outcomes of Steps 1 & 2 and Next Steps of the Environmental Assessment

Public Forum
December 5, 2006

Presentation Overview

1. Background from Terms of Reference
2. Outcomes of Step 1 (Develop long list of alternatives)
3. Outcomes of Step 2 (Identification of short list)
4. Process for Steps 3 (Describe short list) and 4 (Reduce short list)

Background from Terms of Reference

• Terms of Reference (ToR) provides framework for Environmental Assessment (EA)
• Approved in August 2006
• Defines various elements to be addressed during EA

Study Area
Goal of the Project

- To establish and sustain the **form**, **features**, and **functions** of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

Project Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed
5. Encourage additional compatible recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/handicap accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with TWRC’s Sustainability Framework and applicable provincial legislation

Spill Zones

Description of Step 1

- Develop long list of alternatives based on:
  - Discharge points
  - River characteristics
  - Channel shape (cross-section)
  - Habitat types (what grows in the channel)
Step 1
River Characteristics (Flow Rate)

Step 1
River Characteristics (Sediment and Turbidity)
- Current turbidity levels hinder plant growth
- Over 40,000 tons of sediment trapped annually in the Keating Channel

Step 1
Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Lacustrine Environment (L) “Like a lake” in its shape

Natural River Channel (R)
**Step 1**

Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Created Wetland (CW)

**Step 1**

New Cross-sections

L + R =

Lacustrine / Natural River (LR)

**Step 1**

New Cross-sections

L + CW =

Lacustrine / Created Wetland (LCW)

**Step 1**

Habitats (vegetation communities)

SM | EM | MM
---|---|---
Submerged Marsh | Emergent Marsh | Meadow Marsh

UF | TRS | THS
---|---|---
Upland Forest | Treed Swamp | Thicket Swamp
**Step 1**

**Submergent Marsh**

- Require permanent flooding to survive.
- Maximum depth of 0.5 m based on water clarity in Don River.
- Provide little resistance to water flow.

**Step 1**

**Emergent Marsh**

- Require semi-permanent flooding and protection from disturbance to survive.
- Maximum depth of 0.5 m based on water clarity in Don River.
- Provide little resistance to water flow.

**Step 1**

**Meadow Marsh**

- Require seasonal flooding for more than 45% of the growing season (not permanently flooded).
- Provide little resistance to water flow.

**Step 1**

**Thicket Swamp**

- Require seasonal flooding for less than 45% of the growing season to survive.
- Provide low to moderate resistance to water flow.
**Step 1**

**Treecd Swamp**

- Require seasonal flooding for less than 45% of the growing season and protection from disturbance to survive.
- Provide moderate to high resistance to water flow.

**Step 1**

**Upland Forest**

- Limited tolerance for flooding.
- Provide moderate to high resistance to water flow.

**Step 1**

**Long List of Alternative Methods**

**Description of Step 2**

- Ensure that alternatives work based on constraints / thresholds that limit:
  - The ability of channel to convey water
  - The ability for vegetation communities to thrive
**Step 2**

**What are screening criteria?**

- Thresholds to eliminate conceptual designs that are not technically feasible

1. **Flood Protection**
   - Do cross-sections contain water volumes associated with Regulatory flood?

2. **Naturalization**
   - Do cross-sections meet requirements for plant growth?

---

**Step 2**

**Naturalization (plant growth)**

- Water depth under average conditions is shallow enough to promote plant growth

- Vegetation communities are not susceptible to siltation

---

**Step 2**

**Flood Protection**

- Cross-section conveys Regulatory flood

- Vegetation communities do not impede water flow

---

**Step 2**

**Screening**

- Water level is too deep to support submergent and emergent marshes

- Flooded too frequently to support meadow marsh and thicket swamp

- Floods too infrequently to support most wet vegetation communities

- Promotes growth of trees
Step 2
Screening

- Trees provide too much resistance to water flow

UF
Treed Swamp

TRS
Upland Forest

Step 2
Screening Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>LCW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THS</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☒ Does not meet flood protection criteria
开奖结果 Does not meet naturalization criteria
✓ Meets all screening criteria

Step 2
Screening – Primary Channel

- Water level is too deep / flooded too frequently to support vegetation communities except submergent marsh

- Will not survive in lacustrine environment because of too much silt

Lacustrine Environment

SM
Submergent Marsh

Step 2
Screening Summary – Primary Channel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LR</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>LCW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THS</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☒ Does not meet flood protection criteria
开奖结果 Does not meet naturalization criteria
✓ Meets all screening criteria
### Step 2

#### Description of Overflow Spillway

- 300 m wide spillway designed to convey minimum of 10-year flood
- May include a variety of upland habitat types and other compatible uses

#### Next Steps

- Step 3
  - Describe short list of alternatives
- Step 4
  - Reduce the short list of alternatives
- Step 5
  - Select preferred alternative
**Step 3**
Describe the Alternatives

- Layer information on each combination of discharge point and cross-section

---

**Evaluation Criteria Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the project trying to achieve?</td>
<td>What elements of the project influence how the alternatives achieve the objective?</td>
<td>What do we need to research about each component to determine whether each objective is met?</td>
<td>How do we measure the criteria?</td>
<td>Why are the criteria and indicators important in evaluating the alternatives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Step 4**
Reduce the Short List of Alternatives

- Determine how well alternatives achieve objectives based on evaluation criteria
- Describe issues and trade-offs with alternatives
- Identify approximately 5 refined short list alternatives

---

**Step 4**
Overview of Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>• Sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hydraulics and Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Geomorphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aquatic Species and Habitat (lake and river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Terrestrial Species and Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood protection</td>
<td>• Hydraulics and Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational management</td>
<td>• Sediment / Debris / Ice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 4

**Overview of Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration with infrastructure</td>
<td>• Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and cultural opportunities</td>
<td>• Hydraulics and Hydrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise and Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other planning efforts</td>
<td>Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with TWRC Sustainability Framework</td>
<td>• Groundwater and Soil Contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 4

**Sample Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Short List of Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and cultural opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with other planning efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with TWRC Sustainability Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF TRADE OFFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 - Develop Long List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 - Assess Technical Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3 - Refine Short List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4 - Reduce Short List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5 - Select Preferred Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6 - Assess Preferred Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7 - Develop Functional Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions?
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1. Do you have any comments on the technical screening process and/or the results of the technical screening?

- I think that the “secondary” channel to the river mouth should have a flow more frequently than once every ten years, so that it contains more of the 6 vegetation communities.
- Overall the methodology for technical screening is robust. The details of screening criteria need public review and that is happening as a result of this meeting.
- Excellent presentation and helpful clarifying of issues. Impressive work. I’m always impressed by how carefully you listen to public concerns and how well you communicate your findings. It is great to be able to participate all along the process.
- The lacustrine “L” cross-section dismissed too quickly because it was “boring”. However this is a typical section at natural river mouths, usually known as “estuary”. Since it is essentially contained in LR and LCW it is not a major issue, as the degree of “L” or “R” or “CW” remains to be determined. Error noted in presentation “the thicket swamp offers a much greater degree of resistance than the treed swamp”, the former would rate “high resistance”, the latter “moderate resistance”. Therefore the thicket swamp should be screened out and replaced by treed swamp.
- Success of the undertaking is entirely contingent on relocation of infrastructure (roads, etc.). If infrastructure is a priority and natural habitats are left to fill in the remaining spaces the project will not fulfill any of its promise or stated purposes/benefits. It will be nothing more that a semi-natural public park with low diversity and severe compromises in its natural habitats that will make them non-functional.
2. **Review the criteria proposed for the next round of evaluation. These criteria will be used to narrow down the 14 alternatives that made it through the technical screening, to a short list of approximately 5 alternatives.**

   (i) Do the criteria reflect the issues that are important to you? Why or why not?

   - Yes, they are reasonable
   - Yes – I believe that you are the people best equipped to weigh these issues. All seem important to me but I’ll email if I think of other points.
   - Criteria might want to include examination of the health aspects of marshes and “standing water”. A mosquito factory comes to mind. (Participant then commented that they had found this after all, under “Recreational/Cultural”.)
   - Yes. I do have a question as to whether and the extent to which high marks for naturalization and flood protection (the stated goals of this project) may be offset by low marks for issues like recreation – or vice versa. Naturalization and flood protection should still be considered the overriding goals.
   - The primary criteria must be flood protection, as this is a city, not a nature park. Whatever physical or natural biological features are compatible are fine, but should not control.

   (ii) Are any criteria missing? If so, list any additional criteria you suggest be considered.

   - No
   - I think West Nile goes beyond that. Mosquitoes travel, and even if the immediate area is not frequented by humans, the area will affect the health of the whole city’s inhabitants.
   - Historical/cultural features. Let’s not try to erase man’s use of the Don River but capitalize on it.
Do you have any other advice or comments for the project team?

• I think that all options should be considered through the lens of public use of the area. A naturalized mouth is a tremendous goal, but it won’t have much meaning if people don’t appreciate it or go there. The favoured alternatives will give people access to the water for a variety of uses – paddling, fishing, etc. – and provide for both natural and paved trails throughout.

• The TWRC and City should look closely at burying Lakeshore Boulevard through this area (i.e. about Parliament to Sault) to prevent flooding on Lakeshore and – most importantly – opening more area for naturalization.

• Naturalization, to me, also means the “shape” and “topography” of the river. A natural river is not uniformly wide or uniformly deep. The sides are not of uniform height. I hope as the “engineering” of the naturalization progresses, there is a means to “create” a natural river mouth.

• There is not enough space to create functional coastal wetlands here. They will be an improvement over the present situation (concrete) but far less than they could be if enough land were allocated. The areas to the west and south need to be added to provide more space.

• Look at means to remove sediment and/or debris before it reaches the study area, thereby reducing the sunlight/turbidity constraint. Unquestionably, the lacustrine or estuarine cross-section provides the greatest potential for flood protection conveyance and this should be focused on. Preserve/restore navigability of the lower Don River.

• I want to confirm that the Don Mouth planning will include the provision for small water craft access into the Don River from the harbour. The thought that the Don could be revitalized, and not include access by canoe/kayak etc., would be incredibly stupid and totally unexplainable to the majority of citizens. No one would understand, or condone, the expenditure of millions that would still leave the river inaccessible for recreation.
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Don Greenway Workshop

On September 18, 2007, an invited workshop was held to focus on determining the future identity and roles of the Don Greenway. The concept of the Greenway dates back to early proposals to renaturalize the lower Don River. The purpose of the workshop was to ensure that the idea of the Don Greenway would be furthered and reinforced as overall waterfront revitalization progresses. Fifty-three people attended the workshop, which was held at The Historic Distillery District, Archeo Restaurant.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Develop consensus on the functions and uses of the Don Greenway.
2. Identify opportunities to resolve any remaining issues.
3. Provide input regarding the functions and uses of the Don Greenway to the:
   - EA team for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project,
   - MVVA team for the Lower Don Lands Framework Plan,
   - Future planning for lands between the Ship Channel and Unwin Avenue, and
   - Lake Ontario Park Plan.

At the workshop, participants were asked to address the following questions:

1. What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?
2. How important are these functions?
3. Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What should it look like/feel like?
4. What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?
5. Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?

The full report is available online by visiting www.waterfronttoronto.ca.
Report prepared by Suzanne Barrett, Barrett Consulting, in conjunction with Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto
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INTRODUCTION

On September 18, 2007, an invited workshop was held to focus on determining the future identity and roles of the Don Greenway. The concept of the Greenway dates back to early proposals to renaturalize the lower Don River. The purpose of the workshop was to ensure that the idea of the Don Greenway would be furthered and reinforced as overall waterfront revitalization progresses. Fifty-three people attended the workshop, which was held at The Historic Distillery District, Archeo Restaurant, Building #45, 55 Mill Street, Toronto. A participants’ list is attached as Appendix 1.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Develop consensus on the functions and uses of the Don Greenway.
2. Identify opportunities to resolve any remaining issues.
3. Provide input regarding the functions and uses of the Don Greenway to the:
   - EA team for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project,
   - MVVA team for the Lower Don Lands Framework Plan,
   - Future planning for lands between the Ship Channel and Unwin Avenue, and
   - Lake Ontario Park Plan.

The workbook provided to participants is attached as Appendix 2. It includes:

- Agenda
- Objectives
- Ground Rules
- History of the Greenway Idea
- Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project/EA
- Lower Don Lands Framework Plan
- Discussion Questions
### AGENDA – SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>Welcome and agenda overview</td>
<td>Suzanne Barrett, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 pm</td>
<td>Opening remarks</td>
<td>John Campell, Waterfront Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Paula Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 pm</td>
<td>Importance of the Don Greenway</td>
<td>David Crombie, Canadian Urban Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 pm</td>
<td>History of the Don Greenway idea</td>
<td>John Wilson, Chair, Task Force to Bring Back the Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 pm</td>
<td>Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA</td>
<td>Paul Murray, Gartner Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Willis, MMM Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 pm</td>
<td>Questions of clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>Initial concepts for the Lower Don Lands framework plan</td>
<td>Michael Van Valkenburgh, MVVA Associates, with Steve Apfelbaum, Applied Ecological Services, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>Questions of clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 pm</td>
<td>Supper break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Round table discussions</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Plenary reports</td>
<td>Table facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 pm</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Suzanne Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 pm</td>
<td>Concluding remarks and next steps</td>
<td>Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 pm</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PRESENTATIONS**

**John Campbell** welcomed participants on behalf of Waterfront Toronto. He outlined the context for the workshop in relation to a number of current waterfront planning initiatives and environmental assessments. He emphasized Waterfront Toronto’s commitment to green infrastructure, and said that he was looking forward to participants’ advice about the functions and uses of the Don Greenway.

**Councillor Paula Fletcher** noted the City’s expectations for the Don Greenway, as described in the City’s Secondary Plan for the Central Waterfront. She reminded participants that the scope of the Greenway extends from the tip of the Leslie Spit, through Lake Ontario Park and across the Port Lands to connect with the Don River Valley. Councillor Fletcher expressed her interest in defining a greenway that would truly bring nature into the developing Port Lands. She stressed the importance of making sure that the results of this workshop don’t sit on a shelf, but are acted upon.

**David Crombie** talked about early discussions of concepts to re-naturalize the Don River and its mouth in Regeneration, the Final Report of the Royal Commission into the Future of Toronto’s Waterfront, 2002. He noted that greenways are now an important part of waterfront revitalization efforts all over the world, citing some local examples including Hamilton and Oshawa. Mr. Crombie noted three key values of greenways. First, they represent a transformative experience that connects ecology, economy and community. Second, they help to build good cities. And third, they can provide forms, functions and uses for everyone, in ways that may change for each successive generation.

**John Wilson** outlined the history of the Don Greenway idea (see Appendix 3), starting with a report to Council called Bringing Back the Don in 1991.

**Paul Murray** described the environmental assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (see Appendix 4).

**Michael Van Valkenburgh** and **Steve Apfelbaum** presented their initial concepts for the Lower Don Lands (see Appendix 5).

**QUESTIONS**

Q: Dalton Shipway asked if the next stage is to assemble lands for the greenway south of the ship channel?

A: Christopher Glasiek replied that Waterfront Toronto will work with TEDCO to assemble these lands.

Q: John Wilson asked how the MVVA design addresses flood protection on the north side of the ship channel?
A: Ken Greenberg replied that the team includes considerable expertise to address flood protection in an integrated way. He noted David Crombie’s reference to taking the notion of the greenway and building it into green neighbourhoods. They are not just looking at storm water conveyance but at small pedestrian streets and neighbourhoods on the ship channel. Along the edge there will be very public spaces, just as there are in West 8’s design for the Central Waterfront. As part of flood conveyance there will be continuity of hydrology in a very compelling and seamless system. The focus is on the Don River and the way it comes to Lake Ontario and the harbour.

Q: Bill Snodgrass asked about the historic trace of the Don River geography.
A: Steve Apfelbaum replied that we’re not yet trying to design the greenway, but as we consider appropriate uses and functions we can also think about connectivity. We haven’t defined the width yet, but we know that resident and breeding birds need 500 metres or wider. For migration, we don’t need such width over a long distance. Migratory birds need to see east-west oriented greenspace along the shoreline. Then they can take advantage of smaller pieces of green to move from north to south in fall and south to north in spring. At night, they look for areas without lights and during the day they need to see green features. So our concept is to provide more orientation for spring and fall migratory birds.

Q: Councillor Fletcher inquired whether sports fields would disrupt migration of Monarch Butterflies?
A: Gord MacPherson replied that experience shows that sports fields are not an issue for butterflies on the waterfront, citing the example of East Point in Scarborough, where butterflies make considerable use of the habitat areas surrounding the sports fields.
Michael Van Valkenburgh added that the team’s decisions about landscape configuration will include elements to attract and improve habitat for butterflies and birds.
Steve Apfelbaum noted that he could show us many parks in Chicago that have important staging areas for monarch butterflies.

Q: Councillor Fletcher asked for some commentary on the wilderness opportunities in the Port Lands and Lake Ontario Park, noting that she hasn’t heard that theme, but the community has said it’s very important.
A: Ken Greenberg replied that the wilderness idea was an inspiration to the organic design proposed by the team. Like the ravines, which provide a natural edge and counterpart to our entire city. The presence of nature is an extremely large element, and is strongly articulated with people like Steve Apfelbaum on the team.
ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

There were seven round tables, each with 5-8 participants. They were facilitated by Nicole Swerhun, Anneliese Grieve, Tanya Bevington, Elaine Baxter-Trahair, Michael Van Valkenburgh, Ken Greenberg and Gwen McIntosh. Participants were asked to address the following questions:

1. What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?
2. How important are these functions?
3. Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?
4. What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?
5. Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?

Table reports and comment sheets filled in by individual participants are included in Appendices 6 and 7 respectively.

PLENARY REPORTS

Questions 1 and 2: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance? How important are these functions?

Uses by Wildlife

Participants agreed that the Don Greenway is fundamentally all about nature. It should serve as a safe and supportive corridor and habitat for various species (small mammals, insects, birds, fish, turtles, snakes and frogs) including rare ones.

Specific requirements include:
- allow for safe passage of migratory species (bird flight, stepping stone for terrestrial wildlife),
- provide habitats for resident and breeding wildlife,
- ensure that wildlife are the prime focus,
- maximize diversity,
- provide connected tree canopy cover,
- strike a suitable balance between aquatic and terrestrial habitats to sustain wildlife, and
- ensure that the green spaces are part of a web and not an isolated entity.

Uses by People

Participants agreed that the Greenway should be a place to observe, experience and explore nature - a “wild in the city” respite. Some emphasized that access to natural
areas is important to reduce vandalism and encourage environmental stewardship. However, human use should be a secondary focus to wildlife and nature.

Many participants thought that the Greenway should be for the local community, with connections to the residential areas. It could also be a regional facility for passive recreation. Manicured space should be avoided or kept to a minimum. Services and amenities should be close by but not in the Greenway itself.

Some people advocated that trails should be generally on the periphery of the Greenway, leaving the middle wild. It was also suggested that pedestrian trails should be incorporated through a variety of wildlife habitats to increase opportunities for people to interact with nature.

Area of disagreement: Participants recognized that there can be tension between nature and human activities. For example, most table groups discussed the role of active recreation and sports fields in the Greenway. Many participants were adamant that they should not be included. Others felt that it was important not to exclude one use for another. It was suggested that if any sports fields are included, criteria should be developed, such as: provide for local (not regional) use, locate on the periphery of the Greenway, use real (not artificial) turf and prohibit lighting.

Other suggestions for human uses of the Greenway included:
- human uses should be related to the Greenway’s wildlife habitat values (being in a natural setting, watching wildlife, etc),
- focus on passive uses and walking trails,
- separate bikes from pedestrians and put bike trails on the edges,
- make it a place to take kids,
- provide a series of habitats and places with different experiences,
- allow for organic and passive formation of functional trails,
- create destination nodes for people (benches, viewpoints and such spaces), but not formal picnic areas,
- include educational opportunities,
- provide shade,
- do not provide large swimming facilities,
- encourage fishing,
- maximize public safety (eg limited or no access after dark),
- encourage year-round uses, and
- ensure ways to accommodate large numbers of people without disturbing wildlife or ecological functions.

Environmental Functions

Participants emphasized the importance of connecting the Don River and the Lake, both for the river and the people. The design of the Greenway must be resilient to change and sustainable. It should function as a storm water retention and control feature and act as a floodway. The Greenway should be a place for plant communities and nature in general to thrive.

One group suggested that the design process could use a formula that focuses on the qualities and functions of the natural places. If you start with the integrity of each natural place you can design it so that people fit in.
It was suggested that there should be a marshy area towards the centre to reflect a ravine-style landscape and overall function, with human activity situated mainly at the edges to avoid damage to the ecosystems.

Other recommendations for environmental functions included:
- adjacent development to be completely sustainable, including an off-grid, renewable energy system for neighbourhoods to mitigate climate change,
- manage stormwater on site,
- Greenway to be a natural setting with minimal or no maintenance or energy use,
- strict environmental guidelines protected by legislature,
- wildest places in the middle with a gradation to more accessible places at the edges,
- ensure a dark place with minimal/no light pollution to provide a suitable habitat for insects, contributing to the food chain,
- limit dust and noise,
- create large masses of functional habitats,
- provide appropriate buffers between people and wildlife,
- keep out cats and dogs,
- minimize Canada geese by avoiding open expanses of mown grass,
- continue uses that are available in the Don River Valley,
- find ways to incorporate stormwater from sports facilities into the natural environment (eg bio-filtering wetland), and
- consider vertical landscape elements to serve as a buffer between human users and wildlife inhabitants.

**Question 3: Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What should it look like/feel like?**

There was general agreement that the Greenway should be a place of serenity and beauty. It should be a great piece of protected wilderness in the city where you can experience contact with water, skyline views and elements of surprise. It should enable people to close their eyes and imagine native people here before Europeans arrived. A place that is quiet, peaceful, spiritual and magical. An un-winding place.

**Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?**

Participants suggested that the Greenway should be a historical tribute that respects the origins of the Don River Mouth and Ashbridge’s Bay Marsh. It should be a vast expansive delta (but how much should remain in the flood plain)?

The Greenway should be in the city, not of the city.

Consider stewardship opportunities for Portlands businesses.

Finally, the Greenway and the adjacent developments should be a reflection of the new reality of how we must live sustainably in our world and in the natural landscape.
Question 5: Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?

Some participants suggested examples of parks and greenways:
- Highland Creek Valley
- Music Garden, Toronto Harbourfront
- Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
- 7th hole of Don Valley Golf Course
- Below Science Centre
- Ravine at Bayview south of York Mills
- Todmorden Mills
- Boston Common
- Central Park, New York
- Stanley Park, Vancouver
- Kortright Centre Marshland
- Spadina Quay Wetland

NEXT STEPS

Chris Glasiek concluded the workshop by thanking everyone for participating and said that it had been an impressive and valuable discussion. Waterfront Toronto will circulate a draft workshop report to participants for comments and then post a final report on the website. The workshop results will be incorporated into the work being undertaken by the MVVA Team for the Lower Don Lands and by Field Operation for Lake Ontario Park.
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<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Bevington</td>
<td>Gwen McIntosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Evenson</td>
<td>Tom Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Howarth</td>
<td>David Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele Freeman</td>
<td>David Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Armour</td>
<td>Bill Snodgrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Whish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Baxter-Trahair</td>
<td>Suzanne Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Findlay</td>
<td>Amanda Flude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Kidd</td>
<td>Andrea Kelemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Piper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliver Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not stay for table discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Denney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Crombie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo Bonanni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret McRae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Medeiros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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APPENDIX 2. Participants’ Workbook
DON GREENWAY WORKSHOP

PARTICIPANTS’ WORKBOOK

SEPTEMBER 18, 2007

The Historic Distillery District (Boiler House Complex)
55 Mill Street, Toronto
Archeo Restaurant, Building #45

WHAT’S INSIDE...

Agenda
Objectives
Ground Rules
History of the Greenway Idea
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project/EA
Lower Don Lands Framework Plan
Discussion Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>Welcome and agenda overview</td>
<td>Suzanne Barrett, Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 pm</td>
<td>Opening remarks</td>
<td>John Campell/Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Paula Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 pm</td>
<td>Importance of the Don Greenway</td>
<td>David Crombie, Canadian Urban Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25 pm</td>
<td>History of the Don Greenway idea</td>
<td>John Wilson, Chair, Task Force to Bring Back the Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40 pm</td>
<td>Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA</td>
<td>Paul Murray, Gartner Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Willis, MMM Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55 pm</td>
<td>Questions of clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>Initial concepts for the Lower Don Lands framework plan</td>
<td>Michael Van Valkenburgh, MVVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associates, with Steve Apfelbaum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Ecological Services, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>Questions of clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40 pm</td>
<td>Supper break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Round table discussions</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Plenary reports</td>
<td>Table facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40 pm</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Suzanne Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 pm</td>
<td>Concluding remarks and next steps</td>
<td>Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 pm</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this workshop are to:

1. Develop consensus on the functions and uses of the Don Greenway.

2. Identify opportunities to resolve any remaining issues.

3. Provide input regarding the functions and uses of the Don Greenway to the:
   • EA team for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project,
   • MVVA team for the Lower Don Lands Framework Plan,
   • Future planning for lands between the Ship Channel and Unwin Avenue, and
   • Lake Ontario Park Plan.

PARTICIPANTS’ GROUND RULES

~ All participants should treat each other as equals, regardless of “rank” or position in your organizations.

~ Accept the concerns and goals of others. You don’t have to agree with each other, but respect people’s rights to have different opinions.

~ Everyone should have an opportunity to be heard.

~ Try to consider the best interests of the total system, not just a specific interest.

~ All ideas are relevant and all questions are valid. If you don’t understand something, ask.

~ Allow the facilitator to guide the process but stay in charge of the content.

~ Seek consensus, but keep track of differences of opinion for future work.
HISTORY OF THE DON GREENWAY IDEA

Interim Report of the Royal Commission of the Future of the Toronto Waterfront (RCFTW), 1989
The RCFTW was established in 1988 as a federal inquiry, headed by the Honourable David Crombie, with a mandate to make recommendations on the future of the Toronto waterfront. This first interim report identifies the need for a general greenbelt along the entire waterfront for wildlife habitat and migration, recreation, aesthetics and improvement of microclimatic conditions. The Leslie Street Spit is recognized as a potential urban wilderness park. A call is made to physically link the waterfront to the river valley systems and for a continuous trail system within natural areas.

In this second interim report, the RCFTW recommends a Don Valley Wildlife Corridor from the Keating Channel to the Ship Channel along the approximate location of Don Roadway, with another greenspace slightly southeast running from the Ship Channel to a park on the north shore of the harbour (pg 139). The Corridor is described as running from the Mouth of the Don to Unwin Street. The greenway was to be a City park serving as a wildlife corridor and a direct link from the Don Valley to greenspace that was adjacent to the Leslie Street Spit.

This report recommends that the City of Toronto should create wildlife corridors linking the north shore of the Outer Harbour to the Don Valley, Leslie Street Spit and Ahsbridge’s Bay Park. These should be wide enough to provide buffers between wildlife and adjacent human land uses. Native plants should be used as part of a naturalization process. Connections for wildlife movement through the Don Valley should be developed in association with the Task Force to Bring Back the Don.

Bringing Back the Don: Task Force to Bring Back the Don, 1991
The Task Force to Bring Back the Don proposed a delta/marsh south of the Keating Channel’s location, extending to the Ship Channel. The delta’s role was natural river mouth function, but boardwalks and other pathways are included to increase education and recreational opportunities. The marsh is seen as aquatic habitat and a setting for low density “green industry”.

Regeneration: Toronto’s Waterfront and the Sustainable City (Final Report of RCFTW), 1992
A special feature of the report is an article on Healing an Urban Watershed: the Story of the Don, written by Michael Hough. Based in part on Bringing Back the Don, this article describes the roles of the greenway as being to provide buffers between wildlife and human uses, and link parks and green spaces. It shows a greenway on either side of an extended Don Roadway (with bridge across Ship Channel), within the context of a number of green areas within a delta. It describes a wildlife corridor continuing south from a new Don Mouth to natural areas along the north shore of the Outer Harbour with links to Tommy Thompson Park.

Forty Steps to a New Don, Don Watershed Task Force (chaired by Mark Wilson), Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 1994
This blueprint for regeneration across the Don Watershed recommends a wildlife corridor, improved linkages for human access, plus roles in flood control, remediation of contaminated soil, re-establishment of historical form and function of mouth of the river.

Metropolitan Waterfront Plan, 1994
Generally, the Waterfront Green Space System was seen to restore ecosystem integrity, improve physical connections to other green spaces and provide recreation opportunities. Map (schedule 1) shows a greenway running from the Don River Mouth to about Unwin Ave, (northern boundary of the proposed “THC Waterfront Park”) in the approximate area of Don Roadway.

The Official Plan of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto: The Living Metropolis, 1994
Green space in general was to be planned and managed for protecting and rehabilitating the integrity of the natural features and ecological functions, improving physical connections to other green spaces and recreation. Map 5 shows the greenway running along the approximate location of Don Roadway from the mouth of the Don River to Unwin, connecting with parkland on the north shore of the Outer Harbour.

Greening the Toronto Port Lands, by Michael Hough, Beth Benson and Jeff Evenson for the Waterfront Regeneration Trust, 1997
This book establishes a framework for green infrastructure: wide corridors, narrow corridors, major parks, minor parks, water’s edge promenades and development parcel landscapes. The Don Greenway is classified as a wide corridor, providing stormwater management, wildlife movement, wildlife habitat, air quality improvement, noise
abatement, microclimate enhancement, soil and groundwater management, sense of place and recreational opportunities. Six wide corridors are recommended, including one along the Don Roadway continuing south of the Ship Channel to Unwin and the North Shore Parklands.

A Living Place, by Joanna Kidd for the Living Bay Study Group, 1998
This report describes a plan to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat within Toronto Bay. Besides providing for terrestrial habitat and wildlife movement, corridors are seen to improve air quality and aesthetics and provide locations for recreation. A green corridor is shown on each side of Don Roadway, with a wider corridor extending from Commissioner's Street to the Ship Channel and continuing to Unwin.

Our Toronto Waterfront! The Wave of the Future, City of Toronto, 1999
This vision document covers the waterfront from Etobicoke to Rouge Park. A green linkage is shown along approximately the location of Cherry Street from north of Lakeshore to the Ship Channel, and then south to the Harbour. General roles of greening in the Don River area are given: restoration of the mouth of the Don, re-creating marsh land, flood control and the resulting removal of constraints on development in the Port Lands and East Bayfront.

Design Concept: Don Roadway Open Space Corridor, TEDCO in partnership with Task Force to Bring Back the Don, 1999
This report provides an implementation scheme for the Don Roadway portion of the more general green infrastructure vision of Greening the Toronto Port Lands. The greenway is seen as a wildlife corridor to connect existing habitat and provide new habitat for foraging and migrating wildlife, stormwater management, improved microclimatic conditions, recreation and education opportunities, and aesthetic benefits. The report notes that TEDCO's concept plan for the redevelopment of the Port area has shown a green corridor along the east side of Don Roadway since the mid 1980’s. It is shown as extending south from Lakeshore along both sides of Don Roadway, then continuing along the east side of the road from south of Villiers Street, ending at the Ship Channel.

Unlocking Toronto’s Port Lands, City of Toronto, 1999
This report provides a plan for the Port Lands to revitalize vacant land, attract new business, improve the appearance and environmental quality of the area, solve flooding issues, and improve access and connections to adjacent areas. The greenway is shown as a major north-south corridor for stormwater treatment, a pedestrian trail, wildlife habitat linking the Don mouth to “North Shore Park” and to Tommy Thomson Park. Specific elements to be incorporated into this greenway: modifications of dockwalls of Ship Channel to permit wildlife access, wildlife culverts under all east-west road crossings of the greenway, viewing areas for the public, and stormwater ponds. The greenway is shown as being on the east side of Don Roadway, from the Gardiner to the Ship Channel and continuing south to Unwin, where parkland would continue to the harbour.

Unlocking Toronto’s Port Lands: Consultation Results, City of Toronto, 2000
This report by Lura Consulting documents public consultation on Unlocking Toronto’s Port Lands (1999). Working groups were formed to comment on and refine the vision presented in Unlocking. 350 people and 75 companies were involved in the consultation process. The community vision includes a major swath of green space connecting the south end of the Don Valley via the north shore area to the Leslie Street Spit, providing wildlife and bird habitat and travel corridors. The industrial/business forum vision shows a greenway to the east of Don Roadway, from Lakeshore to Unwin.

General roles for green infrastructure are listed: provide multi-functional framework for development (attractive and functionally useful setting); protect and restore health and biodiversity of land, air and water; provide linkages; increase natural habitats and wildlife movement; enhance recreational opportunities (e.g. trails); improve aesthetics; improve public access; improve air quality; reduce noise; enhance microclimate; and manage stormwater, soils and groundwater. Figure 6-2 shows a greenway running from parkland southeast of the Don to the Ship Channel, to the west of an extended Don Roadway.

Making Waves, Central Waterfront Part II Plan, City of Toronto, 2001
This report, prepared by Urban Strategies, shows the greenway connecting the Don Valley, Tommy Thomson Park and Lake Ontario, specifically from the mouth of the Don, meandering along the west of Don Roadway to the Ship Channel, then straight to parkland at the harbour. The greenway is described: “A new green, natural heritage corridor will be created in the centre of the Port Lands, functioning as an important open space connection linking the Don Valley, Tommy Thompson Park and Lake Ontario. The corridor will be a key component of the Centre for Creativity and Innovation offering a unique amenity attractive to knowledge-based industries of all types. In addition to providing local open space and subject to its Natural Heritage designation in the Official Plan, the corridor will be
able to fulfill a variety of functions, including neighbourhood recreation, compatible community uses, multi-use pathways, a wildlife corridor and habitat, and a receptor for stormwater from adjacent communities”.

Our Waterfront: Gateway to a New Canada (The Development Plan and Business Strategy for the Revitalization of the Toronto Waterfront) by Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation, 2002

A discontinuous series of green and blue corridors is shown running north and south of the Ship Channel. The largest of these extends from the reconfigured Don River Mouth along the Don Roadway, across the Ship Channel to Lake Ontario Park (LOP). Linkage is described between LOP and Tommy Thompson Park and the naturalized Don Mouth is identified as a priority.


A green connection is shown between the Don Mouth and Lake Ontario Park for wildlife habitat and movement, active and passive recreation and trails, as well as stormwater functions. Many uses and ecosystems are envisioned as co-existing. The greenway is shown extending from Commissioners Park (south of the Don River mouth near the Keating Channel) west of the Don Roadway, south to the Ship Channel and then continuing south to LOP.

Toronto Official Plan, 2006

Refers to Toronto Waterfront Secondary Plan for specifics. The Natural Areas Policy 4.3.3 states: “The areas shown as Natural Areas on Maps 13-23 will be maintained primarily in a natural state, while allowing for:

a) compatible recreational, cultural and educational uses and facilities that minimize adverse impacts on natural features and function; and

b) conservation projects, public transit, public works and utilities for which no reasonable alternatives are available, and that are designed to have only minimal adverse impacts on natural features and functions.”

Port Lands Implementation Strategy, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation, 2006

This report implements the policies of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan at a finer scale. There was a Community Advisory Committee as well as public consultation meetings and a landowners/tenants meeting. Roles of the greenway: hydraulic function, stormwater, terrestrial corridor, may include common open space features such as sports fields, gardens and informal park spaces. While the intention is to create a green link, roadways, walkways or similar uses may also be located within the greenway provided that these features do not pose an impediment to the flow characteristics of a flooding spillway function. The greenway is shown west of Don Greenway from Commissioners Park (south shore of Keating Channel) to Ship Channel continuing south of Ship Channel to Lake Ontario Park. The Martin Goodman Trail is shown as crossing the Ship Channel but no bridge is shown.
DON MOUTH NATURALIZATION AND PORT LANDS FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT (DMNP) AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Objectives
The Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP) seeks to design a river mouth that works. The Project will remove the risk of flooding of 230 hectares of urban land to the east and south of the river and transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, sustainable, more natural river outlet to the lake. The Project must also respect both the future plans for urbanization and the needs and interests of the many other activities in the area. This is particularly challenging for the mouth of the Don since it is located in an area with a rich cultural heritage that is also densely occupied by the roads, buildings, bridges, trails, and other infrastructure that is essential to making our city work.

Process and Timelines
TRCA and their consultant team, led by Gartner Lee and SENES, are undertaking a coordinated Environmental Assessment process to determine an alternative that best meets the objectives while at the same time addressing both provincial (Individual Environmental Assessment) and federal (Environmental Screening) requirements.

The first stage of the provincial EA process requires the establishment of an EA Terms of Reference (ToR) that outlines how the EA will be conducted. The Project received approval of the EA ToR from the Minister of Environment in August 2006.

In fall 2006, TRCA and the consultant team began the further development and evaluation of alternatives based on the guidelines established in the approved EA Terms of Reference. TRCA and the consultant team have also been working closely with Waterfront Toronto throughout the International Design Competition Process for the Lower Don Lands, recognizing that elements of the design submitted by the winning team would become an additional alternative to be considered through the EA process. Since the conclusion of the design competition in May 2007, TRCA and their consulting team, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and the winning design team (led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates - MVVA) have been working together to incorporate the new alternative into the EA process. This Don Greenway Workshop is but one aspect of the integration and information gathering process that is required to build the MVVA design into the DMNP EA process.

Once a preferred alternative is selected, likely early- to mid- 2008, TRCA and Gartner Lee will begin the development of an Environmental Screening (to meet federal regulations) based on the preferred alternative.

As the EA continues to progress, the public will have a number of opportunities to review and provide input into the development of the preferred alternative. We anticipate submission of the documentation for both the federal and provincial EAs for public and government approval in late 2008. Construction of Phase 1 of the project may commence as early at 2010.

Alternatives
The study area identified in the approved EA ToR is outlined in the following map.
Within this study area, four alternatives (discharge points) were identified in the EA ToR:

The ToR defines Alternative 4 (W and S) as having one primary channel (assumed 300 m wide) and one regional overflow channel (200 - 300 m wide). Alternatives 3 and 4S envisioned the Don Greenway as a river mouth, providing both greenway and naturalized river mouth functions. Alternative 4W aligns the greenway with a proposed overflow spillway function.

Based on these original discharge points, a long list of alternatives was developed by considering a range of channel cross-sections and habitat types for each of the original four alternatives. These channel cross-section and habitat types are typical of streams found naturally along the north shore of Lake Ontario. The diagram below shows how the long list of alternatives was developed by considering a multitude of combinations.
An initial screening of this long list of alternatives was conducted in fall 2006 on the basis of whether a particular combination of discharge point, channel cross-section and habitat type would be able to convey the Regulatory Flood and whether in so doing, the desired habitats would be self-sustaining over time.

Generally speaking, if the combination of floodplain width and resistance to flow (i.e., larger trees produce higher resistance to flood flows) was such that the Regulatory Flood could not be contained within the created valley system, then that alternative was screened out. Conversely, if the channel and floodplain conditions were such that the required depth and frequency of inundation made it impossible for a desired vegetation community to be self-sustaining, that alternative was also screened out.

Alternative 2 did not propose to use lands within the Greenway alignment.

For Alternative 3, it was determined that only those physical conditions that allowed the establishment of thicket swamp, meadow marsh, emergent marsh and submergent marsh were viable alternatives for further consideration given the need to pass the entire Regulatory Storm through one discharge point. Other vegetation types would exert too much resistance to contain the entire Regulatory Storm within the dimensions of the proposed constructed floodplain.
For Alternative 4S, upland forest and treed swamps were also viable habitat types along the primary channel given that the proposed overflow channel leading to the Inner Harbour would be able to convey flows up to the Regional Storm.

For Alternative 4W, the overflow spillway could include upland habitat types, again, due to the additional amount of area and hydraulic conveyance associated with the two channel alternatives.
Following the results of the International Design Competition, a new alternative discharge point is being developed for inclusion in the evaluation of alternatives. This new alternative discharge point can be identified as Alternative 4SW with a primary channel flowing to the Inner Harbour through the Port Lands, bounded by two overflow channels - one wet overflow channel to the north through the existing Keating Channel, and one potentially dry overflow channel going south to the Ship Channel along a Don Greenway which had been moderately realigned to the west. The integration process is ongoing.

**The Don Greenway as reflected in the EA**

To summarize, the Don Greenway is reflected in the EA either as a river mouth or as an overflow spillway.

If a single discharge point is selected through the EA process, the range of viable habitat types in the Greenway is reduced to submergent, emergent, meadow and thicket vegetation species. Given the physical conditions that a single discharge point alternative would be required to maintain in order to convey the Regulatory Storm, the range of viable secondary land uses would also be significantly limited.

For those alternatives with two or more discharge points, the range of viable habitat types to be considered for the Greenway increases to include treed swamp and upland forest conditions. Under such alternatives, there would also be much more flexibility in considering a range of secondary land uses within the Greenway, including trail systems, open fields and possibly sports fields.
LOWER DON LANDS FRAMEWORK PLAN

Design Competition
The Lower Don Lands run from the Parliament Street Slip east to the Don Roadway and from the rail corridor south to Commissioners.

Over the past three decades, public calls for the naturalization of the mouth of the Don River have grown steadily stronger. At the same time, waterfront revitalization efforts have put increasing pressures on the Lower Don Lands area, which sits squarely between three emerging new neighbourhoods; the West Don lands, the East Bayfront, and the Port Lands. Initial planning has already begun for bringing new roads and new transit infrastructure through the Lower Don Lands to service new development – overlapping the same area being studied for naturalization of the river mouth and creation of a flood protection system. However, until now, no comprehensive process has been established to produce an overall vision for integrating these various initiatives while simultaneously addressing the complex technical challenges this area presents.

Waterfront Toronto in cooperation with Toronto Region Conservation (TRCA) and the City of Toronto launched an Innovative Design Competition in February 2007.

The goals of the competition were to:
1. Naturalize the mouth of the Don River
2. Create a continuous riverfront park system
3. Provide for harmonious new development
4. Connect waterfront neighbourhoods
5. Prioritize public transit
6. Develop a gateway into the Port Lands
7. Humanize existing infrastructure
8. Enhance the Martin Goodman Trail
9. Expand opportunities for interaction with the water
10. Promote sustainable development

Four multi-disciplinary international design teams submitted proposals for consideration. Mid-term and final reviews were conducted by a Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA technical review team, a City of Toronto technical review team, and a Community Liaison Committee team. Presentations by the individual design teams were given to the general public, from which public comment was consolidated and a report prepared. Waterfront Toronto appointed an independent jury to review presentations by the design teams, the two technical review teams, the community liaison committee, and the general public comment summary. From this process, the team led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) was selected as the winning team.

Vision
The MVVA Team’s vision for the Lower Don Lands is that of an urban estuary, a place of exchange, where liveable urban neighbourhoods and robust natural systems intermingle in a balanced yet dynamic relationship to create a unique environment.
**Process and timelines**

Prior to the selection of a preferred alternative by the Don Mouth EA, the Lower Don Lands work will focus on data gathering for the site and verification of assumptions within the competition design. As part of this verification process, the design will be discussed with city agencies, technical advisors and stakeholder groups.

If the competition winning design is selected as a preferred alternative by the Don Mouth EA, Precinct Plans and EA’s will begin for the Lower Don Lands neighborhoods. These processes will include added opportunities for public involvement.

**Highlights of the Lower Don Lands concept**

The MVVA Team approached the competition with two initial questions: “Where does the mouth of the Don River want to be and what form does it want to take?”

The MVVA Team proposal for the Lower Don Lands originates from these questions and from a very simple observation about the two types of park that one encounters in Toronto: the traditional square derived from the urban grid, and the irregularly formed parks generated from the natural curves of the Don River. Given these two distinct typologies, and Waterfront Toronto’s objectives in undertaking the naturalization project, it seemed apparent that the new greenway park and river mouth should take their cues from river morphology, rather than the existing urban condition as represented by the right angles of the Keating Channel.

The MVVA Team proposal consolidates the program of naturalized mouth, floodway, and recreational park into a single and complex central parkland along the new alignment of the Don River. Naturalizing the mouth of the river in this way has the broadest possible effect on the Lower Don Lands, creating miles of parkfront property and a sustainable “urban estuary” of great richness and complex mixing on multiple levels: spatial, ecological, functional, economic and social. Most importantly, it makes new parkland very close to the new neighbourhoods for all to enjoy. In shifting pre-established boundaries, new possibilities are opened up for new relationships between city, river, and lake. Finally, the relocation of the mouth of the river reasserts the presence of the river in its city. The riverside park extends into the Inner Harbour with a new hill that will make a magnificent prospect for Torontonians to experience the lake’s edge.
The Don Greenway
The MVVA concept creates two greenways for the Don River: an east-west oriented greenway that acts as an ecological stepping stone at the reinvented mouth of the river, and a north-south greenway creating a lush natural connection from the Don River southward.

Relationship to EAs and other planning processes
The Framework Plan for the Lower Don Lands will become the vehicle for coordinating the parallel planning efforts of the Don Mouth EA, transit and master servicing EAs, and the goals of the Secondary Plan. If the competition winning design is selected as a preferred alternative by the Don Mouth EA, the Framework Plan will continue its role as a guide to future Precinct Plans and EAs in the adjacent Lower Don Lands neighborhoods, creating a united vision for the emerging Port Lands.
**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

**Question 1:** What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses by wildlife?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses by people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental functions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2:** How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5: Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please hand in your comment sheets to Andrea Kelemen before you leave, or send them to her by fax 416-214-4591 or mail 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310, Toronto, ON M5J 2N8 by September 25\(^{th}\), 2007.

Thank you for your participation!

Your name:
Phone number:
History of the Don Greenway Idea
John Wilson
Task Force to Bring Back the Don

Royal Commission on the Future of Toronto’s Waterfront
• Drawing upon work of others, e.g. Toronto Field Naturalists, Toronto Ornithologists, Friends of the Spit, etc.
• Hearings and background studies, e.g. # 10 “Environment in Transition”
  “The vegetated areas along the north shore provide a connection to the Don Valley, albeit a fragmented one, for continued migration.”
  (P. 60)

Regeneration
Toronto’s Waterfront and the Sustainable City Final Report 1992
Don Greenway purpose:
Provide buffer between wildlife and human uses.
Provide linkages between parks and green spaces.
Especially, provide a migratory link from Tommy Thompson and North Shore Parks to Don Valley.

Bringing Back the Don - 1991
“Bringing Back the Don” Report to Council 1991
• Recommended a Port Lands delta for the Don River.
• Hydrological link to restore natural function at the Mouth of Don River.
• No discussion of “greenway” link to North Shore.

Metropolitan Toronto Official Plan 1994
• First expression of the Don Greenway in an official planning document.
• Only shown on the map – No specific discussion.
• In general the Waterfront Green Space System was to restore ecosystem integrity, to improve the physical connection to other green spaces, to provide recreation.
Greening the Toronto Port Lands - 1997
Waterfront Regeneration Trust 1997
Michael Hough, Beth Benson & Jeff Evenson

- Green Infrastructure system to attract investment and encourage revitalization in brownfield Port Lands.
- Approved in principle by Council, Sept. 1997
- Six-fold “hierarchy of green space”: Major and minor parks, wide and narrow corridors, water’s edge promenades & “development parcels”.
- Ten “green infrastructure functions…”

Greening the Toronto Port Lands
Hough, Benson & Evenson 1997

Green Infrastructure Functions
- Ambient air quality improvements
- Noise abatement
- Microclimate enhancement
- Stormwater management
- Soil & groundwater management
- Wildlife movement
- Wildlife habitat
- Sense of place
- Pedestrian/cycle trail
- Recreational opportunities

Design Concept: Don Roadway Open Space Corridor
TEDCO and “Bring Back the Don” 1999

- "TEDCO’s Concept Plan for… the Port Area has shown a ‘green corridor’ along the east side of the Don Roadway since the mid 1980’s." P.1
- Primary goal to achieve an urban wildlife corridor – a linear vegetated natural area.
- Seven objectives…

Unlocking Toronto’s Port Lands - 1999

Don Roadway Open Space Corridor Objectives
1. Connect nodes of existing habitat
2. Reduce potential “sink effect” by maximizing linkage techniques
3. Provide a diversity of natural habitat for foraging and migrating wildlife
4. Discourage predators, parasites and invasives
5. Attract target species
6. Provide for recreational and educational/demonstration opportunities
7. Enhance the overall perception and appearance of the Port Area.

Unlocking Toronto’s Port Lands - Community Consultation Results 2000
The Vision: A green spine serving as a connective place making a corridor between the Don Mouth and Lake Ontario Park and as a key structuring element for community space for emerging Portland neighbourhoods...

The Greenway will be functionally diverse and act as a habitat corridor, active and passive recreational space, trailway connector and as adjunct to community spaces. (Panel 9)

A new green, Natural Heritage corridor will be created in the centre of the Port Lands, functioning as an important open space connection linking the Don Valley, Tommy Thompson Park and Lake Ontario. The corridor will be a key component of the Centre for Creativity and Innovation, offering a unique amenity attractive to knowledge-based industries of all types. In addition to providing local open space and subject to its Natural Heritage designation in the Official Plan, the corridor will be able to fulfill a variety of functions, including neighbourhood recreation, compatible community uses, multi-use pathways, a wildlife corridor and habitat, and a receptor for stormwater from adjacent communities.
Overview of Environmental Assessment
Alignment with Don Greenway

Background on EA
- EA commenced in August 2006 after approval of Terms of Reference (ToR)
- Addresses 3 key objectives
  - Naturalization
  - Revitalized City
  - Flood protection
Alignment of Alternatives

- Four alternatives (discharge points) identified in ToR

- ToR defines alternative 4 (W and S) as having one primary channel and a regional flood overflow
- All alternatives from ToR consistent with Central Waterfront Secondary Plan

Overview of EA process

- Step 1 - Develop long list of alternatives
- Step 2 - Screen long list to identify short list of alternatives
- Step 3 - Describe short list of alternatives
- Step 4 - Reduce the short list of alternatives
- Step 5 - Select preferred alternative

Step 2 - Naturalization

- For Alternative 3, vegetation communities that do not impede water flow include:
- Primary channel of Alternative 4S may also contain treed communities

Step 2 - Naturalization (cont'd)

- For alternative 4W, overflow spillway may include upland habitat types
- Opportunities for more naturalization closer to the lake based on lake levels
Alignment with the Greenway
Naturalization

• Alternatives depict greenway as river mouth or overflow spillway
• Variety of wetland communities would be located within greenway

Alignment with the Greenway
Public Use / Recreation

• Trail system could be located within greenway parallel to river mouth
• Greenway would be designed for compatible uses between flood events:
  – Walking / biking trails
  – Sports fields
  – Open space

Lower Don Lands Competition

• Undertaken by Waterfront Toronto from January to April 2007
• Great public interest and support
• MVVA design team chosen to integrate with DMNP EA team

Where we are going

• Revise study area to reflect larger area for integrated urban fabric with natural river mouth as the centrepiece
• Revise alternatives to reflect ideas and design elements emerging from competition
• Refine assessment of feasible alternatives
• Integrate urban fabric with naturalized river

Changes from Design Competition

• New alternative is variation of 4W, with following attributes:
  – Primary channel to Inner Harbour south of Keating Channel
  – Overflow spillways to Shipping Channel and Keating Channel
• EA team is working with Waterfront Toronto, the City and MVVA to integrate new alternative into existing evaluation framework

Integrating Workshop Comments

• Potential uses of greenway will be refined based on outcome of workshop
• Will be integrated into short list of alternatives during Step 3

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assess Technical Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refine Short List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reduce Short List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Select Preferred Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assess Technical Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Disseminate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 – Nicole Swerhun

Uses by wildlife
- Has to be terrestrial and aquatic function
- Passage for deer to lake/connection to hinterland (Oak Ridges Moraine and beyond)
- Place for bird flight, stepping stone for wildlife
- Sanctuary (although some disagreement about this, some participants said there are more appropriate places for a sanctuary)
- Habitat use by wildlife – the infrastructure can itself be habitat, if you make it right
- Maximize diversity, maximize number of plants, number of species
- Attract indicator species (turtles, frogs, fish, migratory birds, wood ducks, etc.)
- Use design to create the function you want. Size is not a surrogate for quality (lots of examples where small pieces of habitat work – e.g. Spadina Quay). Also, vertical relief can be extremely effective at effectively separating wildlife from people
- Interesting fact – reason birds come to Toronto is the magnetic properties of the rock under Toronto. Another interesting fact – one of the most important “downing” areas for birds in Toronto is Coronation Park because of the connected canopy cover
- Need some marshes elevated so they don’t get damaged by flooding

NO MAJOR DISAGREEMENT ON ANY OF THIS

Uses by people
- A place to integrate with biodiversity (enables integration of people and ecology) – “What kind of uses by wildlife would I like to take my kids to go see?”
- Enhance human interaction with neat stuff
- Series of habitats and places that provide different experiences – marsh, woodland
- Relief from sun, access, viewing points
- Trails that don’t destroy the wildlife corridor function
- Bike trails separate from pedestrian trails – some feel it’s critical that these trails go right through the middle of the greenway
- The primary functions of the Greenway should be habitat/naturalization related, and active recreation (if there at all) should be secondary. The main top-of-mind human uses were related to the Greenway’s wildlife habitat values (being in a natural setting, watching wildlife, etc.)

NO MAJOR DISAGREEMENT ON ANY OF THIS

Playing fields
- Some feel playing fields are NOT consistent with a greenway. They are especially not appropriate in the southern part of the Port Lands. Suggestion was made to split the Port Lands into 3 core areas: Cherry (tourist corridor), Don Greenway (green space), Carlaw/Leslie (can put playing fields here, along with green industry)
- Others feel it’s important not to exclude one use for another (TRCA uses “A, B, C” Abiotic, Biotic, and Cultural when planning conservation areas), and therefore playing fields could be considered. Reference was made to the importance of cultural component of green spaces, as well as the huge demand for recreational outlets in Toronto and the importance of having sports fields close to where people live (e.g. thousands of people that are drawn to Sunnybrook Park and others because of the sports fields, picnic areas, etc.). Also flat areas of a flood plain lend themselves to use by sports fields

NO MAJOR DISAGREEMENT ON ANY OF THIS
Answer may lie in focusing on criteria which would make people “most able to live with” playing fields in the greenway. Advice on what to consider when making a decision re: playing fields included: need buffer between people and wildlife. Use design to accomplish this; push playing fields to the edge (don’t locate in the core of the greenway); nuisance wildlife – use design to minimize impact of geese (e.g. use smaller fields, don’t put them side-by-side, line with high trees that impede their flight path); need fences/controls for dogs (strong on leash policy).

Table 2 – Anneliese Grieve

Uses by wildlife
- Create large masses of natural habitat (MVVA concept didn’t do this)
- Connected environments
- Animals need habitat they can live and pass through safely.

Uses by people
- Tension between human and natural habitat.
- Important role of human access to achieve environmental stewardship.
- Sustainability for active recreation – maintenance is more expensive than for passive recreation.
- Green character is important.
- Create balance of experiences between people and appreciation of nature.
- Discourage inappropriate uses.
- Continuation of uses existing in the lower Don Valley
- Importance of year round uses.
- Playing fields – if have to be located in greenway they should become a buffer. Not put in middle of greenway as the dominant use.

Table 3 - Tanya Bevington

Uses by wildlife
- Allow for movement for existing species.
- Don’t want to create a barrier but embrace the Greenway
- Greenway should be functioning part of a web of inter-connected spaces (Tommy Thompson Park, Lake Ontario Park, small neighbourhood parks, Don Valley Parks)
- Tommy Thompson Park has incredible species diversity already. Greenway shouldn’t duplicate this, but provide important connections.
- Reduce high level predators.
- Food source for wildlife – want species to come.
- Allow for safe movement of species.

Uses by people
- People – variety of modes.
- Spillway - don’t sterilize the land.
- Look at passive recreation.
- Any playing fields should provide local recreation opportunities
- Active recreation facilities - 600% deficiency in this part of the city
- Local playing fields can accommodate stormwater storage (people don’t use the fields when it’s “raining cats and dogs”)
- Greenway should accommodate large numbers of people – there will be high density neighbourhoods
- Include drinking fountains and washrooms
- Passive and active
- Create “wow” places
- Don’t over-program it

**Environmental functions**
- Connect other elements of the urban green infrastructure
- Exciting opportunities
- Abate noise and dust
- Environment - managing storm water
- Dark place – don’t light sports fields
- Apply “audobon for parks” principles
- A web of connected features

**Table 4 – Elaine Baxter-Trahair**

**Uses by wildlife**
- Opportunity for animals and fish habitat as well as people
- Migrating more than residential wildlife
- Staging for migratory birds
- Self sustaining
- Terrestrial and aquatic diversity

**Uses by people**
- People – look at edge of greenway and the opportunities there
- Passive recreation and cycling and pathways
- Healthy communities
- Thought be given for educational purposes
- Should include some amenities – green benches
- Lighting in some areas
- Destination nodes
- Sense of being in wilderness and out of the city

**Environmental functions**
- Environment – floodway is high priority
- Use a resilient design, allow habitats to evolve
- Low maintenance
- Naturally sustainable balances in natural habitat so that one species does not crowd out others
- Provide shade
- Limit dust and noise
- Dark place – recreation places in daylight only
- Organic and rectangular
Table 5 - Michael Van Valkenburgh

Uses by wildlife
- Philosophically the group felt the greenway should be primarily for wildlife
- Go back to the original - it is about nature and enjoy four-legged creatures and butterflies. No skateboards – unless they’re for fish!
- Needs to be planned and legislated with a permanent way to ensure protection long term

Uses by people
- If there is circulation in greenway it is for people (not vehicles)
- Grading from edges - most wild in middle and most accessible areas at the edges
- The portion of the greenway in the Lower Don is only a small part of the overall greenway from the Don River to the Lake
- The greenway should feel like a ravine - separate from the city - although it won’t have a regular stream in the middle
- No picnicking
- Vandalism is reduced if people feel empathy with the place
- Recognition of playfields; need to think about where fields will go
- Meditative space where one can feel “mind-less in a green way”

Environmental functions
- Essentially a place to experience the water and lake - greenway is conduit
- Less lighting it interrupts bugs
- Inspiring for a place that is quiet
- Don’t be ashamed of an idea of beauty

Table 6 – Ken Greenberg

Uses by wildlife
- Incredibly diverse group and difficult to summarize
- Wildlife – saw potential for migratory and conveyance habitats and residential habitats for smaller creatures
- Fisheries opportunities
- Mid point in Steve’s pyramid
- Small mammals and insects that don’t require large areas
- Green spaces part of a web and not an isolated entity
- Great piece of “protected” wilderness in the city

Uses by people
- All ways for people to engage with nature
- Skiing, biking organized sports
- Human species part of natural order
- Integration and non exclusivity
- How can it make contribution to healthy lifestyles?
- “A golf course without golf”
- Demonstration as an example of river mouth
- Educational
- Space where people can feel they are not imposed by city
- Strolling in the evening
Environmental functions
- Environmental issues - greenway
- Working with nature
- Conveyance of storm water
- Low maintenance
- Low energy use
- Other functions: neighbourhoods expressing ideas
- Adjacent development should be off-grid with energy use based on renewables
- Emissions and effluents of better quality than the receiving air, water and soil
- The development should improve our city’s environment from any further degradation
- A new model of local, decentralized sustainability
- Broaden the senses of quality of natural space, rather than ranking high med low
- If you start with natural place you can fit in and not compromise integrity of natural space
- Some active recreation would fit, some would not, depending on the requirements for quality of natural space
- Everyone felt reasonably comfortable with this paradigm

Table 7 – Gwen McIntosh

Uses by wildlife
- Wildlife corridor highest priority
- Residential wildlife habitat including mammals high priority
- Bird migration medium priority

Uses by people
- Co-existence with industry high priority
- Primarily passive uses
- Locally based active recreation medium priority
- Regional sport facility low priority, if at all
- Interpretive opportunities medium priority
- Trail – walking and bikes
- Balance the active/passive
- Balance the people/wildlife

Environmental functions
- Soft bank at Ship Channel
- Stormwater retention and quality control

What kind of place should the greenway be?
- Floodway with shrubs and trees
- Localized areas for recreation
APPENDIX 7. Individual comment sheets
**DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses by wildlife?</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological regeneration is primary core strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should have lacustrine marsh on north and south sides of Ship Channel (must reserve space and assemble the properties; see map on file for lot numbers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad water swales with gently sloping sides can form aquatic linkages throughout the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big green “S” will connect the hinterland at the Oak Ridges Moraine, to the Don Watershed ecosystem, to the Don Greenway, to the Don Greenway, to Lake Ontario Park, to the Base of the Spit, to the top of the Leslie St Spit. This is an opportunity that far exceeds Stanley Park, Central Park or the Boston Common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer can come down to the lake for a drink of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species list to be assembled: fish, mammals, plants, birds, invertebrates, with help from Toronto Field Naturalists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Chester Springs Marsh for an example of ecological design and species list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses by people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway should be road free, with gateways at the Lower Don, Portland at Cherry St, and Leslie St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development zones on west and east of Greenway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmport should have its own exit off the Don Valley Parkway southbound. Other traffic needs can be met through a reconfiguration of the Cheery Street-Lakeshore intersection. The Don Roadway can be closed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must deal with toxic soils – should bioremediate; do not cap. Capping is not adequate because of the costs to the City and to the ecosystem at a later date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public input at focused (guided) public meetings, where options (eg A, B, C, or D) are presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give credit where credit is due – some people have “been in the trenches” for a decade or more. People with a “black belt in environmentalism” need to be recognized, and separated from beginners and intermediates to get away from the bureaucratic response that “if we do that for you, we have to do it for everybody.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Jacobs quote: “administrators always take over from the doers”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success triangle has (A) citizens (B) politicians (C) staff-bureaucrats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote: “The human imagination leaps to form the whole (Gestalt) to complete the scene in order to make sense of it….To fill the gaps is essential if the scene is to have meaning” pg 158 on “Passion for Form” in “The Courage to Create” by Rollo May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need both revitalization (economic development) and regeneration (environmental health) at the water’s edge. It’s not either/or!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by wildlife?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fundamental function is that it is “all about nature”....a safe and supportive corridor and habitat for various species of all types who choose to use the area.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe space for a diversity of wildlife, where green space is connected and ensuring that they are the prime focus. ---provide habitats for resident and breeding wildlife, ---trees</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by people?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time need be spent thinking of special attractions. It’s HUMAN NATURE TO BE IN NATURE. Manicured space should be non-existent.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is crucial that the Don River and Lake Ontario be connected and that the Don River be given the space it needs to expand---be what it is suppose to be.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a wetland/marshland as part of this. ---masses of functional habitats, ---no dogs as they will run through wetlands and destroy ---avoid open expanses of mown grass to minimize Canada geese ---no need for energy use ---minimal to no maintenance ---no lighting needed as this is not what is found in nature and is unnecessary for insects and animals whose habitat this will be</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a place for sport facilities of any sort. This is a space for nature, wildlife and the river.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?

The Greenway should be a place of ‘passive’ recreation---a place to “BE”

**HIGH PRIORITY**
**Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?**

The key to success of the Don Greenway project is that any adjacent development must support the goals of clean water, breathable air and clean soil in which to grow food. With this always in the forefront, any notion of development adjacent to the Greenway must be totally sustainable. For example, any development would be built to LEED standards and be self-sustaining in energy production and waste treatment.

Sustainable development is not just a catch-phrase. It is a real tool through which our community can affect positive change not only for our lives, but for future generations.

Solving the Climate Crisis is humankind’s biggest challenge. Every possible means must be taken to reduce our impact on the planet. The Don Greenway project is just such a project. Governments must lead the way and set a positive example for industry and people to show how sustainable development can be properly done.

**EXTREMELY HIGH PRIORITY**

**Question 5: Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?**

-- Kortright Centre’s Marshland area (the boardwalk in attached picture can probably only be suitable if the area was bigger)
-- Spadina Quay Wetland on a much larger scale (picture attached)
-- Stanley Park, Vancouver
### DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by wildlife?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the green spaces are part of a web and not an isolated entity.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by people?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human use should be a secondary focus to wildlife and nature, and the Greenway should strike a stronger preference for nature which is struggling for its “survival” in many of the nearby neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My preference for sports fields with respect to their location is that they be within the “peopled” portion of the waterfront plan. I agree that they should cater to local not regional needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?

It should be a great piece of “protected” wilderness in the City.

**Question 4:** What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?

It may be questionable to develop communities in a flood plain.

It is important to ensure that if there is development that it be a workable off-grid development whose energy use is based on renewables and whose emissions and effluents are of better quality than the receiving air, water and soil. The development should improve our city’s environment from any further degradation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses by wildlife?</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A migratory corridor for birds &amp; butterflies with native plants for food &amp; shelter</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses by people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive recreational only. A walking path with benches for relaxation. Perhaps something like the Music Garden</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It should be a quiet place for walking and relaxing. Something like the music garden – a winding path with native flowers, shrubs and trees. No bikes, roller blades, skateboards or dogs off leash – a welcoming space for birds and butterflies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your name:

These are my own responses. The Toronto Field Naturalists will send in an additional response form.
### DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses by wildlife?</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a high priority given to providing protected habitat for a broad spectrum of wildlife: mammals, amphibians, reptiles, fish, birds; and trees, plants and fungi. Grass should be allowed to grow long to discourage Canadian Goose populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses by people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low impact, recreational use which should NOT include playing fields, buildings, structures. Crushed gravel paths for walking and bicycling should be kept to a minimum, and they should be designed to steer people away from natural areas. Small signs should help people understand the significance of the natural environment they are enjoying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental functions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat...as wild as possible...along with flood control function. Natural species should be encouraged. Norway maples extirpated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functions?</td>
<td>NO!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?

It should be primarily natural habitat for wildlife and a natural corridor for the movement of wildlife between the Oak Ridges Moraine and the waterfront. It should look “green”; it should natural rather than urban.

**Question 4:** What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?

Keep it as wild as possible! Naturalization of the shoreline should be a key objective and have the highest priority.

**Question 5:** Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?

Not really. One assumes that there are some major American city and I have read that some of the newly-built cities in China have incorporated large natural areas.

**Your name:** Toronto naturalists re Don Greenway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses by wildlife?</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Functions (Birds)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife corridor – have to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>???? is a critical landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat – land base &amp; mammals</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses by people?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co existence with industry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary passive</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active – locally based recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sports Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft ???? @ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail (walking &amp; bikes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental functions?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm water quality control</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other functions?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance the active/passive; people/wildlife</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3: Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodway with shrubs, trees with localized ????? for recreational area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4: What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximize use as a laboratory (back drop) for film studios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain shipping use in ship canal &amp; build fish habitats, structure in ship canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low maintenance requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize the integrity of the 'Natural Place&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5: Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign ????? Sunnybrook Farms part of the Don Valley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVVA's Summary best provided a T of R for moving forward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?</th>
<th>Question 2: How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by wildlife?</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for the safe movement of existing species</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a food source for existing species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses by people?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe movement of people</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full size sports fields/active recreation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillways shouldn’t sterilize land</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages storm-water</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to other environmental features</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve on quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abate noise and dust</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other functions?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects other elements of the urban green infrastructure</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?

- **Wow places**
- **Dark place (don’t light sport fields)**

**Question 4:** What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?

- **Audobon for Parks**
- It’s a web of connective features – don’t be literal about it
- Don’t over program and under design it

**Question 5:** Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?
### DON GREENWAY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

**Question 1:** What functions should the Greenway perform, in addition to flood conveyance?

**Question 2:** How important are these functions? Place a check mark in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses by wildlife?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small species: piping clovers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries – aquatic transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrestrial small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalists species of birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses by people?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage/not exploration/enjoy habitat/walking/hiking/bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sports/pick up sports (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human species – org sport. Integration (not exclusionary) Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a great space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration – nature and people as a model policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a great space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contradictory – baseball/soccer/cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to healthy communities – fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course – no golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public space - gathering events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of not being in city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strolling in the evening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental functions?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energize in river/storm water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant communities/ flood protection/nature works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports people also environmentalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood proofing comp in naturalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction in water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low – maintenance – low energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other functions?</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential – off line waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate energy source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get energy sources (solar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not separate – neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of buildings – basketball in fabric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit frontier – Balance and imbalance – what works with ecological prospective – if all natural does it achieve the objectives – to integrity what can fit. Branch toward low maintenance naturalized river mouth ???? in a city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 3:** Based on these functions and priorities, what kind of place should the Greenway be? What it should look like/feel like?

- All be it to evolve in a natural way. ‘Not in City’ ????
- Small scale intimacy high quality vs. quantity
- Historical recall (fidelity) – half close eyes experience what native people experience – contracted out of centre (going forward) ed component.
- ‘Distance’ million miles away

**Question 4:** What other advice do you have regarding the Greenway?

- Showcase ??????????
- Demonstration. Hydrology & Natural ????
- commitment to ???? watershed
- Greenway catalyst for ????
- Really can do – not ____ _____

**Question 5:** Do you know of good examples of greenways in other places? If so, where?

- Music Garden
- ??? Change Park North
- 7th Hole of Don Valley Golf Course – sense of trees
- Below Science Centre
- Highland Great Valley
- Ravine Bayview South of York Mills
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Public Presentation, Discussion and Drop-In Notice of Public Meeting
March 29, 2008
The Don River is one of Toronto’s great assets and the centrepiece of major revitalization initiatives on the waterfront. Toronto and Region Conservation is proceeding with the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project on behalf of Waterfront Toronto. Ultimately this project will develop a preferred alternative that will transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more naturalized river outlet to the lake, while at the same time, removing the risk of flooding to urban land to the east and south of the river. This project is a key component of Waterfront Toronto’s mandate to renew and revitalize Toronto’s waterfront.

PLEASE JOIN US on Saturday, March 29th for an update on the exciting work underway to naturalize the mouth of the Don, provide flood protection, and integrate this incredible asset into the ecological and urban fabric of Toronto. The purpose of this public information session is to present the evaluation of alternatives and the selection of a preliminary preferred alternative for the naturalized Don Mouth, and to hear the public’s feedback on the evaluation. The session will also include an update on how the results of the Lower Don Lands Design Competition completed in 2007 have been integrated with the Environmental Assessment.

Questions? Comments? Want more information? Please contact Michelle Vanderwel at Toronto and Region Conservation at 416-661-6600 ext. 5280 or e-mail at mvanderwel@trca.on.ca or Andrea Kelemen at Waterfront Toronto at 416-214-1344 ext. 248 or email at akelemen@waterfronttoronto.ca.
The purpose of the meeting was to present the evaluation of alternatives and the selection of the preliminary preferred alternative for the naturalized Don Mouth, and to hear the public's feedback on the evaluation. The session also included an update on how the results of the Lower Don Lands Design Competition completed in 2007 have been integrated with the Environmental Assessment.

210 people signed in at the meeting, and the following points summarize the feedback received from the public at the meeting:

• **Many participants said they felt comfortable with the results of the evaluation, and expressed support for the selection of 4WS as the preliminary preferred alternative for the naturalized Don Mouth.** High praise and appreciation was directed toward the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and their consultant teams for the good work done to date, and their commitment to delivering the vision of a naturalized Don River mouth.

• Some people would like to see more naturalization than what is proposed in 4WS. Suggestions included expanding the Don Greenway to include the area south of the Ship Channel (to link the current study area to Lake Ontario Park) and potentially also more of the southeast area of the Port Lands.

• A rigorous plan is needed to ensure the financial resources will be raised and available to implement the project.

• Global issues such as climate change need to be planned for and addressed, especially given the further pressure they will put on flood levels, greenspace and wetlands in Toronto.

• Water quality improvement should always be recognized as a priority.

*Please refer to the remainder of this report for more detailed notes.*
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Public Presentation, Discussion and Drop-In Meeting Notes

March 29, 2008
1.0 Public Open House

The Open House portion of this event opened at 10:00 a.m. Members of the public were invited to sign in and view display boards showing details on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project and on projects being conducted in the surrounding area by several agencies. Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA), Waterfront Toronto, Michael Van Valkenburgh and Associates (MVVA), Gartner Lee Limited, SENES, City of Toronto, York University and Toronto Port Authority staff members were on hand to answer questions during the Open House. All participants received the following information as they signed in:

• Meeting agenda and participant workbook

The following information was also available to participants:

• Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Newsletter Volume #5 March 2008

All of the meeting materials listed above are available on the TRCA website at: http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization/whats_new

Display boards, models and laptop PowerPoint slideshows available for viewing during the Open House were:

• Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Environmental Assessment – TRCA and Gartner Lee Limited
• Water Quality – City of Toronto
• Lower Don Lands Design Competition – Waterfront Toronto and MVVA
• Upcoming Don Narrows Naturalization Workshop: a component of the DMNP EA – TRCA
• Don River Mouth Heritage – Michael Moir, York University
• Aquatic Habitat Toronto – TRCA
• Toronto Port Authority Operations - Toronto Port Authority
• Don Greenway Workshop Results – Waterfront Toronto

Copies of the poster boards are found in Appendix A to these notes and are available for download on the TRCA website.

2.0 Welcome and Opening Remarks

Nicole Swerhun opened the presentation portion of the meeting at 11:10 a.m. She identified herself as a third party facilitator for the meeting, outlined the materials available at the sign-in desk and invited participants to fill out the Participant Workbook with their comments on the DMNP Project and the materials presented at the meeting.

Ms. Swerhun then introduced the speakers:

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Open House and Public Forum, March 29, 2008
• Mark Wilson, Chair, Waterfront Toronto and Paula Fletcher, Councillor, City of Toronto Ward 30 – Welcome and Opening Remarks
• Chris Glaisek, Vice President, Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto – Background and Context
• Michael Van Valkenburgh, MVVA – Follow Up to the Lower Don Lands Design Competition
• Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Limited – DMNP EA

Ms. Swerhun also brought participants’ attention to the area in the entranceway to the Great Hall, where a Speaker’s Corner was set up. Participants wishing to do so could have their comments on the DMNP Project or on any other projects described at the event recorded on video and be included as part of the EA record.

Mark Wilson welcomed the participants and described the current EA for the Don Mouth as a project that developed from a vision proposed in 1991 by a group of community activists for a proposed marsh in the Port Lands. The transformation of the Don Mouth and the Central Waterfront areas was described as an opportunity to present a new face of Toronto to the world. All three levels of government have been involved in the financing of and support for this project.

Waterfront Toronto’s approach has been to integrate design visioning (through the use of a design competition in 2007) with the ongoing Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (EA). This integrated approach will lead to a transformed Don Mouth, which will be built in the upcoming years.

Councillor Paula Fletcher thanked Mark Wilson for the work that he and his colleagues have been involved with for many years in the planning of the Don Mouth area. Councillor Fletcher commended Waterfront Toronto for their big-picture thinking regarding waterfront revitalization. This project and the Don Greenway represent an opportunity to establish a link to the Leslie Street Spit area. Councillor Fletcher stated her commitment to making the naturalization of the Don Mouth happen.

3.0 Presentations

Please see the enclosed presentations in Appendix B to these notes and are available for download on the TRCA website.

Chris Glaisek, Vice President of Planning and Design for Waterfront Toronto, provided background and context for the DMNP Project and the Lower Don Lands Design Competition.

Mr. Glaisek explained that the naturalization of the Don River mouth is being conducted in tandem with a number of other projects in the surrounding area, including transit EAs, the extension of Queens Quay and potentially other roadways and public works, in addition to a number of proposed projects on private land. Waterfront Toronto chose to step back and look at the area holistically. This led to the Lower Don Lands Design Competition. In close cooperation with TRCA and Gartner Lee Ltd., design teams worked within the Terms of Reference for the DMNP EA and the development and open space goals set out for the lower
Don Lands area. The goals for designs submitted for the Lower Don Lands Design Competition were:

- Naturalize the mouth of the Don River
- Create a continuous riverfront park system
- Provide for harmonious development
- Connect waterfront neighbourhoods
- Prioritize public transit
- Develop a gateway into the Port Lands
- Humanize existing infrastructure
- Enhance the Martin Goodman Trail
- Expand opportunities for interaction with the water
- Promote sustainability

The winning design team, MVVA, produced a vision that was deemed to best meet the goals by an independent jury with input from the public, the DMNP EA team and City staff. Mr. Glaisek explained that Paul Murray of Gartner Lee Ltd. would be giving a presentation later in the meeting to explain how this design was developed and evaluated within the EA process.

**Michael Van Valkenburgh**, MVVA, gave a presentation on the development of the design as submitted during the Lower Don Lands Design Competition and the work done since that time to refine the design to allow it to be integrated into the DMNP EA process.

Mr. Van Valkenburgh acknowledged the members of the MVVA design team. The development of the design submitted to the competition began with the *Making Waves* Secondary Plan. The construction of a new Don River mouth was seen as the central spine of a series of new parks and public spaces organized around the river. An organic shape was sought, based on where the river would more naturally flow based on hydrological forces.

Details of the submitted design include a promontory proposed for the western edge of the area. This site will be a place for people to come to feel connected to the water. A neighbourhood will develop around the Keating Channel, which will have a canal-like feel to it. New wetlands, both on- and off-line, will be created throughout the area and will be central to the future development in the area. The form of these wetlands is still being determined, but bringing as much marsh and wetlands into the area as possible was central to the development of the scheme. One seamless system of trails will be created. Overall, the lower Don Lands is envisioned as an interwoven series of naturalized and people-friendly areas.

**Paul Murray**, Gartner Lee Ltd., provided background on the Terms of Reference and Steps 1 and 2 of the EA. Mr. Murray described the outcomes of the process of describing the Alternatives and the outcome of the comparative evaluation of the alternatives.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) provides a framework for the EA. The DMNP ToR was approved in August 2006, and defines various elements to be addressed during the EA process. The goal of the DMNP Project was described as “to establish and sustain the form, features, and
functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood”. The objectives of the DMNP Project are:

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed
5. Encourage additional compatible recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/handicap accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with Waterfront Toronto’s Sustainability Framework and applicable provincial legislation

Mr. Murray identified the area known as the Don Narrows on the study map. This narrow, straightened channel runs parallel to the Don Valley Parkway, between Gerrard Street and the CN Railway bridge, just north of the Don River mouth. Formal alternatives are not being considered for this area within the EA. However, a wide range of naturalization techniques are being considered within the Narrows.

The four **Alternatives To** described in the ToR were presented. The channel and habitat types that could possibly be created with each were examined. It was determined that there were more constraints on one-channel alternatives when compared to alternatives which incorporated a primary and an overflow channel.

The four Alternatives were then shown in diagram form. Note that Alternative 1 is the Do Nothing option which is required in the EA process. The Do Nothing was not shown at the meeting since it represents the status quo at the Don River mouth. In each diagram, a blue asterisk indicates the location (the same for all four Alternatives) of a widening of the river which will function as a sediment trap. Here, the flow of the water will slow, and the heavy particulate matter will fall out and can be removed, dried and transported for disposal. In each diagram, a dotted blue line indicates the flood plain, green areas indicate proposed wetlands, yellow areas are proposed open space (including recreational areas) and terrestrial habitat and grey areas are slotted for development. Brown lines are trails and orange are railway lines. The dashed yellow line indicates a connection to Lake Ontario Park by way of the Don Greenway. This is not an exact alignment, but rather indicates that within the general area indicated, the Don Greenway will be placed to provide a terrestrial habitat linkage between the naturalized Don River mouth and Lake Ontario Park.

Alternatives 2 and 3 include a 50 – 80 metre wide channel, while Alternatives 4W and 4S include a 15 - 30 metre wide, shallower primary channel with a spillway that would contain floodwaters during flooding events. A shallower channel allows for greater flexibility in the habitat types that could be established within the channel. Alternative 4WS was developed from the original MVVA concept to allow it to be evaluated against Alternatives 2, 3, 4W and 4S. The present form of the Alternative represents many ongoing discussions between MVVA,
Waterfront Toronto and the TRCA-Gartner Lee team, plus many meetings with various stakeholders to evolve the concept to its present form. This alternative consists of one 15 metre wide primary channel discharging to the Inner Harbour with two overflow channels, one to the Keating Channel and one to the Ship Channel.

Mr. Murray then recounted how Alternatives recommended by stakeholders during the ToR were assessed to determine whether they met the project goal and objectives. Alternative 5 is similar to 4WS, but all three channels here are permanently wetted and are meant to create a delta marsh over time. This alternative does not allow development to occur within the area between the channels and would not meet project objective 6, as listed above. Alternative 6 is similar to 3 but continues through the Ship Channel to discharge to the Outer Harbour. Operations of the Toronto port would be disrupted as would industrial uses to the east, thus not meeting project objectives 3, 4 and 6. Alternative 7 would pass through Filmport and other uses to the east, thus not meeting project objectives 4 and 6. Alternative 8 would discharge Don River water to Ashbridges Bay, affecting water quality in the Beach area and would not meet project objectives 4 and 6.

The project team's conclusion was that Alternatives 2, 3, 4W, 4S and 4WS should be compared in greater detail to determine which best meets the project goal and objectives. The results of this evaluation were presented in the next few slides. In the summary evaluation tables, darker colours indicate more highly preferred options. Indicators and criteria were all given equal weighting. It can be seen from the table (see Appendix B, slide #33) that Alternatives 2 and 3 were least preferred. Alternatives 4W and 4S were moderately preferred. Alternative 4WS was most preferred for five of the seven objectives and most preferred overall. This Alternative, based on this analysis, was recommended as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative.

Further study will be required to confirm the Preliminary Preferred Alternative. Detailed studies of hydrology and sediment management, management of contaminated soils and groundwater, and the potential realignment of the shipping lane within the Inner Harbour will be required.

Consultation on this step of the EA has been ongoing, with many stakeholders being individually consulted leading up to the public meeting. Feedback received for this meeting will be considered as the design is further refined. Another public event will be held once the preliminary preferred alternative is confirmed and further detailed studies conducted, to present and confirm the results prior to submitting the EA for MOE approval. Waterfront Toronto and the City will proceed with additional planning including a precinct plan, master servicing plan and others.

The timeline was presented, with submission of the EA expected in early 2009. The earliest implementation would begin is 2010, with the demolition of buildings and moving utility infrastructure. Implementation of the Lower Don Lands projects would require 15 to 20 years of phased construction.

4.0 Feedback on the Presentations

Questions and comments are noted below in italics, followed by the response from the project team.

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Open House and Public Forum, March 29, 2008
Q1. This project is an example of a triangle of success: citizens, agency staff and politicians working together. The missing link is to the Leslie Street Spit, south of the Ship Channel. Without such a link, this area is severed – it should be added to the Study Area.

Q2. Regarding the chart just presented – why was 4WS least preferred in terms of Operational Management?

All alternatives propose the same type of primary sediment and debris management facility. The differences in operational management pertain to how difficult it is to manage that portion of sediment and debris that is transported south of the primary management facility. In the 4W, 4S and 4WS Alternatives, the channel is narrow and shallow meaning that access to management of sediment and debris is much more difficult than for Alternatives 2 and 3 which have much wider and deeper channels downstream of the proposed sediment management facility. The amount of dockwall removed is also a significant issue for the Toronto Port Authority from an operational perspective.

Q3. Is Lake Shore Boulevard proposed to move north of the Keating Channel?

It varies depending on the alternative; Alternative 3 does not require Lake Shore to be realigned. Under 4WS (and the other alternatives), the white line north of the Gardiner is the proposed Lake Shore re-alignment.

Q4. What modifications have been made from the MVVA design to Alternative 4WS?

There was a proposed island in the low-flow channel which was removed due to hydrological issues. The Don Greenway originally contained playing fields, but will now contain wetlands. The promontory beyond the dockwall was extended somewhat. The Keating Channel was originally to be a low-flow channel connected to the river. Now it will be blocked off and will spill over only during higher-flow events.

Q5. Regarding past recommendations, there was another Alternative suggested – Alternative 5 - which was missing from the evaluation. It included two active channels plus one further east. Regarding 4WS, I would like to make two points:
  • I’d like to see the southeast corner of the study area (now shown on the map as a development area) added to the Greenway. Also, the area south of the Ship Channel should be added to the Greenway.
  • I’m concerned about the height of buildings and the fact that they’re not integrated and accessible enough. I’d like to see the number of units proposed to be decreased to 2/3 the original number in order to widen the greenway.

Waterfront Toronto is aiming to find a balance between greenspace and development. Compared to the Secondary Plan, this design achieved the same amount of development. We need to have some development in the area as the costs of the project will be high and this will help to pay for the wetlands and greenspace. The density of units may evolve over time.
Q6. How much of Toronto was flooded during Hurricane Hazel? Can future flooding be more severe than that?

We are now in a period of unpredictable weather. Hurricane Hazel was actually centred on the Humber rather than the Don. The Don did not have massive flooding during that storm event. For instance, the DVP would have been covered by only 1 – 2 metres of water (had it been built at the time). When we look at how we plan for flooding, we take the rainfall that fell on the Humber and model the impact based on a storm of equivalent rainfall centred on the Don. Under this scenario, much of the entire Port Lands area would flood. Flooding would be relatively contained until Queen Street, where the land is all landfill and flat, so the floodwaters spill out. The West Don Lands project currently under construction will contain flooding to the west, and this project (the DMNP EA) protects the lands to the east. We are looking at the impacts of climate change using several model scenarios. Referring to the Cross-Section slides, Mr. Haley pointed out that the channel will be built to a capacity even larger than Regulatory Flood levels.

Q7. If the Keating Channel is just an overflow channel, will the water become stagnant?

Yes, if we leave it without any circulation. The design phase will focus on methods for circulation of this water.

Q8. Will Toronto Port Authority delay this project? Also, what flood remediation is being done up-stream?

Toronto Port Authority is a stakeholder in this EA and a federal agency that will be involved in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) EA process. We have met regularly with them to consult on aspects of the DMNP Project. We do not anticipate a delay in the project as we will work with the Port Authority to resolve any concerns.

Regarding your question on up-stream flood control, we examined this issue while we did the EA for the West Don Lands. We looked at dams as an option, but it was not possible – we would need 25 dams and we don’t have enough land to devote to them. There is some flood control upstream but the best option is to control flooding in the Port Lands with local works.

Q9. What work is going on up-stream on water quality?

The City of Toronto’s Wet Weather Flow Master Plan is a 25-year plan to improve water quality. An EA has just been launched which will clean up the Lower Don and the Inner Harbour through work on the combined sewer outfalls in these areas. There will be a public meeting over the next few months to formally launch the project.

Q10. What are the constructability issues the presentation referred to? Also, is there an estimate of total cost for the project, and is that budget dependent on land sales?

Constructability issues relate to (i) the ability to maintain flow of the river during construction; (ii) the requirements for diversions while existing infrastructure is moved, (iii) the ability to manage soils, and (iv) the ability to remove dockwalls. We have some rough cost figures available today, but these are coarse estimations. Costing is a part of the EA process and
occurs during the next step. Design details still need to be worked out and the team does not yet have the data at a sufficiently detailed level to determine estimated costs. Waterfront Toronto has $65 million committed to the Lower Don Lands revitalization. Once the EA is approved, this seed money is committed to the project. Land values will play a part in the equation, since the project cannot be fully built for the money currently available. Commitments from the various levels of government will also be sought.

**Q11.** What is the impact of moving the current dredging operations further north? Will the same amount of dredging be required? Will these operations impact the naturalization of the Don Narrows or the new West Don Lands community? Also, once the EA is submitted, there is a period before its approval. What effect will the EA have on development proposals while it is awaiting approval?

The team’s assumption is that a similar amount of dredging, compared to the current operation, will continue to be required. Currently, broad assumptions are being made but more detailed modeling of sediment management is an important part of the next stage of the EA. Studies on how local residents would be affected will be done.

An EA is generally approved within 6 months to one year after submission. It does not have governance over private land, but Toronto City Council does. Precinct planning for the area north of the Keating Channel is about to begin, and this will guide development within the area.

**Q12.** We need to reserve the lands to the south of the Ship Channel (the southeast corner, to the Don Roadway) to have a wildlife corridor link to Lake Ontario Park. There should be no stadiums or retail stores in this area and it should be designated as a holding space for the Don Greenway. I understand that there is pressure for retail in this area and that the local Councillor is opposed to it. All retail space should be located east of the Don River.

There will be a green link south of the Ship Channel. Waterfront Toronto is beginning the design process at this time so we do not have an exact location for it, but the Don Greenway will be located here. We are not looking at retail space except along the Keating Channel. Most of the development slated for this area will be residential.

**Q13.** Climate change will lead to increased pressure on our greenspace and wetlands. Why do we need to include development in this plan?

The plan for Lake Ontario Park includes 1,000 acres of greenspace. The clean up of contaminated soils is very costly and must occur before we can construct new parks. Some development will be necessary to pay some of these costs.

**Q14.** Will Waterfront Toronto take an active role at any OMB hearings arising from developers’ plans in this area?

Waterfront Toronto is working to get out “in front” and proactively address any issues that might have the potential to end up at the OMB. That being said, if something does end up at the OMB, Waterfront Toronto is prepared to take a stand that’s consistent with the results of the precinct planning and zoning processes.
Q15. The proposal for big-box retail in the Leslieville area has received a lot of media attention recently. Would the plans for the residential communities in the Lower Don affect this application?

The Leslieville area is outside of our study area, to the east. Land use issues will be part of the Framework and Precinct Planning that is going on in parallel with the DMNP EA project. There will be public discussions in that aspect of the project as well. Big-box stores are not planned for the Lower Don Lands.

Q16. Water quality is a concern for the Don River as a whole and improvements to water quality should be a part of this project.

The next steps for Waterfront Toronto for the Lower Don Lands project will be precinct planning and infrastructure design. Waterfront Toronto is working with the MVVA team to look at innovations and sustainability and with the City on the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan.

Q17. I have been a stakeholder in this process for many years and have always been impressed with the skill, the work done, the professionalism and the response to community concern by this team. I want to make sure we acknowledge Waterfront Toronto, the MVVA team, Adele and the TRCA team and the EA team.

Thank you.

5.0 Closing Remarks

Nicole Swerhun encouraged all participants to submit comments in writing and/or to give their thoughts on the project at the Speaker’s Corner. Ms. Swerhun thanked all the participants and the speakers for taking part in today’s meeting, and reminded participants that the Open House would continue until 3 p.m. and that the experts would be available to speak to them individually until that time.

The comments submitted in participant workbooks are summarized in Appendix C.

Notes prepared by:
Michelle Vanderwel
Don Watershed Administrative Clerk
Toronto and Region Conservation
Public Presentation, Discussion and Drop-In
Appendix A
Poster Boards

March 29, 2008

Please download these poster boards from the meeting summary on the TRCA website.
## Criteria Based Summary of Comparative Evaluation for Step 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Summary</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alt #2</th>
<th>Alt #3</th>
<th>Alt #4W</th>
<th>Alt #4S</th>
<th>Alt #4WS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>Total naturalized area</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of wetland habitat types created</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of open space/terrestrial habitat</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for negative and/or beneficial effect on wildlife species or communities (i.e., minimizing disturbance)</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for negative and/or beneficial effects on native fish habitat or aquatic communities</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for hydraulic and hydrologic to affect sustainability of vegetation communities and associated fauna</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to maintain and improve connection for aquatic species</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of habitat types created</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for negative and/or beneficial effect on wildlife species or communities (i.e., connecting habitat)</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td>Potential to impact flooding conditions elsewhere</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for sediment to affect flooding and conveyance of flow</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Lead preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to accommodate potential changes in extreme precipitation and water flow resulting from climate change</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td>Potential to phase implementation of river modifications</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Accessibility of river mouth for operational management (i.e., dredge, barge, etc.)</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effects on Port operations and shipping</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Lead preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effects on Port operations and shipping</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Lead preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual operation and maintenance costs</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td>Potential for changes to existing, planned and proposed roads solely due to DMNP</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with</td>
<td>Potential need for new bridges</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Modifications required to accommodate surface transit</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for changes to existing rail lines or yards or access roads leading to rail yards</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for changes to existing, planned and proposed underground utilities</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for modifications to dock wall</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Lead preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for changes to existing above ground utilities</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Criteria Based Summary of Comparative Evaluation for Step 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alt #2</th>
<th>Alt #3</th>
<th>Alt #4W</th>
<th>Alt #4S</th>
<th>Alt #4WS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td>Potential for effect from construction on archaeological resources</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for changes to use of river mouth for boating</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to negatively or positively affect recreational boating in the Inner Harbour</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to enhance/upgrade existing and proposed pedestrian/cycling linkages with and between waterfront areas and the rest of the city</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to provide functional linkages to Martin Goodman Trail</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for displacement from construction of naturalized area on built heritage resources</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Consistency with the intent of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential for nuisance effects on the planned and proposed surrounding community</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land outside of regulatory floodplain available for development</td>
<td>Most Preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity value created by river and naturalized areas</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability of location of river to support transit utilization</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walkability - ability to create pedestrian connectivity between and within neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to provide vistas to the downtown skyline</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Waterfront Toronto Sustainability Framework</td>
<td>Potential for disturbance of contaminated soils</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to manage contaminated soils and groundwater</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical constraints imposed by existing soil and groundwater contamination</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of management of groundwater and soil contamination</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Alt #2</td>
<td>Alt #3</td>
<td>Alt #4W</td>
<td>Alt #4S</td>
<td>Alt #4WS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Management and Constructability</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with Infrastructure</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Waterfront Toronto Sustainability Framework</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Outcome of Step 3 & 4 and Next Steps in the Environmental Assessment

Public Forum Presentation
March 29, 2008

Presentation Overview

1. Background from Terms of Reference and Steps 1 and 2 of the EA
2. Outcomes of Step 3 (Description of Alternatives)
3. Outcomes of Step 4 (Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives)
4. Next Steps

Background - Terms of Reference

Project Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Split Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through recontouring, dikes and ice management
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed
5. Encourage additional recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/urban accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with TMBC’s Sustainability Framework and applicable provincial legislation

Background - Terms of Reference

Alignment of Alternatives

• Four alternatives (discharge points) identified in ToR

Study Area

Background - Terms of Reference

Consideration of Alternatives in EA

• ToR allows consideration of discharge points from other planning processes
• Other discharge points already evaluated in ToR will be considered further only if a reasonable range of “alternative methods” cannot be identified

Background - Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference framework

• Terms of Reference (ToR) provides framework for Environmental Assessment (EA)
• Approved in August 2006
• Defines various elements to be addressed during EA

Project Goal

• To establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.
Background - Step 1
Long List of Alternatives

- Develop long list of alternatives based on:
  - Discharge points
  - River characteristics
  - Channel shape (cross-section)
  - Habitat types (what grows in the channel)

Background - Step 1
River Characteristics (Sediment and Turbidity)

- Current turbidity levels hinder plant growth
- Over 40,000 m² of sediment trapped annually in the Keating Channel

Background - Step 1
River Characteristics (Flow Rate)

Background - Step 1
Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Background - Step 2
Description of Step 2

- Ensure that alternatives work based on constraints / thresholds that limit:
  - The ability of channel to convey water
  - The ability for vegetation communities to thrive

Background - Step 2
Summary - Primary Channel
**Step 3**

**Describe the Alternatives**

- Layer information on each combination of discharge point and cross-section
Step 4
Evaluation of the Alternatives

- Determine how well alternatives achieve objectives based on evaluation criteria
- Describe issues and trade-offs with alternatives
- Identify preferred alternative(s)

Outcome of Steps 1 to 3

- 5 alternatives carried forward for comparative evaluation (Step 4)

- Will evaluate “Do Nothing” during Step 5

Step 4
Comparative Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Management and Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Seafood Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Inundation Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

- Low Preference
- Moderate Preference
- High Preference
- Very High Preference
- Preferred

Note:

- Table data needs to be filled in with actual values.
Next Steps

Confirmatory Studies

- Hydrology/Sediment Management
- Management of Contaminated Soils and Groundwater
- Risk Analysis of Shipping Lane

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining Tasks</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult on Step 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and Submit EAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Implementation of Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Undertaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any Questions?
**Presentation Overview**

1. Project Location and Background
2. Historical Context – How did the Don Narrows Come to Be?
3. The Don Narrows Today
4. Next Steps

**Where is the Don Narrows?**

- The “Don Narrows” extends ~2150 metres from Riverdale Park to Lake Shore Blvd; where the Don River enters the Keating Channel.

- Engineering works in the late-1880s straightened and widened the river channel; cedar posts were inserted into the ground vertically side-by-side to create new river banks.

- Steel sheet-piles were installed behind these cedar posts in the late-1940s to mid-1950s to facilitate construction of the Don Valley Parkway (DVP) and Bayview extensions. Remnants of the original cedar posts can still be seen in the “Narrows.”
### What is the Don Narrows?

- The location of the DVP, Bayview Avenue and railways along the top of the river bank through the “Narrows” are frequently flooded (~2 year return period).
- A pedestrian trail along the west side of the river provides the only public access to the Don River through the “Narrows”.
- Vegetation along the “Narrows” is either absent or limited to a narrow band of opportunistic trees, grasses and shrubs – usually of the invasive variety.
- Heavy sediment loads (mainly sands and silts), and straight, hard channel banks that are overly-wide inhibit the formation of good aquatic habitat within the “Narrows”.

### Project Background

- For years, strong community support has been expressed to improve the natural habitat conditions along and within the Don Narrows.
- In response, TRCA and Waterfront Toronto included consideration of “In-Channel” naturalization opportunities for the Don Narrows as part of the DMNP EA.

### Existing Conditions

A Vision By the Task Force to Bring Back the Don (2001)

### Project Objective

- As part of the Step 5 Activities for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA, TRCA and the Gartner Lee Limited consultant team will examine opportunities for improving the instream habitat conditions within the Don Narrows (e.g., within the channel banks and immediately adjacent to the top of banks between the DVP on the east and railway tracks on the west).

- The EA team will examine:
  - Options for providing instream structures designed to improve aquatic habitat quality; and
  - Where vegetation can be planted or transplanted (in the case of phasing out invasive species).

### Historical Context

**How did the Don Narrows end up this way?**
Early 1800s

Early to mid 1800s, the Don River originally exited into the Ashbridge's Bay Marsh near what would become Eastern Avenue.

Mid 1800s

- By 1857, the Grand Trunk Railroad had established a rail crossing over the Don between Palace Street and Front Street (adjacent to existing location).
- By late 1850's, crossings at Gerrard Street (then known as Bell's Bridge) and Queen Street were built.
- Between late 1850’s and 1890, numerous other road bridges were built and either destroyed or removed south of Queen Street.
- Late 1850’s small ships and scows travelled up and down the river as far as Gerrard.

Late 1800s

- Don River “Improvements” occurred between 1887 and 1890.
- Objectives were to straighten and deepen the channel from Gerrard Street to the Grand Trunk Railway crossing.
- Goals were to provide flood protection, prevent ice jams and attract industry.
- The “Improvement” project was one of Toronto’s greatest political boondoggles in the late 19th century as it accomplished none of the goals, and took far longer to construct and at a much higher cost.

Goad’s Atlas 1890

Skating on the Narrows

Cedar Pile Bank Protection along the Narrows
Late 1800s & Early 1900s

- By 1890, the Canadian Pacific Railway built railway lines up the Don Valley along the west side of the Don River, occupying lands that were made available by the Don River "Improvement" project.

- By 1912, the Keating Channel was completed, which effectively diverted the Don River entirely to the west, into the Inner Harbour.

Early 1900s

- Pollution in the Don River increased during the 19th and early 20th century due to agriculture, logging, milling, industrial and animal wastes, and human sewage. Pollution accumulated in the lower Don and Ashbridge's Bay Marsh contributing to disease outbreaks.

- The Toronto Harbour Commissioners devised the 1912 Waterfront Plan, calling for the transformation of Ashbridge's Bay Marsh into a port that provided industrial, commercial and park land uses.

- The Port Industrial District was completed between 1912 and 1952.

Early 1900s

- Major ice jam floods occurred in the Don, in February of 1918 and 1925.

- In 1928, the Grand Trunk Railway over the Don River was raised 6 metres onto an earthen viaduct.

Mid 1900s

- The DVP & Bayview Extension were built along the east and west banks of the "Narrows", respectively in the mid-1950s.

- The Gardiner Expressway was completed by the early 1960s, providing an elevated expressway from the DVP to Toronto's downtown core.
What are the Physical Conditions Today?

Don Narrows

Flood Levels in the Narrows
(2 Year Flood)

2 Year Flood Plain

Flood Levels in the Narrows
(2 and 100 Year Flood)
Don Narrows

Flood Levels in the Narrows
(2, 100 Year, and Regulatory Flood)

Don Narrows
Channel Morphology

Bed Profile of Don Narrows as Surveyed in 2003

Remnants of original cedar piles from 1880s
Don River "Improvement" Project

Don Narrows
Riverdale Park Section (2007)

Looking downstream at Riverdale Park Pedestrian Bridge and Gerrard St. Bridge
DVP upstream from Queen St. Bridge

Don Narrows
At Queen Street (2007)

Looking downstream from Queen St. Bridge

Don Narrows
At Queen Street (2004)

Remnants of Cedar Piles Under Queen Street Bridge

Don Narrows
At Queen Street (2007)

Looking upstream at Eastern Ave. Bridge

Don Narrows
At Eastern Avenue (2004)
Next Steps

A Site Walk and Working Session to Discuss Ideas for the Naturalization of the Don Narrows will be held on

Saturday May 24, 2008

IF INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND EMAIL ADDRESS AT THE BOOTH SO THAT DETAILS OF THE EVENT CAN BE SENT TO YOU WHEN THEY ARE AVAILABLE
Public Presentation, Discussion and Drop-In

Appendix C

Workbook Public Comments Summary

March 29, 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appears to be a thorough and balanced approach – people uses versus environment</td>
<td>Yes, headed in the right direction, but obviously is the most complex alternative</td>
<td>For me, major issue is implementation, especially of recreation and green aspects. How will park development be funded? How do we get it done? Right balance between public and private funding will be key.</td>
<td>Hope that the players will be able to keep things moving forward.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2         | Yes.4WS appears to be the best, however: 1) More greenspace would be preferable to allow people to enjoy nature and allow for nature to live and prosper and contribute to a healthy city and environment. 2) Keating Channel and flow of water, potential "stillness" | Yes.                                                                                                             | - Design with respect to the development of surrounding lands.  
- Balance between use by people and nature’s contribution.  
- Design and use of Keating Channel. | Greater connection of greenspace between the Don and the lake is necessary (see sketch) | Naturalization of the Mouth of the Don creates a great impetus to improve the water quality of the Don. Without that, the project will never bear the fruit of its labour. |
<p>| 3         | No comment                                                                                       | No comment                                                                                                      | Lands within the Don Greenway, including required lands south of the Ship Channel, must be given the planning designation of “Gr” (open space, for conservation purposes) and an “H” holding symbol needs to applied to those lands. This is necessary to reserve these lands for greening and to protect from other interests e.g. retail stores, stadiums. | No comment                                                                                   | No comment |
| 4         | Yes, agree with objectives and their criteria. Mitigates design concept. Balance between flood control and recreation development. What impact will it have on the built form required for proposed density? How will the built forms be shaped by this concept? Will the density need to be changed to achieve low rise, pedestrian-walkable community? | Yes, agree with objectives and criteria. Mitigates design concept. Balance between flood control and recreation development. Questions about density, developable area posed under previous question need to be answered. How will issues with operational management and constructability be addressed? | | No comment                                                                                   | No comment |
| 5         | Great work – solid plan, Excellent choice. Brilliant plan that                                   | 1) What port activity is there that makes                                                                 | Senior government ought to give you                                                                 | Thanks for hard |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No comment at this time. Positive about preliminary preferred alternative because of its regard to natural flow of the river. Prefer greater greenspace within the study area, but believe balance was struck between development and wetland/greenspace.</td>
<td>1) What is happening upstream in the Don that could potentially affect the naturalization of the mouth?  2) How can surrounding land uses of the study area help with implementing the project? How can they complement efforts through green roofs, walls, pervious driveways, etc.</td>
<td>There needs to be thought given to local citizen efforts in and around the study area with respect to naturalization projects which can complement the efforts of the Don Mouth Naturalization Project. Bigger picture view. This area is highly urbanized so small efforts also need to be encouraged and celebrated.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Yes. The plan as it evolves maintains options for future planning exercises, i.e. connection of the greenway still possible.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Would like to see small boat facilities- canoe, rowboat rentals, etc. on the Don from the mouth as far north as navigation is possible.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes – increased naturalization and more accessibility to water by public</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Appropriate mix between natural habitat, park and development</td>
<td>I agree that Don mouth is important for image of the City</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes- process handled well. Yes. Best alternative based on constraints imposed by project.</td>
<td>Concern about sediment management – if this management occurs north of Lakeshore Blvd, then the barging of sediment now occurring may not be able to occur- would it need to be trucked out? At 20 m$^3$/truckload (estimated) this would take 2000 trucks per year – a bigger environmental impact than the current process.</td>
<td>Spend some time considering how you’re going to sell this plan to the powers that be (Province, Federal authorities that have regulatory controls in the area). Ensure as much as possible that the developments outlined won’t be appealed to the OMB.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Generally very happy with the approach taken to refine generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative</td>
<td>1) Imperative that the “green corridor” be extended south of the Ship Channel so that</td>
<td>Keep working on this, keep involving the public and try to get the overall plan</td>
<td>Thanks for all the work that you are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>the EA alternatives, and congratulate you all on a very clear process.</td>
<td>for the EA and how it was chosen.</td>
<td>there is a clear green path from Tommy Thompson Park right up the Don River. 2) How will the green corridor link at the Keating Channel? Animals cannot be expected to cross roads, will there be underpasses or other? Ensure that the “Don Narrows” stretch of the river is improved so that it is a better “wildlife route”. 3) Important that this plan be implemented and to do this it will be important that other developments in the area respect the ideals expressed in your planning. Ask the City to impose a moratorium on developments in this area until the planning is completed. 4) Thought needs to be given to transit very soon. Present plans are likely to call for a streetcar line along Queens Quay to Cherry Street, linking to the already approved, branch down Cherry Street from King Street to the rail corridor. Though it may not yet be necessary to extend a streetcar line down into the “southern Portlands” it may be time to extend the QQ line down to, maybe, Commissioners or even the Ship Channel. 5) How will pedestrians and cyclists reach the area? The access under the rail lines at Cherry, Parliament Jarvis and Sherbourne need to be improved - if only with better lighting, painting and landscaping.</td>
<td>approved as soon as possible.</td>
<td>doing, and for your very open involvement of “users”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I've looked at the report and agree that 4WS looks best, it allows the maximum opportunities for people to contact the river, e.g. spots for picnicking.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 No comment

I’ve looked at the report and agree that 4WS looks best, it allows the maximum opportunities for people to contact the river, e.g. spots for picnicking.

No comment

No comment

How is the project interfacing with the people involved in Ward 30, e.g. South of Eastern planning group,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>I am a small craft boater, I have a rowing skiff and a canoe. I hope it will be possible to have a continuous, unencumbered waterway from the harbour going north as far as Gerrard Street. Please don't plan any artificial portages or land forms that might break up the continuous flow of the river. There is little enough current as it is and any break in the water course would only further choke that flow. I am also a sport fisherman and it would be great to have some natural habitats that might encourage the return of the lake's various fish species to the new river.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Support 4WS as the preferred alternative as it meets all the environmental objectives and provides two spillways in addition to the main river and flood plain in the event of climate changes and increased number and intensity storms</td>
<td>1) Support protection of the flood plain primarily for naturalization (rather than organized sports.) 2) Would like to underline the importance of &quot;connectivity&quot; of the Portlands and the Don right up to the ORM with special consideration for long distance hikers, birders, cyclists and perhaps even canoeists if base flow can be restored in the future.</td>
<td>1) From the renderings at the meeting the flood plain appears to be a large, flat area with no topographic relief. In the design stage attention should be given to plant materials (ex. shrubs, grasses that would not hinder flood flows) and grading to &quot;soften&quot; the appearance and provide visual points of interest. 2) Strongly support the sustainability guidelines and the importance of implementing them - without compromises. This project has to be a world leader to attract the interest and funding from the right investors.</td>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very exciting project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Support the attempt to have the flyway widened at the south end of Alternative 4WS and that a similar width greenspace be created between the Ship Channel and the Leslie Street Spit. The green strip is perhaps more important even than the widened gap. Birds seem to find their way up the even narrower Lower Don flyway.</td>
<td>3) Recommend investigating the possibility of an &quot;Interim Control Bylaw&quot; to prevent development pressures during the preparation of the Precinct Plan.</td>
<td>I will be 96 in 30 years and am already looking forward to seeing the completed project. No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes, very comfortable It has been done with great care, listening to all comments of participants and evaluating on basis of reality rather than on emotional wishes. The process has been painfully slow but very open and inclusive. Those who claim otherwise, will be those who after all this time still did not get their particular suggestions incorporated, mostly because they are not realistic and the evaluation process eliminated those options for good well founded reasons.</td>
<td>Yes, it nicely marries the Winning Design Proposal from the Competition with the preferred options that the original EA put forward. Some tweaking that was necessary happened, some of the suggestions and ideas from the Don Greenway Workshop were incorporated, a very realistic preferred alternative is on the table.</td>
<td>a) Create waterways that actually have water in them. &quot;Marshes&quot; are not realistic, they need water. Do we really need another &quot;Spadina Wet Lands&quot; which are seldom wet? b) The opportunity to engage the larger population of Toronto in the marvels of this project. Still too many people don't know that this Wonder of the World is about to happen on their door step. If they can be brought into the picture and on side with the project, the momentum of their enthusiasm will get behind it such that no opposition will have a chance to side line the future Naturalization of the Mouth of the Don River. c) To make sure that the river mouth really functions so that in the future it will look like it has always been here; as the levels of the lake rise and fall, that the river mouth can survive and thrive.</td>
<td>Don't get sidelined by the wishes for things that are unrealistic. Areas of development scattered around the new river mouth must not be too small to survive as small communities. They need to be able to support the services that each will need. If the community is too sparsely populated, people will be forced to drive for their needs, this will defeat the priority - make this a transit first community. The precinct planning which follows will need to ensure that the population of each community and the diversity of uses will allow each to develop its own character and be a healthy node unto itself, but still within easy reach of the larger city by transit. However, the push for more and more park land can threaten the viability of the communities. Lake Ontario Park is only a short stroll away from most of</td>
<td>I want to congratulate the team on their very hard diligent work on this project. The detailed analysis of how the decision were reached is clear and comprehensive for those who want to see them. The year 2035 seems a long way away. At almost 30 years into the future this 60+ year old may be looking over the shoulders of the worker bees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I was interested in the meticulous way the points were allocated according to the various criteria, to come up with a tentative winner.</td>
<td>The plan with most points also seems on the face of it to be the most attractive too.</td>
<td>I would concur with some of the audience members who suggested there should be more green areas, rather than industry closest to the outer lake. That gas plant has to go!</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>Don't forget the need for the recreational facilities which were part of the Commissioners Park Project. A healthy community must have access to sports facilities for people of all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>I like the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>I would like the EA to include a consideration of green space that continues south of the shipping channel, right into Lake Ontario Park.</td>
<td>I was a tad deflated re: the timeline. 2035?! And I am very concerned that WT and other stakeholders will have spent millions of dollars and spent thousand of hours (including large amounts of public input) doing all this fantastic planning, and the ORB (sic) might simply ignore the final result. Is there anything that can be done to ensure that this does not happen?</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Very pleased with the level of detail and methodology used to refine the EA alternatives and then select a preferred alternative.</td>
<td>Preferred alternative provides a great opportunity to balance the natural features of the mouth of the Don with the proposed development in the Port Lands.</td>
<td>Considerable concerns about the ability of the landowners/planners/builders/contractors to be able to determine a proper scale for the proposed developments in the Port Lands that do not overpower and threaten the proposed natural features. If economics alone (money from development etc.) is used to determine development density, then project will probably not be truly successful. I would hate to see a corridor of tall buildings &gt; 8 stories lining the proposed naturalized river. It might be worthwhile to establish the success.</td>
<td>The meeting was well advertised, well attended, and well run. Everyone seems to have done a great job. I look forward to the next meeting.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Generally comfortable with the following exceptions:• The decision for the preferred choice of the design competition had significant emphasis on building density and height and that other design concepts with higher density and greater building height had not been successful with that factor being significant in the decision. In general this is desirable, but not appropriate at the edge of the waterfront. • Difficult to really assess the study area without a stronger understanding of what is going to happen around it. Although the Central Waterfront, East Bay Front and the West Don Lands are well described, the balance of the Port Lands is ill-defined and it is critical. The surrounding area is important to the whole vision and its ultimate viability and desirability.</td>
<td>Generally comfortable. Not sure why Keating Channel is no longer linked to the Don as a permanent, open-water connection. May be due to hydraulic modelling issues, debris build-up issues or terrestrial linkage of natural areas. I am not certain I agree with this decision and would like an explanation why it was taken. Strongly support the following: a) The planned entertainment element to area under the Gardiner along the Keating Channel. This could be linked to the Distillery District, creating a critical mass that will improve the success of both areas. Pedestrian-oriented connectivity to both areas should be maximized. The planned development in both the Study Area and the East Bay Front will result in the loss of two of Toronto’s medium-sized, event-oriented entertainment venues (the Guvernment and the Docks). Their replacement should be considered in the new development. Would be in everyone’s interest to separate such entertainment zones and complexes from residential areas. Toronto has a face, and that is the waterfront. Most images in foreign media, post cards, tourist images show the Toronto waterfront with the CN Tower and Sky Dome prominently displayed. This is the image of Toronto to the rest of the country and the world. All development around the center of the waterfront should consider opportunities to improve the face of Toronto. We have had notable successes and notable failures in this area. I hope we have learned but I am afraid, based on the presentations I heard on March 29th, we have not. Please consider the following: a) Toronto has no natural visual element that helps create an impressive, unique and identifiable sky-line (examples that have include Montreal with Mount Royal and Vancouver with the coast ranges). Toronto has beautiful river valleys, improvements of which are part of the waterfront projects, however, these are not evident when viewing the skyline. • The face of Toronto is the skyline and it is man-made. • Toronto has a recognizable skyline thanks to large, iconic buildings such as the CN Tower and the Sky Dome. • Toronto’s recognizable iconic buildings are characterized by bold geometries giving</td>
<td>a) What will happen to the steel railroad bridge up river, though, I think in or close to the northern extent of the study area? When bike riding up the Don bike path, I have always liked this structure and hope that not only will it not be demolished but something could be done with it to enhance its use (even if relocated). I think the steel bridge for pedestrians/bikes at the off-ramp to Lake Shore from the DVP is a nice complement to it and hopefully there is a linkage-theme going on here. b) The presence of industry in the Port Lands and the port itself needs a clear direction in order to really be able to understand the study area’s future success and viability. This needs to be discussed with more emphasis instead of seemingly to be ignored. What is going to happen on the south side of the Shipping Channel? What is going to happen east of the study area? Right now, with a few exceptions of natural areas and the new playing fields, these areas are dreadful. The industries present, with a few exceptions, are unpleasant in appearance, generate too much truck traffic and are noisy. This is not compatible with a sustainable neighbourhood. Most of these industries, particularly the container port</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the residential zones. Entertainment complexes by the water are popular and successful if made accessible and well serviced (e.g. Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, Darling Harbour in Sydney, South Street Sea Port, New York). It needs to be distinctly different than existing waterfront areas (Ontario Place or Harbour Front), i.e. not so kid or family oriented. b) The relocation of Lake Shore and its minimization as a significant throughway. It cuts off the public from the waterfront, is hostile to cross, ugly and unnecessary. With the Gardiner taking traffic, Lake Shore should be pedestrian oriented with minimal lanes only serving local traffic, as well as on and off ramps for the Gardiner. c) The three channel approach (although with the disclaimer mentioned above). d) The use of the arched bridges in the artist’s conceptions of the competition winner - they are beautiful, distinctive and functional. Continuing such a linking design element through the whole central waterfront would be a good idea. Bike riders can travel long distances and would notice in one ride this continuing design the city a modern, even futuristic look. • Toronto is a new city whose historical architecture, though important to protect, is not iconic for the most part, and not along the immediate waterfront. • Only government projects seem to result in iconic architecture. The private sector and private sector developers do not have the ability to create buildings that stand out. There are enough un-inspired slab condos, and office buildings (low-rise, mid-rise and high-rise) along Toronto’s waterfront...we don’t need to compound the mundane tradition that has been widespread in the last few decades. Only government projects, with a few exceptions such as the TD Towers, seem to be able to develop integrated architecture… multiple buildings with the same look or design elements (not identical though!!). This should be carried out at the structures at the foot of the harbour. This leads to the following recommendations: • Buildings at the foot of the harbour should be iconic with bold geometries and a significant presence. • The architecture of buildings at the foot of the harbour should be integrated, following the same design elements. • The neighbourhoods that make up the rest of the developable part of the waterfront can be more human-scale. I realize this viewpoint may be in the minority in the public meetings where many and bulk storage yards, should be displaced elsewhere. While industrial/commercial land use along Leslie Street by the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant makes sense as a buffer to residential, light commercial and films studios is a good idea, this should not include the heavy industries and storage yards now present. I suggest that such industries would be better off in Hamilton Harbour, where active docking facilities do not conflict so much with long term vision, access to highways is superior, and employment in greater need. With the relocation of the need for active harbour use outside of Toronto’s waterfront, there would be less constraints on redevelopment. Obviously I believe that industry on the waterfront should be minimized and not heavy in nature, the Port of Toronto is unnecessary and has outlived its usefulness and, you may not be surprised to find I also oppose the Island Airport, which caters to the few, and think this should be converted to a pedestrian-only neighbourhood. c) I would like more accessible and democratic land uses on the waterfront such as the sailing clubs by Cherry Beach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes. The use of a failure mode effects analysis (FEMA) and summarizing of results in a matrix to compare and contrast the various sub-components (Criteria and Indictors) for each Objective is a sound approach to evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the various alternatives.</td>
<td>Essentially quite comfortable. Applying a qualitative weighting to the intrinsic elements related to the 7 main factors and similarly applying a derived weighting to the overall alternatives is a bone fide decision making protocol. Final matrix lends itself to a self-explanatory presentation to the uninstructed.</td>
<td>participants are more into the small is beautiful, green is good philosophy and would look at my view as one from a by-gone era of mega-projects and grandiose government spending, but I am an environmental engineering consultant by profession.</td>
<td>a) Continue to maintain the critically important focus on improving (and re-inventing) natural habitats in the many Don River and Waterfront projects. Accelerate implementation wherever possible. b) Continue to encourage public input.</td>
<td>Unfortunate that the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project is forecast to be quarter century long implementation. This presents a potential risk that commercialization will overtake the envisioned project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes. Very comfortable. Was done in a very systematic way and was very detailed in Yes. With respect to the 7 objectives for the project; it was given the “most preferred”</td>
<td>1) During the summer months, the water flow in the Don is very low. How do you ensure that there is adequate flow in the</td>
<td>1) Make sure the two bridge crossings have a unique and attractive design 2) The western end of the proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature. Final summary grid for comparing alternatives was clear and concise. Easy for me to understand why alternative 4WS was the preferred alternative.</td>
<td>designation for 5 of 7 objectives and a “moderately preferred” designation for one other objective. No other alternative came close to matching the objectives for the project.</td>
<td>new meandering Don River course from the Lakeshore Blvd to the inner harbour? We could be looking at an almost dry river bed. Would initial dredging of the new river channel address this concern? 2) Along the Keating Channel, diagrams for the revitalized Don show promenades, cafes etc. These will be fine as long as the water in the Keating Channel is not stagnant – how will you keep the water in Keating Channel from becoming stagnant? Could you install a pipe along the bottom of the Channel and periodically pump compressed air through it to create bubbles that would aerate the water? Or could you install a large wind turbine at the harbour entrance to the Channel connected via gears to underwater paddles. As the wind turned the blades the gear system would slowly turn the underwater paddles to create a small current that would flow towards the inner harbour.</td>
<td>open space/terrestrial habitat facing the inner harbour will offer great views of the harbour and downtown. Any walkway following the perimeter of this open space should feature adequate lookout stations with enough seating to accommodate viewers. This area facing the harbour might be a good location for a couple of restaurants/cafes. 3) The remnants of the industrial buildings in the area (i.e. concrete silos, lifting crane) should be retained and converted to attractions for the public. Perhaps the crane could be converted to offer better views of the harbour and downtown. (i.e. a viewing platform could be lifted by the crane to allow visitors to view the harbour for a nominal fee) 4) When plans are being finalized for the neighbourhoods bordering the new Don River course, they should include a mix of variable income housing using the requirements for the West Don Lands and East Bayfront as a guide.</td>
<td>open space/terrestrial habitat facing the inner harbour will offer great views of the harbour and downtown. Any walkway following the perimeter of this open space should feature adequate lookout stations with enough seating to accommodate viewers. This area facing the harbour might be a good location for a couple of restaurants/cafes. 3) The remnants of the industrial buildings in the area (i.e. concrete silos, lifting crane) should be retained and converted to attractions for the public. Perhaps the crane could be converted to offer better views of the harbour and downtown. (i.e. a viewing platform could be lifted by the crane to allow visitors to view the harbour for a nominal fee) 4) When plans are being finalized for the neighbourhoods bordering the new Don River course, they should include a mix of variable income housing using the requirements for the West Don Lands and East Bayfront as a guide.</td>
<td>No comment No comment No comment WATER and AIR QUALITY a) Water quality is extremely important. Rather than waiting for solutions to water quality to happen upstream it would be improved by returning the natural meandering feature of the river in the Don Narrows. Could be accomplished by replacing the DVP starting south of Bloor with a two-lane road. The four most westerly lanes starting south of Bloor would be removed, keeping the one lane on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>WATER and AIR QUALITY a) Water quality is extremely important. Rather than waiting for solutions to water quality to happen upstream it would be improved by returning the natural meandering feature of the river in the Don Narrows. Could be accomplished by replacing the DVP starting south of Bloor with a two-lane road. The four most westerly lanes starting south of Bloor would be removed, keeping the one lane on the</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>east and adding it to the existing one lane street called Davies Ave. Water quality would further be greatly improved by eliminating this part of the DVP as the airbourne pollutants, which end up in the river, come from the exhaust of the huge numbers of cars that travel that route and the oil, grease and chemicals they deposit on the road which are washed into the river during rain falls would be eliminated. Would also be have a vast positive impact on air quality. b) Water quality must also be addressed in the EA. c) Wet Weather Flow and controls must start at Steeles Ave and be constantly emphasized.</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ON FLOOD PLAINS Climate Change must be the MAIN consideration for any development project. The intensity of Hurricane Katrina resulted from Climate Chang. The 'winds' carried the storm all the way up to Canada and flooding occurred in the lower Don. When, where and intensity of storms cannot be predicted and decision-making with respect to all development projects must 'err on the side of caution'.</td>
<td>INTENSIFICATION MUST BE LIVABLE Intensification is needed but it must be done sustainably, without causing overcrowding and with a sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23        | Generally yes. I really liked the island that was eliminated. If water issues                    | Yes.                                                                                                                                               | a) Expanding the study area, south of ship channel and east as well  
b) Maximizing naturalization, preservation                                                                                      | a) The EA needs to address water quality  
b) One disadvantage of the plan                                                                                                       | Emphasize wet weather flow control upriver                                                                                   |

amount of green space. The wise locations for intensification would be along subway lines. It is unwise to have it where it is crowding a river, situated on the flood plain and on or in too close proximity to waterfront, all of which are prime public space where the "majority" will be reaping benefit. Vancouver has a population of 1/2 million and they have Stanley Park which is 1,000 acres. Toronto's population is 2-1/2 million and the Portlands are also 1,000 acres. The Portlands is historically the flood plain for the Don River and keeping it public means it will always be available for the whole of the GTA to access as a green space. Leslie Spit cannot truly be considered as green space for people, it is man-made, very narrow 'strip' and the only way out is to return on the very narrow path. It is a great corridor for animals but not for the majority of people.

RIVER MAINTENANCE
The annual cost of maintenance for the river will still be there and very costly. Were the river given a larger area to form its own and changing path, the cost could be reduced. Ever changing year to year directions that the river takes would also be a fascinating event to observe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Prevent creating the island in the suggested location, can an island be sited elsewhere in the plan?</td>
<td>of land a priority or we will lose it c) Considering reductions in development density, perhaps higher ‘exclusive’ prices could be gained on any market value developments? (not that I want this to be an exclusive playground for the rich).</td>
<td>Identified was the cost of annual maintenance. To what degree could this be reduced by letting the river play a role in determining the form year to year? c) Maximize natural regeneration, but minimize built form and human impact. I think much more can be done, but this is the best plan I’ve seen so far.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24
No comment
No comment

With respect to the choice of solution, this is a case of too little too late, as opening up the last 500m or so of a lengthy river will do little to alleviate flooding upstream, and the cost of the works along with the loss of productive realty suggests that this option is too costly.

a) In the Don Narrows presentation slides it is erroneous to say that the Don originally discharged into Ashbridges Bay Marsh. It passed through that bay and discharged into Toronto Bay, and would have had very little contact with the marsh as it would have leveed itself off from it, as all rivers tend to do when they pass thru marshes.
b) There is one slide showing return period flow rates as a bar graph, with one bar oddly called ‘hurricane’. I presume that this is in reference to the Hazel storm which was not a hurricane per se, it would today be called a tropical storm. We get a great number of tropical storm remnants in the Great Lakes region, Hazel was merely the worst one we’ve recorded here. As all these storms are covered by return period data, it should not therefore be difficult to assign the Hazel one a return period as well. I suspect that it falls within the 1000 to 10000 year range.

25
No comment
No comment

Cycling connection between Queens Quay and Lakeshore Blvd. From a trail user’s perspective, there seems to be a break in No comment No comment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>I was part of the Task Force to Bring Back the Don when we met several times with Michael Hough at the time when he was preparing his rendering of the naturalization of the mouth of the Don that we hoped to achieve one day. At the time I felt that what he drew was a good as we could hope to achieve. Since, I realized how we had a very limited scope which limited our dreams. In a Utopian world I’d like to eliminate the Keating Channel and the Ship Channel and have the river flow through multiple channels into the lake and a huge wide path as a natural green space rather than sports fields - I realize that is impossible. I am now overjoyed to learn that the preferred option goes way beyond the Hough drawing and that green space at the east-west routing of the multi-use trail. As one travels west bound along the Lakeshore Blvd. trail there doesn’t appear to be a direct connection to the Queens Quay trail. The Queen’s Quay route will be a popular east-west network serving not just recreational users, it will be a commuter route. As such there should be a direct link between Queens Quay and Lakeshore Blvd trails. Currently the plans seem to indicate a detour south on Don Roadway and Cherry St. rather than along the current alignment of Lakeshore Blvd.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>This is the time to get the most natural space at a branched, sprawling mouth of the Don. This opportunity will never come again! We have to push the limits as much as possible BUT you need to know how shocked and pleased I was to hear the preferred option described.</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27        | No comment                                                                                      | or near the mouth should not be sports fields. The preferred option is not Utopia but I think it’s a superb option...just do not let it shrink or have the river become just one pathway slightly off the current right angle. | a) How the dredging operation will be carried out will have a crucial important impact on the success of 'naturalization' initiative and the final preferred alternative.  
 b) Aside from potential pedestrian foot traffic from the proposed adjacent local residents to the south and north of Lakeshore, vehicle access to Don Mouth will largely be by bike based on current travel patterns. The preferred alternative review should given nominally stronger preference to alternatives giving improved passive and active bicycle enjoyment. | No comment                                                                                      | No comment       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</th>
<th>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</th>
<th>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</th>
<th>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</th>
<th>Other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sustainability of that design alternative e.g. car travel to shop. If there is no bothersome industrial noise coming from the shipping channel, it would indicate there is no economic benefit of maintaining the channel (in which case the shipping channel should be closed and incorporate into preferred alignment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Filmport studio development has a significant interest in the naturalization of the mouth and flood protection of the Port Lands area. Although we were not able to attend the Public Information Meeting on March 29, 2008 we have reviewed the presentation material and offer the following comments. All of the Alternatives, except for 4WS, would not allow for any development opportunities to the west of our site. Our concern would be the compatibility of any land use that would be designed for that area if this alternative were implemented. We would ask that the Environmental Assessment identify anticipated land uses for the developable lands shown in Alternative 4WS. The Terms of Reference provide general mapping of the Project Study Area and the Impact Assessment Study Area, with both areas to be confirmed during the study process. Can you advise if the study areas have been confirmed. We note that in all the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responder</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA alternatives? Why or why not?</td>
<td>Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?</td>
<td>What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed in the next steps of the EA?</td>
<td>Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?</td>
<td>Other comments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternatives presented, Basin Street has been not been shown within the study boundaries. At the present time, the Official Plan and Secondary Plan anticipate Basin Street to be constructed from Bouchette Street to Cherry Street. In addition, it would appear that Basin Street could only be accommodated in Alternative 2 and 4W since a crossing of the Don River would need to be studied as part of the alternatives. Will the Official Plan and Secondary Plan be amended as part of the EA process should the preferred alternative be selected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Don Narrows Workshop
Summary Notes and Workshop Feedback

May 24, 2008
Introduction to the Workshop & this Report

On Saturday, May 24, 2008 Toronto and Region Conservation hosted an afternoon workshop and site walk to explore opportunities to naturalize the Don Narrows. The results of the workshop will be used to inform conceptual design development for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Environmental Assessment. Over 30 people participated, including members of the Community Liaison Committee for the DMNP EA, the Task Force to Bring Back the Don, the Don Watershed Council, the City of Toronto, and other individuals and groups that care about the Don.

This draft meeting report was written by Nicole Swerhun, third party facilitator for the event. Please forward any thoughts, comments or suggested edits to Michelle Vanderwel at mvanderwel@trca.on.ca or 416-661-6600 ext. 5280.

Presentations delivered at the workshop included:

- Introduction to the DMNP EA, Marc Rose, Gartner Lee
- History of the Don Narrows, Jennifer Bonnell
- Existing Conditions & Constraints within the Don Narrows, Ken Dion, TRCA
- Recent activities of Task Force to Bring Back the Don in the Don Narrows, John Wilson
- Enhancement Opportunities to Consider for Naturalizing the Don Narrows, Ken Dion, TRCA

Copies of the presentations are available on request from the TRCA. If you would like to receive a copy, please contact Michelle Vanderwel (see phone number and email address above).

The workshop discussion asked participants to share their thoughts and offer their advice regarding opportunities for naturalizing the aquatic habitat conditions within the Don Narrows and immediately adjacent to the banks. Feedback is captured in Section I of this report, and includes suggestions that cover everything from in stream structures and riparian plantings to bank reconstruction or other ideas. Suggestions for improvements beyond the immediate channel and banks were also recorded but will be considered independently from the DMNP EA (included here as Section II).

In terms of next steps, TRCA will be reviewing the technical feasibility of the suggestions received from this workshop and also exploring other naturalization opportunities for the Don Narrows. Public follow-up will happen when the next Public Meeting is held as part of the DMNP EA.

There were 30 participants at the meeting. The Agenda is included as Appendix A.
SECTION I. Ideas and Advice on Opportunities to Naturalize the Don Narrows

This feedback focuses on opportunities for naturalization in the river itself and on the immediately adjacent river banks. It will be considered as part of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) EA.

1. Adjust the trail (see notes on maps from Tables A, B, and inset graphic on Table D map)
   - Use the real estate that the path sits on to create opportunities. This could be done, for example, by excavating the area. This creates more room for the river water to flow, and may allow for some infilling on the east side. The path could also be elevated along certain portions – which creates the room required for the river to meander. The path also doesn’t have to be as linear. Consider meandering the trail so it’s suspended over the river at some points.
   - Similar to the above point: “Take everything from river to rail out and re-build with what we want (e.g. wetland-like suspended/raised boardwalk) – increases capacity to move water and naturalization”.
   - Move fence west a bit and create bike express route.

2. Animal access/wildlife/aquatic corridor (see especially map from Table C)
   - The east side of the Don Narrows is a no man’s land – it could be a wildlife corridor.
   - Consider creating a way for animals to cross river from west to east, but discourage people. It could be some kind of bridge that would allow water to flow through. Another option could be to build a culvert under the DVP, rail, and Bayview to allow water to flow through, especially in area of Riverdale Park.

3. Parks/green space/wetlands
   - At Queen Street: enhance terrestrial habitat, east side; point bars; island – excavate to sheet pile and let water flow through (nesting for waterfowl).
   - No night lights – don’t want to draw people into natural wildlife area.
   - Create more stewardship teams.

4. Walls of the riverbank (see especially insets on map from Table B)
   - Over the long term, use stones instead of replacing piling (even if piling hidden).
   - Between Eastern and North of Queen: cut down higher walls, protect behind to prevent scour; and have sheet pile along rail to protect rail and between rail and current river edge.
   - Use rocks and other materials, large woody material cabled in.
   - Put estuary hooks on either side.

5. Overall approach
   - Need to have combination of: trail expansion, change shoreline, bioengineering so different type of plant material can thrive, green wall along Eastern Corridor, floating ponds
   - Nature’s doing good job, and encourage this to continue – embrace what nature is already trying to do. This includes keeping a “soft” approach. Put an emphasis on biodiversity. Let nature take its course.
SECTION II. Ideas and Advice on Opportunities to Naturalize the Don Narrows

This feedback focuses on opportunities beyond the river banks and is therefore outside the scope of the DMNP EA. That being said, there are a number of groups (e.g. TRCA, City of Toronto, Task Force to Bring Back the Don and others) who are involved in ongoing improvement activities and for whom this feedback is very valuable.

1. Transportation
   • Give Filmport a dedicated DVP exit and then close the Don Roadway.
   • Establish balanced transportation system, more towards people and trains versus cars.

2. Parks/green space/wetlands
   • Look at opportunities for little parkettes – at Labatt Street, other streets? City Planning could get involved in urban renewal. Use every little bit of green space at Queen.
   • Add wetlands north of Riverdale pedestrian bridge.
   • Create more stewardship teams.

3. Walls of the riverbank (see especially insets on map from Table B)
   • Increasing the height of the wall beside the DVP is one option that has been previously considered (to avoid flooding the highway), but it would need to be built on a barge and one lane of the DVP would need to be closed for 3-4 months. At the time it was considered too costly.

4. Opportunities on the bridges
   • Old Eastern Avenue bridge and Enbridge bridge are very low bridges. Look at ways to green the bridges as destinations (although may have to address access issues on the east side).
   • Art on the bridge is good – attracts people.
   • The roof of the Enbridge bridge could be greened with plantings.
   • Beautification: people fall in love with it; it creates constituency for stewardship advocacy – do this through overlooks (see especially map from Table A), Eastern Bridge as rest and recreation spot.

5. Opportunities on Private Property
   • Take private green property adjacent to buildings along valley and make public OR create “BIA-like” membership of private landowners and challenge businesses to improve
   • Tree planting on private property is outside the scope of the EA, but there are areas to do it on the top of the banks (which improves bird migration and look) – for example, at the Oak Street apartments, Don Incinerator site
APPENDIX A.  Agenda

DON NARROWS WORKSHOP
Saturday, May 25, 2008
South Regent Park Recreation Centre
1:00 – 4:30 pm

Workshop Purpose:
To identify opportunities for naturalization of the Don Narrows, as part of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) EA

Agenda:
1:00  Welcome & Introductions
     Adele Freeman, TRCA
1:02  Workshop Objectives & Agenda Review
     Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator
1:05  Presentations
     • Introduction to the DMNP EA, Marc Rose, Gartner Lee
     • History of the Don Narrows, Jennifer Bonnell
     • Existing Conditions & Constraints, Enhancement Opportunities to Consider, Ken Dion, TRCA
     • Recent activities of Task Force to Bring Back the Don in the Don Narrows, John Wilson
     Questions of Clarification
1:50  Site Walk
     Half of group will walk to Riverdale Park Pedestrian Bridge, and continue downstream. Other half of group will be bussed to Don Landing and continue upstream.
     • Travel to start Station 1 & Talk (1:50 – 2:20)
     • Walk to Station 2 & Talk (2:20 – 2:45)
     • Walk to Station 3 & Talk (2:45 – 3:10)
     • Travel back to Recreation Centre (3:10 – 3:25)
3:30  Workshop Discussion of Naturalization Opportunities
4:25  Next Steps
4:30  Adjourn
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Don Narrows Workshop
Display Panels

May 24, 2008
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Public Presentation, Discussion, and Open House
Notice of Public Presentation
May 9, 2009
The Don of a New Community

Come learn about plans to revitalize the mouth of the Don River and the communities that will surround it.

Public Forum #3 Invitation
You are invited to attend our open house and view presentations on proposed plans for a naturalized Don River mouth and for a new sustainable community in the Lower Don Lands.

Date: Saturday, May 9, 2009
Time: 10 a.m. – 3 p.m. (light lunch provided)
Location: St. Lawrence Hall, The Great Hall 157 King Street East (southwest corner at Jarvis Street)

New Mouth for the Don
The Don River is one of Toronto’s great assets and the centrepiece of major revitalization initiatives on the waterfront. Toronto and Region Conservation is conducting an Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project on behalf of Waterfront Toronto. This project is creating plans for a healthier, more naturalized river outlet to the lake, while at the same time, removing the risk of flooding to urban land to the east and south of the river.

New Lower Don Lands Community
Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto and the Toronto Transit Commission are conducting the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Municipal Class EA Master Plan and the Keating Channel Precinct Plan. The objective of this plan is to create a vibrant, mixed use, sustainable community that embraces and respects a newly naturalized and flood-protected mouth of the Don River.

For more information visit
www.waterfronttoronto.ca/lowerdonlands or
contact Andrea Kelemen at 416-214-1344 ext. 248 or
lowerdon@waterfronttoronto.ca.
Public Presentation, Discussion and Open House

Meeting Notes

May 9, 2009
The purpose of the meeting was to present and seek feedback on the preliminary concept design for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project.

153 people signed in at the meeting (including 40 team members), and the following points summarize the feedback received from the public at the meeting:

- Can we create a wildlife corridor along the Don Narrows?
- There is concern about flooding and water quality issues throughout the Don watershed, and integration with projects such as the City of Toronto’s Wet Weather Flow Master Plan is a vital component of this project
- Future lake levels need to be considered in regard to operation of wetlands

Please refer to the remainder of this report for more detailed notes.
1.0 Public Open House

The Open House portion of this event opened at 10:00 a.m. Members of the public were invited to sign in and view display boards showing details on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project and on projects being conducted in the surrounding area by several agencies. Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA), Waterfront Toronto, Michael Van Valkenburgh and Associates (MVVA), Arup, Greenberg Consultants Inc, AECOM, SENES and City of Toronto staff members were on hand to answer questions during the Open House. All participants received the following information as they signed in:

- Participant workbook (including meeting agenda)

The following information was also available to participants:

- Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Newsletter Volume #7 May 2009

All of the meeting materials listed above are available on the TRCA website at: http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization/whats_new

Display boards and laptop slideshows available for viewing during the Open House were:

- Sediment and Debris Management Overview
- Regulatory Flood Model: Existing Conditions
- Regulatory Flood Model: Preferred Alternative
- Landscape Communities
- Regulatory Flood Model (laptop slideshow)
- In addition, 19 boards were available on the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Infrastructure Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Plan from the MVVA team

Copies of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project poster boards are found in Appendix A to these notes.

153 people signed in at this event.

2.0 Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mark Wilson, Chair, Waterfront Toronto, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

Chris Glaisek, Vice President Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, introduced the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class EA Infrastructure Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Plan portion of the meeting.
Adele Freeman, Director, Watershed Management, TRCA, introduced the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project portion of the meeting.

Nicole Swerhun and David Dilks identified themselves as third party facilitators for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project and Lower Don Lands Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Infrastructure Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Plan portions of the meeting, respectively. They outlined the materials available at the sign-in desk and invited participants to fill out the Participant Workbook with their comments on the materials presented at the meeting.

3.0 Presentation: Lower Don Lands Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Infrastructure Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Plan


4.0 Presentation: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Please see the enclosed presentation in Appendix B.

Paul Murray, AECOM, provided background on the project, the steps taken to date, and the development of the conceptual design presented today.

The preliminary preferred alternative presented to the public at the last public meeting in March 2008 was subject to confirmatory studies on hydrology and sediment management; management of contaminated soils and groundwater; and a risk analysis of the shipping lane. The results from these studies confirm this alternative as viable.

Hydrology studies involved models predicting flooding responses under the preferred alternative. A run of the model was presented showing how the river flows would be contained under the Regulatory Flood.

Sediment and debris management will continue to be required with the new alignment of the river mouth to maintain hydraulic conveyance and ecological stability. A sediment trap will be located north of Lakeshore Blvd. to trap sand and debris. Silt and clay will continue downstream, as occurs under current conditions. The design allows for a sediment access shaft, which is potentially required by the City of Toronto for its CSO EA.

Geotechnical and geo-environmental data were collected in 2009 to fill data gaps in understanding management of contaminated soils in the study area for the purposes of naturalization. Waterfront Toronto will also be doing extensive studies of soil management for
the entire Lower Don Lands. Contamination will be managed by over-excavating such soil and
the backfilling with clean material. Armouring will also be installed as required.

A navigation risk assessment was conducted and it was determined that the promontories do
not significantly impact maneuverability within the Inner Harbour; aids to navigation are likely to
be required; sediment and debris should be managed upstream to minimize navigation
impacts; and modified currents do not pose an increased risk to navigation interests.

Naturalized areas were described as a mix of aquatic, wetland and upland communities. Water
levels in the majority of wetlands, including the Greenway wetland, will be dictated by lake
levels rather than from discharge from the river. Seepage wetlands are also contemplated
above the anticipated range of regular lake and river flood levels. These unique wetlands would
simulate groundwater seep wetlands found in our jurisdiction and are anticipated to be fed by
green-roof run-off from future development in the adjacent tablelands. It is important to note
that the EA will allow for the accommodation of these flows at the “end-of-pipe” from the
adjacent table lands, but will not be involved with how the delivery of water will occur from the
greenroofs to the end-of-pipe: that will be addressed through the Lower Don Lands Master
Servicing EA and River Precinct Planning processes. Vegetation will need to be resistant to
flooding from the Don River, and following very large flood events, it is anticipated that
maintenance will be required to address the resulting disturbance.

A list of animal target species has not yet been developed, but could include varieties of
songbirds, frogs, voles, bass and sunfish as well as minks, northern pike, and walleye.

Naturalization opportunities within the low-flow channel of the Don Narrows are being
examined, but any viable alterations to the channel cannot increase the frequency of flooding
onto the adjacent Don Valley Parkway, Bala Subdivision railway tracks and Bayview Avenue.

The integration of this project with the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class Environmental
Assessment Infrastructure Master Plan was discussed. This project will define the bridge
clearance requirements for flooding and small watercraft access. It is also anticipated that utility
crossings will be preinstalled through utility conduits under the river at the time that the river
valley is being constructed to avoid having to disturb the river after-the-fact to install or maintain
servicing.

**Feedback on the Presentation**

Questions and comments are noted below in italics, followed by the response from the project
team.

**Q1.** I think this is a wonderful, complicated plan that highlights the role of nature in the City.
One notable species that would symbolize the connection between the lake and wildlife
would be to be able to see deer in this area. Regarding the Don Narrows, the river is
naturally silting on the east side here. This could allow a wildlife corridor. Can we help to
create this linkage?

The Don Narrows must be able to convey flood levels, and this is a constraint on what can be
done, as is the infrastructure in the area. We know that coyotes do move through this area. We
will look into whether deer will be able to do so and what opportunities there are for deer movement through here.

Q2.  *Will the flood control here be the only control for flooding in the Don? What about conditions in the upper reaches of the river?*

The entire Don watershed faces challenges. For instance, the Don Valley Parkway floods regularly, as does lower Bayview Avenue. While this project will not solve these issues, the City of Toronto’s Wet Weather Flow Master Plan will impact flooding of the Don by managing stormwater before it enters the river.

Q3.  *What will happen if man-made or natural causes result in lake levels rising more than one to two metres? How will this impact the design?*

Long term modeling under climate change scenarios predict that lake levels will decline rather than increase. The hydraulic models that we are using do allow us to look at some variation in lake level.

Q4.  *Regarding the tunnel required in the debris management area – if this cannot be done for debris storage, how does this affect the project?*

The City’s Wet Weather Flow Master Plan will address combined sewer overflow by collecting it before it enters the Harbour. One option is for collection at this site, so space has been made to accommodate this option. Long term sediment management is needed, but currently much of the debris collected is clean, and in the form of tree trunks and logs. This debris is currently used in various ecological projects, and may also be chopped for use as mulch. Clean sediment can be used in landfill. Currently, Toronto Port Authority is collecting debris and sediment and it is stored as necessary. This is considered to be normal operations of the river and will continue long-term for any alignment of the river.

Q5.  *Water quality must be the first priority. Wet Weather Flow is meant to address this, but is it being given top priority? Financial commitments need to be made. What about upstream work on water quality issues?*

The wetlands created by this project will have a small impact on water quality but you are correct that this issue cannot be dealt with at the mouth of the river. The City of Toronto and the 905 municipalities and regions are working on this issue. Wet Weather Flow and the CSO EA are a very high priority for the City.

Q6.  *Are the big pipes proposed for areas upstream an issue affecting water quality here?*

Wet Weather Flow is a plan to deal with run-off and snowmelt from upstream as well as within the City. Bill Snodgrass of Toronto’s Water & Wastewater Services is here and will be available for further questions during the Open House portion of today’s meeting that follows these presentations.

Please see **Appendix C** to these notes for comments submitted after the meeting.

---

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project  
Open House and Public Forum, May 9, 2009
5.0  **Closing Remarks**

**Chris Glaisek** thanked participants for attending the presentations and encouraged them to look at the displays and ask questions of the consultants available for the Open House portion of the meeting, to follow.

Notes prepared by:
Michelle Vanderwel
Don/Highland Public Programs Coordinator
Toronto and Region Conservation
Lower Don Land Keating Channel Municipal Class EA & Precinct Plan

Comments Received:

1. Are you comfortable with the draft plans presented? Why or why not?
   
   - It's a very comprehensive. I would like more info on energy reduction and clarification on the images shown in the presentation. How many windmills and where will they be situated? Excellent component – “Aging in place”
   - Yes, the flood control plan sounds very challenging.
   - The images on the role of nature and clarification are very good.
   - The flood control animation images are amazing and make the project easy to visualize.
   - No comfortable. Not enough width of flow channel south of ship channel. Not enough information of impacts to Ashbridges Bay and Leslie Street. Get rid of the 3 high rise buildings, they do not belong in the area. Worried about wet weather flow from upper Don, not enough discussion or data. Do not like the combined sewer outflow storage intake. We have no plans to correct CFO?
   - Transportation for senior and handicapped needs implementation.
   - Need more information on fish habitat and the River function, wildlife migration corridor.
   - Transportation seems well thought out
   - Mixed use zoning is excellent.
   - Please work to keep T&T in new development
   - Detailed timelines from time of project approval to project completion.
   - Very detailed comprehensive and diverse. However, it seems like there isn’t enough parking spaces in the plan.
   - The level of detailed thought on a wide variety of modalities (sunlight, wind stormwater etc.) and creativity of the design teams are breathtaking.
   - The level of creativity and detailed consideration of the many critical issues is commendable. I am interested in aquatic and terrestrial habitat features that take advantage of the varying water levels.
   - Appreciate the attention to the sun, wind and water and recreational use in the plan.
   - The Range of competing requirements all seem to have been taken into account. Cutting edge planning.
   - Plans are well thought out. I like the transit plans, pedestrian and cycling plans.
   - The science and statistical calculations I have no doubt been well researched by accounts based on the information available today. Having made this statement it would be good to see some of the reports generated to show the flows and the maintenance.
   - I might suggest an added feature to deal with a huge 200 year downfall or an ice jam blockage. Why not install 3 – 8' diameter pipes under the bottom channel armor liner system. The pipes could be outfitted with a booster chamber with massive super charged force main pumps. In the event they are ever required they could increase the flow of the river substantially.
   - The approximate increased discharge could be in the order of __________m3.
   - If a suitable screening device can be installed and reasonably maintained. The pumps would be switched on 4 times a year for ongoing maintenance reliability. Tokyo has a somewhat similar problem and has done this to avoid flooding. This might overcome a problem raised in the comments section under Item 1.
2. What opportunities for refinements, if any, would you suggest?

- Remove the DVP and Gardiner Ramps.
- Ensure zoning to allow for proper density (8+ Floors), ensure family sized units in residencies, schools, day cares and retirement hones to have an age diverse area. The commercial areas along Cherry St. and Villiers St. looks good.
- Dredging south of Riverdale Park Bridge so public can canoe and kayak.
- Less urban development and increase natural areas.
- Urban planning, like politics is the art of the possible. With planning well underway, it may be time to insert a component in these meetings on the political/financial trajectory of the project. I appreciate the sensitivities of this, but this element must be managed or we (will) only be left with pretty pictures and consultant fees. Again. Public consultation and advocacy is essential for a plan of this scale to move forward. Acknowledge the political/financial path as equal, important and practical as soil studies and agency consultation. And informing the public/supporters of the status and strategy of WT and TRCA in this regard.
- I have concerns to the lack of retail along the Keating Channel. It will make it a “dead” space, particularly in the winter.
- Parliament St. Rail underpass should be designed similar to the plan for Scarlet Rd at the CP underpass, which includes space for future street cars.
- Urban farming opportunities.
- Encourage ongoing interpretive walks to identify the history and natural ecology of the area through Heritage Toronto, Toronto Field Naturalists.
- Interested in seeing more detailed modeling of the way people utilize open spaces and how this interacts with ecological planning for resident and migratory wild life.
- Interested in seeing the uses that are anticipated for the bridge over the south end of the Greenway along the north side of the ship channel. This would be a good opportunity for a boardwalk type bridge for pedestrian and bikers.
- Planning for interpretation and educational opportunities, especially given the ground breaking nature of the work being done.
- “Aging in place” is valued but a sense of “cost of living” would be appreciated.
- Urban agriculture and farming in the area. It will create sustainability by growing local food and promoting nature preservation. It will create job through farming.
- Provision to include health clinics in the area for residents and workers.
- A number of other studies are currently underway in regards to this redevelopment as shown on the presentation. Until those studies are fully completed it is difficult to comment at this time. I suggest as the studies become available they be uploaded for further review and the refinements may come then.
- Is it possible the historic silos could be reused as giant compost facilities? Given the fact they were originally designed to warehouse grain the reality of converting them into compost facilities should be very feasible. Secondly ever time the obnoxious gas odor discussion comes up is it possible that the escaping gas could be captured and turned into a heat source for burning and heating something like a community walk snow melt application, or maybe there is enough gas to operate some outdoor overhead burners. It might be worth putting it out as a contest to a university challenge to explore this further. This should be a good project for winning over the future generation. The silo can offer good potential for some kind of immediate use and revenue stream if adequately thought through. This should be part of the engineering challenge.
3. Any other comments?

- I might suggest the committee look at this aspect soon as a practical solution to the green garbage problem the city already has. I cannot see leaving them in there present condition for ever. The functionally of this asset could definitely be realized to the community. There is no shortage of green garbage that could be diverted into these silos. They also need to be refurbished on the exterior too. They have no charm and no appeal. Historical designated industrial sites of that size should have something desirable going for them.

- First class presentation, kudos to all involved for simplifying the complex technologies involved.
- Congratulation to WT, TRCA and MVVA for their superb presentation of wonderful plans.
- This could be the best thing to happen to Toronto in all its history.
- Talk to Toronto Airport Authority. They have several innovative programs that promote energy saving to communities and factories.
- The committee would be well served to have an expert property insurance specialist sitting in on some of the discussions. In light of recent biblical tragedies in the US and elsewhere globally I suspect having an insurance expert input from the outset would be advisable. It may force a close rethink of the options available. Vegetative green roofs while recently trendy do pose a fire hazard element if not maintained – this is vital.
- There are a number of timeline issues that would appear to be in need of some more input. I might suggest that 2 – 20 years to build out most of the infrastructure would be required. If it can be further broken down into 2 year phases with budget dollars set aside accordingly it might be more practical in terms of salability to other stakeholders and investors. Ideally I would start with the Don River Re-development with some sort of budget perspective / timeline would be involved on that aspect of the project first.
- What synergies or challenges does the adjacent Toronto Island airport offer or present. Airborne noise might be a factor in window design and/or HVAC duct systems conversely creating a ferry link to the area may yield some desirable financial attractiveness In any case I would be curious to see the noise impact diagram showing the noise level db line configuration.
- What sort of business group working committees can be set up to explore niche business opportunities? Maybe this is well underway.
- While the use of asphalt roads will be with us for some decades to come – the reality is they deteriorate and dissolve into the drinking water supply. Most motorists never stop for a moment to think about the consequences of laying down a road. It likely won’t gain much traction as an idea but if pavers could be used throughout the Toronto Waterfront committee might win some awards in the future on this score alone.
- Some sort of bicycle storage lockers might be desirable that the public can get access to. A number of users would like to use the area recreationally if they could leave their bicycles in some convenient lockup area that is protected from the elements. This could be introduced early in the process to create a revenue stream. A full blown public storage facility is not necessary to meet this demand. Just a dedicated facility for bicycles.
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Public Presentation, Discussion, and Open House Presentation

May 9, 2009
Presentation Overview

1. Where We Were
2. Conceptual Design
   - How Water Moves
   - How Sediment is Managed
   - How Habitat is Created
   - How Existing Contaminants are Managed
3. Next Steps

Project Goal

To establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

Project Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate mouth of the Don River
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Manage sediment, debris and ice
4. Integrate infrastructure
5. Encourage recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and accessibility
6. Contribute to revitalization and sustainability of waterfront
7. Design and implement this project in a sustainable manner
Study Area

- Don Narrows
- Don Mouth

Conclusion of Step 4

- 4WS preferred alternative subject to studies on:
  - Hydrology/Sediment Management
  - Management of Contaminated Soils and Groundwater
  - Risk Analysis of Shipping Lane

River Characteristics - (Flow Rate)

- Graph showing flood frequency and flow rate relationship.
Creating the Valley Feature

- Shape of valley and river channel serves three purposes:
  1. Convey Regulatory Flood
  2. Provide aquatic, wetland, & upland habitat
  3. Public use and recreation
- Armouring of valley and river channel required to stabilize slopes and ensure long-term sustainability of wetlands

Creating the Valley Feature

1. Excavate to depth of valley
2. Fill adjacent lands

Where Does the Flow Go?

Flood Protection Measures
Conveying the Regulatory Flood

Existing Conditions and Conceptual Design

Sediment and Debris Management
**Existing Approach to Sediment Management**

- Sediment currently managed within Keating Channel
- Clamshell dredge removes up to 40,000 m³ per year
- Barge with dredgeate is towed to Tommy Thompson Park for disposal

**Sediment Management Assumptions**

- Dredging required to maintain hydraulic conveyance channel and ecological stability navigation
- Sediment trap north of Lake Shore Blvd. will collect majority of bedload (sand)
- Suspended sediment (silt and clay) will continue downstream as presently occurs

**Hydraulic Dredge Examples**

**Sediment Management Area**

- Sediment Trap
- Sediment/Debris Management Area
- Debris Booms
- Barge Dock
- Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance Pipe
- Accommodation for Access Shaft
Naturalization Design from 4WS

Naturalizations Assumptions

- Design to provide mix of aquatic, wetland, and upland communities
- Wetlands fed primarily by lake, not river
- A range of wetland access controls will be considered to reduce the presence of invasive species
- Vegetation communities expected to be highly disturbed following very large flood events

Valley Channel Creation
**Terrestrial Habitat – Open Space**
Park Land, Upland Forest, 
Approx. 17.5 ha

**Terrestrial Habitat – Valley Slope Transitions**
Upland Forest, Treed Swamp 
Approx. 2.5 ha

**Wetland Habitat – Levee System**
Thicket Swamp, Meadow Marsh 
Approx. 4.3 ha

**Wetland Habitat – Lake Connected Wetlands**
Emergent Marsh Submergent Marsh Meadow Marsh 
Approx. 8.3 ha
Wetland Habitat – Seepage Wetlands

Treed Swamp, Thicket Swamp, Meadow Marsh
Approx. 1.3 ha

Aquatic Habitat

Approx. 18.2 ha + Don Narrows

Landscape Communities

- Open Space
- Valley Slope Transitions
- Levee System
- Lake Connected Wetlands
- Seepage Wetlands
- Aquatic

Fish Habitat Restoration
**Don Narrows Naturalization**

**Greenway Connection**

**Management of Contaminated Soils**

- Geotechnical and geo-environmental data collected in 2009 to fill gaps
- Data will be used as part of risk assessment / risk management for entire Lower Don Lands
Contaminant Management in Valley Feature

1. Excavate to depth of valley
2. Over-excavate to remove contaminated soils
3. Backfill with clean material
4. Install armouring

Navigation Risk Assessment

Shipping Lane Consideration

- Promontories do not significantly impact maneuverability within Inner Harbour
- Aids to navigation are likely to be required
- Sediment / debris should be managed upstream to minimize navigation impacts
- Modified currents do not pose an increased risk to navigation interests

Integration with Lower Don Lands
EA will set clearance requirements for proposed bridges based on hydraulics and sediment management.

Minimize disturbance to natural system by:
- Minimizing number of infrastructure crossings
- Eliminating risk associated with open cut activities

Fall 2009 Public Meeting to present:
- Assessment of construction and operation-related impacts
- Development of mitigation measures to address impacts
- Refinement of conceptual design
Adaptive Management

Consider how to deal with:
- Climate change
- Operational issues
- “Natural” changes in vegetation communities

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining Tasks</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Provincial / Federal EAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA Approval Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design and Other Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline:
- Construction Start: 2011
- Detailed Design and Other Approvals: 2010
- Public Meeting #4: 2009

Timeline:
- Detailed Impact Assessment: 2012
- EA Approval Process: 2011
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Public Presentation, Discussion, and Open House Display Panels

May 9, 2009
Sediment and Debris Management Overview

1. Sediment/Debris Management Area
2. Slurry Hard Pipe
3. Ship Channel Dewatering Facility
4. Slurry Transport to Leslie Street Spit
5. Ice Management Area

Note: the Ship Channel dewatering facility and hydraulic dredge located in area 1 will be transportable in the event of excessive sediment accumulation over time in the Keating Channel and/or new mouth of the Don.

Regulatory Flood Model: Preferred Alternative

Landscape Communities

- Open Space
- Riparian Forest
- Thicket Swamp, Meadow Marsh
- Emergent Marsh, Subemergent Marsh, Meadow Marsh
- Tread Swamp, Thicket Swamp, Meadow Marsh
- Aquatic
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Public Forum #5
Notice of Public Forum

January 27, 2010
A concept has been developed to transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more naturalized river outlet to the lake, while, removing the risk of flooding to urban land to the east and south of the river.

Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) is undertaking an Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project on behalf of Waterfront Toronto.

Get involved in the future of the Don River at the final public meeting:

**Wednesday, January 27, 2010**
6 pm – Open House
6:30 pm – Presentation & Discussion

**Toronto Fire Academy - 895 Eastern Avenue**
Accessible by TTC, 501 Queen St. streetcar to Greenwood Ave. stop - walk west to Knox Ave.
and then 3 blocks south to Eastern Ave.

For more information, contact Jinho Lee at Toronto and Region Conservation at 416-661-6600 ext. 5280 or e-mail at jlee@trca.on.ca
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre

Meeting Notes

January 27, 2010
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Thursday, January 27, 2010

Toronto Fire Academy
895 Eastern Avenue, Toronto

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

SUMMARY NOTES

The purpose of the Public Information Centre was to:

- Provide an overview of Waterfront Toronto’s Lower Don Lands area to provide the context for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA);
- Provide an update on the DMNP EA;
- Remind the public how this project started back in 1989, where we are now, and what more needs to be done to see the project proceed;
- Identify the project benefits as it relates to the original Goal Statement developed during the Terms of Reference Stage;
- Present the idealized Construction Phasing Strategy;
- Summarize the potential effects that will occur during construction and their mitigation strategies;
- Introduce the monitoring and adaptive management program; and
- Identify “next steps”.

70 people signed in at the meeting, and the following points summarize the feedback received:

- The general response from the public was positive, and many indicated their support and enthusiasm towards DMNP project. Numerous comments focused on the need for community engagement and city councillors for this project to get funded. Discussion about developing a community lobby group was made.
- Participants had a number of questions for members on the project team during the Public Information Centre, ranging from the functionality of weirs and the greenway, to the water contaminant concerns for the Keating Channel and the possibility of facilitating a natural curling ice for community events.
- There was a suggestion to include funding estimates on life-cycle costing principles including adaptive management in the Environmental Assessment report.

Please refer to remainder of this report for more detailed notes.
1.0  **Public Information Centre**

The Open House portion of this event began at 6:00 p.m. Members of the public were invited to sign in and view display boards showing:

- Overview of the Lower Don Lands area;
- Benefits of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project;
- Overview of the Project Phasing Strategy;
- Summary of the project effects and mitigation strategies; and
- Next steps.

Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA), Waterfront Toronto (WT), AECOM and SENES staff members were on hand to answer questions throughout the event. All participants received the following information and were asked to fill out the Participant Workbook with comments on the materials presented at the meeting as they signed in:

- Meeting agenda and Participant Workbook
- Don Mouth Naturalization and Portlands Flood Protection Project Newsletter Volume #8, January 2010.

All of the meeting materials listed above are available on the TRCA website at:

Display boards and laptops were also available during the Public Information Centre to depict the Regulatory Flood Modelling output for the existing conditions and Concept Design.

Copies of the Poster boards are found in **Appendix A**. A copy of the presentations are available in **Appendix B**. A synopsis of public comments submitted as part of the Workbooks is available in **Appendix C**.

2.0  **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator, Swerhun Consulting, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. She stated that this Public Information Centre (PIC) is the final PIC for public comment on the DMNP EA prior to submission for Ministry of the Environment (MOE) review. The PIC would start with an overview summary of Waterfront Toronto’s Lower Don Lands to set the context for the DMNP EA. The second presentation would then focus on providing an update for the DMNP EA, including a summary of benefits, phasing strategy, construction effects and their mitigation, the monitoring and adaptive management program, and next steps.

Nicole went over the contents within the Participant Workbook and invited the participants to fill out the forms and provide thoughts and comments.

3.0  **Lower Don Lands Presentation: Waterfront Toronto**

Chris Glaisek, Vice President Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto, identified that the Lower Don Lands design focuses on a sustainable planning strategy that creates a balance between the urban form and the naturalized Don River. The fundamental elements of the Lower Don Lands design are to relocate the mouth of the river to the heart of the new River Precinct; retain the Keating Channel to
both celebrate its industrial heritage and create a new urban public realm as part of the Keating Precinct; and to intensify the community and business development in the area.

Key sustainability components were highlighted for the Lower Don Lands design. These included:

- Greenroof stormwater harvesting to be used to irrigate street trees, provide circulation to the Keating Channel and possibly support seepage wetlands in the naturalized areas;
- Carbon neutral neighbourhoods;
- Daylight penetration to be maximized within the precincts and natural areas;
- Convenient transit system layouts;
- Effective trail network for multi-users; and
- A mixture of passive and active recreation.

Chris indicated that this project is necessary for the city, not only for the naturalization and enhancement of the Don Mouth, but also to provide flood protection for approximately 1,000 homes and businesses currently at risk of flooding within the Port Lands, Leslieville and South Riverdale areas, and allows for the proposed redevelopment in the Lower Don Lands to proceed.

4.0 Final results of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA Presentation: Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA)

Paul Murray, Vice President, AECOM Canada Limited, on behalf of the DMNP EA team, presented a summary of the planning process to date (since 1991), the Project Benefits, Construction Phasing Strategy and Effects, the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan, and Next Steps for the DMNP EA (Appendix B).

Paul started by reminding the audience that the first concept for a naturalized mouth of the Don, was suggested by the Task Force to Bring Back the Don in 1991. A revised vision for a naturalized Don Mouth was later presented in “Unlocking the Port Lands” in 1999. These grassroots planning initiatives resulted in a naturalized Don Mouth being incorporated in Toronto’s Central Waterfront Secondary Plan in 2001. Once recognized in the City of Toronto’s Official Plan, TRCA was identified by Waterfront Toronto to undertake the DMNP EA in late 2004. TRCA’s Terms of Reference for the DMNP EA was approved by the Province in 2006. In 2007, Waterfront Toronto undertook a design process to revisit how the built form and natural areas are integrated for the entire Lower Don Lands area. The winning vision of the design competition was incorporated into the DMNP EA as one of several alternatives to be considered in 2007, which ultimately led to the development of the preferred alternative as presented to the public in 2009.

Paul then identified the project benefits offered by the Concept Design that specifically met the three main elements of the project goal:

1. Flood protection to the Regulatory Flood level;
2. The creation of high quality habitat; and
3. A high level integration between the river and urban environment.

Computer generated hydraulic models indicated that the concept eliminated the risk of flooding from the Don River to over 200 hectares of land which included hundreds of households, commercial businesses and industrial sites that are currently at risk from flooding.
It was also shown that over 13 hectares of high quality of wetlands, 12 hectares of high quality aquatic habitat, and 12 hectares of terrestrial habitat and open space will be created through this project; recreational boat uses in the area will be enhanced; and the trail systems will not only be maintained but enhanced.

Due to the large scale of the project, the construction will occur in phases (See Appendix B):

- Phase 1: Promontory
- Phase 2: Ship Channel Wetland (Reach 3a)
- Phase 3: Creation of the Mouth (Reach 4 and South Promontory)
- Phase 4: Reach 3 & 2
- Phase 5: Reach 1
- Phase 6: Reach 2a

Once constructed, this project offers huge benefits for the City of Toronto. However, like all construction projects, there are some potential negative impacts that need to be identified and managed.

- Existing low quality aquatic habitat will be lost due to lakefill into the Inner Harbour as part of the construction of the promontories. The loss of this poor quality habitat will be more than compensated for by the construction of the extensive high quality wetland and aquatic habitat proposed by the DMNP project;
- Shipping use of 2,700 m of dock walls will be lost due to lake filling and changes in land use. These losses will be offset by the creation of several thousand more linear metres of shoreline being made available for small recreation vessels by the DMNP EA, and through ongoing discussion between Waterfront Toronto and the Port Authority.
- Removal of two heritage buildings – The Marine Terminal Building at Polson Quay and an old maintenance shack on the Keating Channel will either be relocated or commemorated. The design avoided all other heritage structures in the area which will be incorporated as part of the urban form through the Lower Don Lands Precinct Planning process.
- Disruption or relocation of two private land owners – Lafarge and Unilever will either be relocated or compensated. A private grocery store on public lands will also need to be relocated as part of the Precinct Planning activities. All other private landowners in the Lower Don Lands area can be accommodated in the area.
- Management of soil and ground water from construction will adhere to Waterfront Toronto’s soils and groundwater strategy.
- Disruptions to traffic and servicing may occur during construction. These impacts will be mitigated by providing alternative access routes and maintaining existing servicing while construction is underway.
- Cost of construction: this will be an expensive project to implement (hundreds of millions of dollars). However, to unlock the billions of dollars of potential investment to the Lower Don Lands and Port Lands area, this work must be undertaken.

To accommodate changes in environment, regulations and uncertainty, a robust monitoring and adaptive management program is being incorporated into the EA approvals to ensure that the EA remains valid over time, to ensure that the design continues to meet the project objectives, and to ensure that the project functions as desired once completed.

Paul identified the next steps of the DMNP EA is to:

1. Receive City Council approval of the draft DMNP EA;
2. Release the draft EA to stakeholders and the public for review and comment prior to submission to the Ministry of the Environment
3. Submit the DMNP EA to the province for approval in summer 2010, and the CEAA Screening to the federal government for approval in fall 2010
4. Receive approvals of the submitted EAs in Spring 2011 (if all proceeds according to expectations); and
5. Initiate detailed design once funding is made available to proceed. Once funding is available, it is anticipated that the construction will take approximately 10 years to complete.

5.0 Feedback on the Presentation

Questions and comments are noted below in italics, followed by response from the project team.

C:  
I really believe that this project will be successful in getting funding and proceeding into the next stage. But we need to keep the focus on enhancing nature, natural process and enhancing the ecosystem a priority, and not lose it to the development of roads and structures. I believe that keeping this as a priority will assist in getting the public support, the councillors support and generate funding for this project. We, as the public, need to approach councillors and illustrate our interest in this project.

Q1. It was not a good idea to have a design competition for this project, it should have been done through a negotiated process where ideas and comments discussed in the previous meeting be applied; if this were so, the plan would have more green space and less development. I have concerns regarding the development: Triangular area near Filmport should act as wetland and greenspace, the height of the buildings needs to be reduced, the Keating Channel should incorporate some form of naturalization and the developments in the area should not have court yard type of space that are only visually pleasing.

The design competition provided tremendous vision of what this area can be. Without the design competition, we would have only worked on the basic concepts of naturalizing the river and the flood protection; we would not have focus on the development of the lands that hold such economic opportunity. There are natural enhancements being proposed to the Keating Channel for improved aquatic habitat and over 20 acres of public space that ties to other amenities (Distillery, Abercrombie Park, St. Lawrence market and the Don River).

C2. This plan far exceeds anything I’ve seen, and I am very pleased and in support of it. The people within the neighbourhood will have access to the river, the bay as well as the lake; but I would like to see more bridges and easier access to the new area. It would be great to have a pond that would freeze in winter so we can have curling matches.

C3. It has been a huge privilege to be a part of this project and to see this project evolve to this “gift to the city” very fulfilling. There were many issues and problems identified in previous meetings, but it seems that they all have been addressed and I would like to thank the efforts of the staff involved in this project. A large portion of the presentation focused on the environmental aspects, but I think will be great to identify the lifestyle and leisure enhancements this project will bring. Let’s be more passionate and celebrate this project.

Q2. As a resident in the area, I feel that the design demonstrates a “corporate feel” and not enough community elements. I don’t want this area to be like downtown Toronto where the weekdays
are packed with cars while weekends become ghost towns. What kind of corporate and residential uses were you thinking in the design process?

The fundamental principle is the amount of density as illustrated by the City of Toronto Secondary Plan. This is predominantly thought of as a residential community, and not a corporate business park. There have been efforts to create a more community-like feel to the area by incorporating sidewalks and more lighting on the sidewalks and buildings.

A factor that creates a lively neighbourhood is having people living and working in the same area at all times of day and week. The challenge in doing this is not developing residential buildings but getting the employment in the area; to accommodate this, the plan demonstrates a mixed land use that promotes residential housing and employment within the area.

Q3. Can you explain more in detail the daylight and shadowing elements of the plan? Illustrations from tonight and what I’ve seen previously are different.

Sun penetration into the plan was taken very seriously in our designs. To accommodate this, taller buildings will be strategically located to provide maximum sunlight to ground levels with a minimum of 5 hours of sunlight per day during critical year and minimum 7 hours along the public spaces.

Q4. Is the lake water quality better than the river water quality? Can you explain the purposes of weirs?

Currently, the lake water is better quality than the river. The enhancement of river water quality will be based strongly upon its water management systems and treatment facilities upstream. However, the weirs do not influence the quality of water; they are placed to separate the river flow from the Keating Channel. We recognize that it is important to have a steady flow of water in the Keating Channel to provide aeration and healthy habitat.

Q5. There were talks about the Ship Channel Wetland being a recreational land. Please elaborate on the decision making process.

A public workshop was held to discuss the “greenway”. The overall opinions from those engaged in this process were that the greenway should not be for active recreation, but for habitat creation. There are numerous recreational areas imposed in the plan elsewhere.

Q6. What is the standpoint on the Toronto Port Authority? Are they supportive of this plan? Do they have issues?

Toronto Port Authority (TPA) is a significant stakeholder in this project and has been consulted diligently by Waterfront Toronto and the TRCA. If you’d like to know their opinion, you would have to wait for their response and comments on the EA. Previously, TPA raised an issue regarding the promontory and its potential risk of navigation of their boats. A navigation risk assessment was considered to ensure this project does not impact the boat movements in the inner harbour.

Q7. Is there possibility of raising private funding through elements such as naming rights of the river?

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
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There were talks about naming rights and raising revenue for the ongoing capital and maintenance of parks. It is something that the City is looking into, but no definitive decision has been made as of yet. However, looking for private funding is an option being considered.

C4.  I think the construction staging is very well laid out. The development of the wetland first hand will create awareness and public support for the project.

C5.  I’d like to congratulate the team for coming this far into the project and hope that this project will move forward. Can you clarify how residents using the public transit would get to downtown? It makes sense to me that the Light Rail Transit needs to be available during the construction phase in the area.

C8.  I’m very glad that there is a definite wetland and aquatic habitat associated with the plan and you are to be congratulated on that. I think it would be wonderful to create and allow access for boats, vessels and yachts to enter the Keating Channel.

Q8.  What process was undertaken in removing or relocating privately owned heritage buildings? What kind of outreach has been done?

We have a list of heritage buildings in the study area and have worked closely with Heritage Toronto regarding their involvement in the project. The private owners of these heritage facilities were consulted through numerous meetings and were updated on the scheduling, process and how they will be affected by this project.

C9.  We need to gain public engagement on this project and address our interests to the city councillors. Messaging such as: “Many rivers embedded within cities are in poor condition, this project could put Toronto as a leader in river restoration” and creating local community groups to create awareness is an important factor for this project to receive funding.

C10.  Although the design of the river mouth imitates a natural form, it is a man made structure. Are there any other projects around the world that have done similar to this that so that we can confidently say, this will work?

Detailed surveys have been conducted on other river mouths in effort to mimic the function of other coastal wetland. The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of the integration between ecology and channel form; how they are influenced by watershed discharges; and the relationship between ecology, hydrology and general shape of the mouth. There were considerable efforts to apply findings that best imitate a real natural river mouth. This process is closely watched by a group called “Aquatic Habitat Toronto”, which includes members from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), and TRCA ecologists and other consultants sponsored by Waterfront Toronto. The data retrieved by the surveys of natural river mouths are being applied to other smaller projects to test its dependability.

C11.  Citizenship participation and communication is a very important factor. There are community groups such as the Don Watershed Regeneration Council, Task Force to Bring Back the Don, and West Donlands Committee who are very active. There is also a Facebook group “Rise of the New Don” that is an opportunity for people to gain more access to this project and provide comments and feedback.
6.0 Closing Remarks

Adele Freeman thanked and congratulated the public, staffs and consultants that contributed to this project. She indicated that the individuals who are interested in providing feedback and comments can request a copy of the DMNP EA report.
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Benefits of the Project

- River System Conveys Flooding
  - Permanent removal of over 200 ha of land from flooding
  - Facilitates redevelopment of Lower Don Lands
  - Protection of life, and for existing uses, and property

- Creation of High Quality Habitat
  - Wetland = 13 hectares
  - Terrestrial = 21 hectares (including open space)
  - Aquatic Habitat = 12 hectares plus Don Narrows
  - Supports greater diversity of species than existing conditions

- Provides Recreational Opportunities
  - Diverse range of open space uses, which are expected to attract users from broader GTA
  - Improved amenity for small-craft boating
  - Enhanced multi-use trails (including Don and Martin Goodman)

- Aligned with Adjacent Development
  - Bridge crossings designed to convey Regulatory Flood and allow for passage of emergency response crafts
  - Utility crossings designed to minimize existing and future impacts on naturalized valley system

Benefits of the Project

- Management of Soil and Groundwater
  - No significant sources of hazardous material have been found
  - Management undertaken as part of Waterfront Toronto’s soils and groundwater management strategy
  - Will either treat soil at nearby facility or dispose off-site
  - Effects from handling soils will be minimized
  - Will allow for redevelopment of brownfield

- Management of River Operations
  - Sediment Management will ensure flood protection, maintain viability of vegetation communities, protect for navigation and extend the life expectancy of Tommy Thompson Park containment cell
  - Debris Management will benefit safe navigation and ensure flood protection
  - Control of Flows will manage against ice jams and protect naturalized system during large flood events

- Economic Spinoffs associated with:
  - Removal of flood risk and subsequent redevelopment, which will:
    - Increase property values
    - Encourage investment
    - Increase City’s tax base
    - Construction, which will create and sustain direct and indirect jobs

- Economic benefits of mixed-use redevelopment and protection against financial loss from flooding

Effects of Construction & Mitigation

- Loss of 8 hectares of low quality aquatic habitat
  - Create high quality aquatic habitat within new river channel and associated wetlands

- Removal of 2,700 metres of dockwall
  - Address loss of dockwall with Toronto Port Authority
  - Create opportunities for recreational watercraft

- Removal of 2 heritage buildings
  - Relocate or otherwise commemorate

- Displacement / disruption of 3 private land owners
  - Relocate and/or compensate private land owners

- Management of soil and groundwater
  - Treat at proposed soil management facility or dispose off-site
  - Construct valley while physically separated from lake / river

- Traffic (road, rail, and trail) disruption
  - Provide alternate access during construction

- Servicing disruption
  - Maintain existing servicing until new connections can be provided

- Cost of construction
  - Economic benefits of mixed-use redevelopment and protection against financial loss from flooding
Project Phasing

River Reaches

Step 1
- Creation of Promontory north of River Mouth

Step 2
- Excavation of Ship Channel Wetland (Reach 3a)

Step 3
- Lakefilling of Southern Promontory
- Excavation and Grading of River Mouth (Reach 4)

Step 4
- Construction of Remainder of Floodplain (Reaches 2 and 3)

Step 5
- Construction of Sediment and Debris Management Area
- Establishment of Flood Protection Features

Step 6
- Keating Channel (Reach 2a)

Project Phasing continued

Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto staff report</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EA report review</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Provincial EA report (public review through MOE process)</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Federal EA report</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA approval (anticipated)</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction</td>
<td>Timing subject to funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final Results of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Public Meeting
January 27, 2010

Agenda

1. Lower Don Lands Context
2. Background to the Don Mouth EA
3. Benefits of the Project
4. Project Phasing and Construction-related Effects
5. Monitoring and Adaptive Management
6. Next Steps

Lower Don Lands
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Coordination of Current Projects

Planning Process Recap/Update

Overview
Background to the Don Mouth EA

What Does the Study Area Currently Look Like?
1999 – Task Force to Bring Back the Don

1999 – Unlocking the Portlands

Central Waterfront Secondary Plan

2001
- Starting point for EA
- Identified need to redevelop brownfield sites for natural, recreational, and mixed-use purposes

Approved Terms of Reference for Don Mouth EA

2006
- 2 discharge points and 4 alternatives considered
- Focused primarily on flooding and naturalization

Design Competition

2007
- Integrating mixed use community with naturalization and recreation

Conceptual Design

2009

Naturalization of Don Narrows

2009
How Does this Design Fulfill the Project Goals?

- Protects Lower Don Lands and adjacent areas from flooding
- Creates high-quality habitat for aquatic and terrestrial species
- Integrates a naturalized valley system and a mixed use community

Benefits of the Project

- River system conveys flooding
  - Future river valley
  - Permanent removal of over 200 ha of land from flooding
  - Facilitates redevelopment of Lower Don Lands
  - Protection of life, existing uses, and property

Creation of high quality habitat

- Wetland = 13 hectares
- Aquatic = 12 hectares
- Terrestrial = 21 hectares (including open space for active and passive recreation)

- Will support greater diversity of species than existing conditions

Provides recreational opportunities

- Open space uses
- Small-craft boating
- Multi-use trails (including Don and Martin Goodman)

Aligned with adjacent development

- Bridge crossings designed to convey Regulatory Flood
- Utility crossings designed to minimize existing and future impacts on naturalized valley system
Management of soil and groundwater

- No significant sources of hazardous material have been found
- Management undertaken as part of Waterfront Toronto’s soils and groundwater management strategy
- Will either treat soil at nearby facility or dispose off-site
- Effects from handling soils will be minimized
- Will allow for redevelopment of brownfield site

Management of river operations

- Sediment management will:
  - ensure flood protection
  - maintain viability of vegetation communities
  - protect for navigation
  - extend life expectancy of Tommy Thompson Park containment cell
- Debris management will:
  - benefit safe navigation
  - ensure flood protection
- Control of flows will:
  - manage against ice jams
  - protect naturalized system from damage during large flood events

Economic spinoffs

- Removal of flood risk and subsequent redevelopment will:
  - Increase property values
  - Encourage investment
  - Increase City’s tax base
- Construction will create and sustain direct and indirect jobs

Project Phasing

Step 1
Promontory

Step 2
Excavation of Ship Channel Wetland (Reach 3a)
Step 3
Lakefilling of Southern Promontory
Excavation and Grading of River Mouth (Reach 4)

Step 4
Construction of Remainder of Floodplain (Reaches 2 and 3)

Step 5
Construction of Sediment and Debris Management Area
Establishment of Flood Protection Features

Step 6
Keating Channel (Reach 2a)

Construction-Related Effects and Mitigation

Loss of 8 hectares of low quality aquatic habitat
Create high quality aquatic habitat within new river channel and associated wetlands

Removal of 2,700 metres of dockwall
Address loss of dockwall with Toronto Port Authority (TPA)
Create new shoreline for recreational watercraft

Removal of 2 heritage buildings (avoiding others)
Relocate or otherwise commemorate Marine Terminal and Atlas Crane, and TPA maintenance shed

Displacement / disruption of 3 private landowners (avoiding others)
Locate similar development in existing marsh

Management of soil and groundwater
GWT’s Soils and Groundwater Management Conformance with OMAA regulations

Traffic (road, rail, and trail) disruption
Provide alternate access during construction

Servicing disruption
Maintain existing servicing until new connections can be made

Cost of construction
Economic benefits of mixed-use redevelopment and protection against financial loss from flooding
Monitoring and Adaptive Management

• Collect information to confirm whether changes are happening
  – Are the pre-construction conditions changing?
  – Do the detailed design and construction activities reflect what was described in the EA?
  – Does the future river perform as anticipated?

What is Adaptive Management?

• Process to understand changing conditions and respond accordingly
  – Climate change
  – Invasive species
  – Lake level fluctuations
  – Change in regulations
• Necessary to ensure that river functions as designed

Next Steps

Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto staff report</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EA report review</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Provincial EA report (public review through MOE process)</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Federal EA report</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA approval (anticipated)</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction</td>
<td>Timing subject to funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. What are your thoughts or comments, if any, on the impact assessment (particularly the benefits and effects)?

- I’m very pleased with the final outcome, and I am looking forward to seeing the project completed. I like the balance/mix of land uses.
- I really like the fact that the project creates flood protection, enhances recreational opportunities, increases housing, creates habitat and redevelops brownfields.
- Anticipated changes in river water quality, as documented on “WWFMP or as defined in Don and Central Waterfront Project” should be incorporated in the EA report.
- Don and Central Waterfront CSO project has defined to this project.
- The potential need for satellite treatment site at the mouth of the Don.
- Discussions between projects focused on a site adjoining the sediment plunge pool, where the land site for a “works yard access” would be located. The Don and Central Waterfront no longer needs this site for treatment, but needs it for 2 – 3 vertical storage shafts as part of the shaft-funnel storage system.

2. A number of adaptive management considerations were identified in the presentation. Are there any other issues that may affect the project in the future?

- I am glad an adaptive management process has been put into place.
- If there is an Olympic bid in the next 10 years the residential area could get a funding opportunity. In a similar way, the West Don Lands has benefited from the PanAm games.
- A major flood can reshape the naturalized river course.
- Please keep Toronto Police and Fire in the loop.
- Bridges over the waterway should be designed to provide access for emergency vessels (height above water).
- Water depth for the river and the Keating Channel.
- Application of Natural Channel System Guidance (MNR, 2003) for Adaptive Management needs more fulsome articulation to the River Mouth – particularly with respect to bed incision.
- Funding estimates, based on life-cycle costing principles including costs of adaptive management to ensure the integrity of the channel after major floods – should be identified in a ball park way and include the EA report (Implementation Considerations component).
- The aquatic balance using the HATT model, should be ballparked and inserted into the EA report, “Total Aquatic Area (Cost/Created)”
- Integration of natural access to the lake and river for communities near by.
- Water quality, sewer over flow, and run off pollution

3. What will be the key challenges to implementing the DMNP, and how can they be overcome? What role can the community play?

- It is important to get the EA approved so that the DMNP can become eligible for infrastructure funding.
- Create a community lobby group to have a coordinated voice.
- Balancing cuts and fills to internalize environmental costs and address local sustainability.
- What are the economic and other costs to the TPA for loss of docking space? These costs do not seem to be documented in the EA report.
Presentation mentioned relocation/compensation for 3 displayed businesses, including Unilever. Have they not ceased operation at their site? Hence, are there not only 2 operations to be compensated?

Access to the process and progress of the project paternalistic protectionism must give way to cooperative inclusion.

4. Do you have any other advice for TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?

- Make sure the Keating Channel water does not become stagnant by periodically flushing it.
- Form a committee of community reps to work with TRCA and Waterfront Toronto on political strategy and to form an effective lobby.
- Immediately write all Toronto, Federal and Municipal representatives to a thorough briefing on Keating Precinct and Lower Don.
- You assert that you will use debris to create habitat. Where will it be used? I doubt that you can insert it into the river bed or low flow bank due to probable erosion at high flow event.
- Your adaptation of the AGM chart from the NCS manual is not bad. Where you inserted the word “adapt” at the bottom of the circle, is, I’m not sure, consistent with the vision of the Guidance Document.
- Would linking this project together with the Don and Central Waterfront Water Quality Project provide a beneficial approach for getting Federal and Provincial funding for both projects and to delist the ACC?
- Remember to bring forward what natural and analogies. There may be a around the Great Lakes to validate the concept design. You can believe models all you want, but analogies provide additional evidence.
- Recreational seasonal access.
- Natural curling ice for community events. A venue for a grand match.
Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment – Public Meeting
July 24, 2013
MOVING FORWARD WITH PORT LANDS REVITALIZATION

Please join us to discuss two Environmental Assessment (EA) Projects: the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection and the Lower Don Lands Master Plan

Overview
Waterfront Toronto (WT), the City of Toronto, and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) are amending and finalizing the Individual EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). Concurrently, the 2010 Class EA Lower Don Lands Master Plan (LDL MP) is being finalized to reflect the amendments that arose out of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2012.

These two EAs represent key pieces in the revitalization of Toronto’s Port Lands. Their approval will enable the TRCA, the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto to move forward with the implementation of the flood protection and infrastructure works necessary to support the revitalization of the Port Lands and naturalization of the mouth of the Don River.

The DMNP EA
The mouth of the Don River is one of Toronto’s great unrealized assets and the centrepiece of major revitalization initiatives on the waterfront. A plan has been developed that will integrate this incredible asset into the ecological and urban fabric of Toronto. The Individual EA for the DMNP will provide the basis for transforming the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more naturalized river outlet to the lake, while at the same time, removing the risk of flooding to urban land to the east and south of the river. Once completed, the EA will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review and approval.

The LDL MP EA
The LDL MP EA is being carried out to reflect the amendments to the DMNP and will address all of the infrastructure needed to support the revitalization of the Lower Don Lands. The amended Master Plan will consider servicing (water, sanitary sewers and storm water management), streets and public transit in dedicated rights-of-way and will complete Phase 3 and 4 requirements of the Municipal Class EA for all Schedule C projects in the Lower Don Lands.

The Process
The proposed study areas for the EAs are shown on the map to the right. Key components of EAs include consultation with government agencies, Aboriginal communities and interested persons; consideration and evaluation of alternatives; and the management of potential environmental effects. Conducting an EA promotes good environmental planning before decisions are made about a proposal.

Get Involved
Your input into these important projects is critical. The Project Teams will be hosting a final public meeting for interested persons to participate in the EA planning process for both projects. We invite you to our public forum where you can learn more about updates to the projects, and share your thoughts on the refinements being considered. You will also be able to ask questions and speak directly with members of the project team, offer input and submit comments.

Public Meeting Details
Wednesday, July 24, 2013
Open House 6:00pm/Presentations 7:00pm
EMS Training Centre (Toronto Fire Academy)
895 Eastern Avenue

For DMNP information contact: Michael Charendoff, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority at mcharendoff@trca.on.ca /416-661-6600 Ext. 5280.
For information on the Lower Don Lands Master Plan EA please contact info@waterfronttoronto.ca.
Good afternoon,

As a past participant in public consultation activities related to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA), we wanted to keep you informed regarding project related activities and updates.

Waterfront Toronto (WT), the City of Toronto, and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) are amending and finalizing the Individual EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). Concurrently, the 2010 Class EA Lower Don Lands Master Plan (LDL MP) is being finalized to reflect the amendments that arose out of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2012.

Your input into these important projects is critical. The Project Teams will be hosting a final public meeting for interested persons to participate in the EA planning process for both projects. We invite you to our public forum where you can learn more about updates to the projects, and share your thoughts on the refinements being considered. You will also be able to ask questions and speak directly with members of the project team, offer input and submit comments. A copy of the notice being published in the Toronto Star on July 13, 2013 is attached.

Public Meeting Details
Wednesday, July 24, 2013
Open House 6:00pm/Presentations 7:00pm
EMS Training Centre (Toronto Fire Academy)
895 Eastern Avenue

For DMNP information contact: Michael Charendoff, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority at mcharendoff@trca.on.ca /416-661-6600 Ext. 5280. For information on the Lower Don Lands Master Plan EA please contact info@waterfrontToronto.ca.

Apologies for any cross posting.

Regards,

Alexis Wood, BSc, MES Project Manager, Highland Creek Watershed | Toronto and Region Conservation | Head Office - 5 Shoreham Dr. North York, ON M3N 1S4 | Mailing Address – 70 Canuck Avenue, Toronto, ON M3K 2C5 | email: awood@trca.on.ca |phone: 416 661-6600 ext 5243 |fax: 416-667-6278 | web: www.trca.on.ca

EA Toronto Star Ad - July 2013 Final 3.pdf

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*"
Good afternoon,

As a past participant in public consultation activities related to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA), we wanted to keep you informed regarding project related activities and updates.

Work is underway to amend the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA).

These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) in 2012.

A public meeting was held on July 24th, 2013 to provide an update on the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs and to seek feedback on the updated plans. The attached draft summary provides highlights of overall feedback, followed by participants’ questions of clarification and answers provided by project team members at the meeting. Should you have any comments and/or suggested edits to this draft summary, please forward them to Alex Heath (aheath@swerhun.com) no later than Wednesday, September 4th, 2013. Meeting material, including a project backgrounder, agenda, display boards, and presentation, are available for download on the project website at www.trca.on.ca/dmnpea

If you have any questions regarding the status of the DMNP EA, or wish to be removed from the DMNP EA distribution list, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Alexis Wood, BSc, MES
Project Manager, Highland Creek Watershed | Toronto and Region Conservation | Head Office - 5 Shoreham Dr. North York, ON M3N 1S4 | Mailing Address – 70 Canuck Avenue, Toronto, ON M3K 2C5 | email: awood@trca.on.ca | phone: 416 661-6600 ext 5243 | fax: 416-667-6278 | web: www.trca.on.ca

**PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE**

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system. Thank you."
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

&

Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study

Public Meeting
July 24, 2013
Project Study Areas

Need for Flood Protection
Permanent Removal of Flood Risk from 240 ha of Land

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) Study Area

Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment (LDL MP EA) Study Area
**Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2013 Phasing**

**Phase 1**
- Flood Protection
  - Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
  - Construct new Keating Channel bridge
  - Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments

- Development
  - Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
  - Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
  - Fill Essroc Quay

**Phase 2**
- Flood Protection
  - Construct Greenway
  - Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
  - Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
  - Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
  - Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore Boulevard bridge

- Development
  - Development to Munitions Block
  - Film Studio District and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected

**Phase 3**
- Flood Protection
  - Construct Polson Slip bridge
  - Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs

- Development
  - River Valley Precincts
  - Construct Basin Street bridge
  - Raise and fill north and south of river valley

**Phase 4**
- Flood Protection
  - None required

- Development
  - Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall

*Public Meeting | July 24, 2013*
DMNP: Progression of the EA

Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, 2003
Approved EA Terms of Reference, 2006
Lower Don Lands Design Competition, 2007
DMNP EA Conceptual Design, 2010
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), 2012
DMNP EA Amendment, 2013


Terms of Reference EA Process EA Submission EA Paused PLAI EA Amendment
DMNP: Amended Preferred Alternative

- Realignment of the Greenway
- Removal of Inner Harbour Promontories
- Phased Implementation of Flood Protection
- Accommodation of Lafarge During Phasing
- Rationalizing Developable Land and Naturalization
DMNP: Fulfilling the Project Goals

**Flood Protection**
Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land

**Naturalization**
Aquatic Habitat: 14 Hectares
Naturalization (Terrestrial / Wetland): 16 Hectares

**Revitalized City Environment**
Phased flood protection allows development to proceed in step with completion of the new river valley
## DMNP: Overview of the Effects and Mitigation

### Flood Protection
- Phased construction of river will progressively remove lands from flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere
- Permanent removal of 240 ha of land from flooding

### Naturalization
- Creation of 14 ha of high quality aquatic habitat
- Creation of 16 ha of naturalized habitat (wetland/terrestrial) which is expected to attract locally significant species

### Recreational and Cultural Opportunities
- New river mouth provides greater recreational opportunities than the existing river (e.g., boating, trails, enjoyment of naturalized landscapes)
- Heritage resources within the footprint of the river valley system will be conserved, relocated, raised, or commemorated

### Operational Management and Constructability
- Flood protection minimizes throwaway costs between phases
- Sediment management uses existing infrastructure where possible and allows for the use of dredge during lakefilling
- Design and phasing limits impacts to existing operations and shipping

### Planned Land Use
- Nuisance effects on existing/future residents and businesses (e.g., noise, dust, and traffic) due to construction will be mitigated

### Sustainability (Soil Mgmt.)
- Excavated soil will be treated and reused on-site where appropriate
- Remaining soils that must be transported off-site will have minimal effects on traffic, air quality, and noise
Next Steps: Project Schedule

**DMNP EA**
- Public Meetings
- Incorporate Feedback
- Draft Report (Circulated for Review)
- Final Report

**LDL EA MP**
- Public Meetings
- Incorporate Feedback
- Draft Report (Circulated for Review)
- Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Iterative Study**
- **Revisions**
- **Early Fall Circulation**
- **Late Fall Submission**
- **Tentative Approval**

Public Meeting | July 24, 2013
Cross Sections: Flood Protection and Greenway

Illustrative Cross Section of Don Roadway Flood Protection Landform North of Lake Shore

Illustrative Cross Section of Don Roadway Valley Wall Feature South of Lake Shore

Enlargement Plan and Section of Greenway North of Commissioners

Enlargement Plan and Section of Greenway South of Commissioners

Public Meeting | July 24, 2013
Work is underway to revise the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) in 2012.

A public meeting was held on July 24th, 2013 to provide an update on the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs and to seek feedback on the updated plans (for further details, see Attachment 1: Agenda). The meeting was attended by 125 participants.

The summary below provides highlights of overall feedback, followed by participants’ questions of clarification and answers provided by project team members at the meeting. This summary was subject to participant review prior to being finalized.

OVERALL FEEDBACK

Participants generally supported the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs. There were a few participants who identified concerns with and offered suggested refinements to the proposed changes in their comments during the facilitated discussion at the meeting, and through written comments that were submitted after the meeting, up to August 8th (see Attachment 2: Worksheet Feedback and Attachment 3: Additional Submissions). These concerns and suggestions are as follows:

- In written comments, a few participants expressed concern about the configuration of development blocks, including: that it will lead to denser development; that it negatively affects the configuration of green space (i.e. that green space is separated from city blocks by a road rather than immediately next to these blocks); and that it looks duller than what was last proposed in 2010.

- One participant during the plenary discussion and a few additional participants through written comments expressed concern about the placement of the dedicated streetcar right-of-way (ROW) on one side rather than in the middle of the road on Commissioners Street and Cherry Street. It was felt that this would create conflicts with other forms of transportation and would make it more difficult to provide for future transit connections.

- Suggested refinements included:
  - Adding a pedestrian bridge across the river between the Commissioner Street and Basin Street Bridges to help increase connectivity between districts on either side of the Greenway.
  - Consider iconic and/or commemorative designs for the new bridges.
  - Provide measures (e.g. certain types of vegetation) to help protect wildlife that is being encouraged to come into the area from vehicular traffic on the roads that will now run adjacent to habitat areas in the Greenway and river mouth.
  - Rather than trying to design an iconic bridge or civic building begin, by consider the Greenway and or the River Mouth as icons themselves.
  - Consider negotiating a land swap in the future between the City and Lafarge to help the relocate their existing plant.
  - Promote stunning architecture in the Port Lands through design competitions. This could produce the same level of creativity in built form as has been done with the landscape
  - Consider higher development charges to reduce the total amount of development required to help fund infrastructure and flood protection.
QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION

The following are the questions of clarification that were asked during the public meeting. They have been grouped into ten categories: Upstream Flooding, Flood Modelling, Greenway, Bridges and Roads, Soil Remediation, Funding/Financing, Gardiner EA, Existing Uses, Catalyst Uses, and Precinct Planning. Responses that were provided to these questions of clarification at the meeting are noted in *italics*.

**UPSTREAM FLOODING**

There is a bike path in the Don Valley that people use to commute to school and work and this path occasionally floods. Is anything being done to prevent flooding in the Don Valley upstream as far as Taylor Creek?

*The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) has looked at what could be done and because of the way the river reacts to rainfall and the position of the pathways, there’s very little that can be done to reduce flooding there, short of raising the pathways significantly. Flooding where the pathways are will not be made worse as a result of DMNP EA flood protection measures.*

Will flood protection measures around the mouth of the Don River prevent the flooding of the Don Valley Parkway (DVP)?

*The DVP was built within the flood plain of the Don River with the knowledge that part of it would flood occasionally. It is a challenge to remove it from the flood plain as it would require raising the ground level of the DVP (which would require raising the height of bridges that cross the DVP to maintain clearance) or building a dike. Building a dike would require closing portions of the DVP for 6 – 8 months, and this has been viewed as having a significantly greater impact than the limited number of days that the DVP is closed due to flooding.*

Some people have suggested that the West Don Lands Flood Protection Landform (FPL) caused more flooding on the DVP than would otherwise have been the case. Did the FPL cause excessive flooding of the DVP during the July 8th, 2013 storm?

*No. The river’s water level has to be much higher than what happened on July 8th to even get to the bottom of the FPL. Additionally, the FPL is designed so not to create any negative off-site impacts due to flooding. The 21 metre widening of the CN railway bridge crossing over the Don River north of Lake Shore, completed by TRCA and Waterfront Toronto in 2007 was designed specifically to ensure there was no increase in flood levels elsewhere as a result of the West Don Lands FPL under extreme flood events.*

**FLOOD MODELLING**

I understand that flood modelling has been done to test how DMNP flood protection would function during a Hurricane Hazel-type storm. Has any modelling been done to test how flood protection would function during a storm similar to the one that happened on July 8th but that was centred on the Don River?

*We have modelled the July 8th storm. That storm was orders of magnitude smaller than Hurricane Hazel. The flood resulting from the July 8th storm was between a 5 and 10 year flood. The flood modelling undertaken depicts the water levels that would occur from baseflow conditions (at 3-4 m³/sec), up to and including the Regulatory Flood event.*

**GREENWAY**

Where the Greenway intersects the ship channel, what will happen to the existing dock wall?

*Where the Greenway intersects with the north side of the ship channel, the dock wall will be cut down because there will be a wetland habitat. There will still be dock wall below...*
Lake level. The south side of the ship channel will be looked at as part of the Port Lands and South of Eastern EA.

Is the City committed to making a green connection from the Don Valley all the way down to Tommy Thompson Park? A green connection has been shown as part of the future of the Port Lands since the completion of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan. The green connection will be refined as part of the Port Lands Planning Framework and the Port Lands and South of Eastern EA.

Is it possible that the construction of the Greenway will be delayed by private landowners? The Greenway only crosses through publicly owned land. Any land owner that would like to redevelop their land is in support of the construction of the Greenway.

What new bridges will be built? There will be new bridges connecting Cherry Street across the Keating Channel and across the new river mouth near Polson Slip. There will be new bridges across the Greenway at Commissioners Street and at Basin Street. Both the Commissioners Street Bridge and bridges along Cherry Street will include bridges that are able to accommodate transit.

The sidewalks shown in the cross-sections of Commissioners Street and Cherry Street seem abnormally wide at 5m. What is the purpose of a sidewalk that wide, and what does it add (other than cost)? That size of sidewalk may not seem very realistic given current demand, but over time with development, we think that there will be a high demand for pedestrian space, approaching what’s seen on Queens Quay. It may be determined in detailed design that a 5m sidewalk is not necessary. Including a 5m sidewalk in the EA provides designers with the flexibility to design a sidewalk up to that width, in light of more precise demand projections available when that work is undertaken.

Could you provide more information on soil remediation? All of the lands in the Port Lands are contaminated to a greater or lesser degree. Under the Ministry of Environment’s protocol, contaminated soil can be removed and remediated, or capped so that there is a physical separation between people and the contaminated soil. Raising the ground level to support development also serves to cap contaminated soil. We will try to remediate the soil that is removed following the excavation of the new river valley system and use it to raise the ground level/cap other lands.

Who will have primary responsibility for raising money to implement the results of these EAs? Is Waterfront Toronto thinking about seeking the ability to borrow money? Waterfront Toronto is working very closely with the City on this. The City is currently undertaking a Development Charge Study that includes City-wide (and may include area-specific) development charges aimed at funding Port Lands flood protection and infrastructure. Waterfront Toronto has also made preliminary enquiries with the Provincial and Federal governments regarding funding for flood protection. Funding would still be necessary to pay back money raised through financing. Ultimately, we want to involve the private sector – who have a great deal to gain from the provision of flood protection and new infrastructure.
Are there developers that are interested in developing something specific now?
Absolutely. Port Lands land owners have set up a group that is looking at how they can provide funding and advanced financing for development-enabling flood protection and infrastructure.

How does the LDL EA interact with the Gardiner EA?
We have been coordinating with the Gardiner EA team to keep each other informed about our respective projects. The Gardiner EA may have an impact on the area north of the Keating Channel, slightly west of the Don River. To the extent that Gardiner EA impacts the LDL EA, those impacts will be addressed in the Gardiner EA, and if required, amendments to the LDL EA will be undertaken to reflect any specific changes resulting from the Gardiner EA.

Is it possible to move the Lafarge plant to the cement campus by the turning basin?
While the concrete campus is owned by City and leased to different users, Lafarge owns their property. Lafarge has invested a lot of money in their plant recently, including a Research & Development facility. They aren’t interested in walking away from their investment and we can’t afford to buy them out.

There is major hydro infrastructure just east of the Don Roadway. How will that infrastructure be accommodated?
The DMNP EA acknowledges that this infrastructure is there and will identify potential ways to address this infrastructure. The Port Lands and South of Eastern EA will also identify the hydro corridor and look at how to address it comprehensively as part of the visioning for the future of those communities. We know that we will have to raise the ground level of the land that the hydro infrastructure sits on. Ultimately, we think that there will be a need to bury that infrastructure, but we also need to consider the existing heritage view corridor.

During the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2012, some catalyst sites (e.g. the Hearn) were identified. I didn’t see any catalyst sites identified in the presentation. What has happened to these catalyst sites?
The catalyst sites haven’t disappeared, they will be considered in further detail under the Port Lands Framework plan and precinct planning processes. We think that catalyst sites are a key and we are actively looking at potential opportunities. The Hearn in particular will be looked at under the framework plan.

You mentioned that you couldn’t speak to catalysts in particular, but could you speak in general what kind of uses they are?
We think that a catalyst use is a public facility that is iconic and will help trigger further development, something like the Bilbao Guggenheim or the Sydney Opera House. It’s not a condo, office or retail store.

Could the naturalization of the mouth of the Don be considered a catalyst?
Naturalizing the mouth of the Don will be a catalyst but it’s also something that is absolutely necessary to do – flood protection has to happen before any land can be redeveloped to a higher and better use. A naturalized Don mouth is unique, but we think that there’s also a need for an iconic building.
If zoning by-laws won’t get approved until precinct plans are complete, how can potential developers talk intelligently about plans within precincts if they don’t have some idea about what the zoning will look like? What will the precinct planning process look like?

The precinct planning process will have its own extensive consultation program, including consultations with land owners to ensure that they are provided with information about how the work is unfolding and have an opportunity to provide feedback on the precinct planning.

During the presentation, it was mentioned that the Cousins Precinct planning process is moving forward but the Polson Precinct planning process is not because of landowners there. How much land is privately owned in the Polson Precinct?

The Polson Precinct includes a site that is owned by Lafarge, who have expressed an interest in maintaining their operations there for the foreseeable future. Other land users in the Polson Precinct are similarly not currently interested in redevelopment. For comparison, land in the Cousins Precinct is partially owned by the City and partially privately owned. The owner of the private portion has already submitted a plan to develop that land.

How will storm water management be accommodated within the EAs?

We’re using the storm water standards that currently exist, but we want to incorporate them in a way that is principle-based and flexible, so as to allow for changes in standards and technology as the plan is rolled out over a number of years. In addition to the storm water performance standards within the EAs, a detailed assessment of storm water management design will be undertaken during precinct planning.

NEXT STEPS

The meeting wrapped up with representatives of the Project Team thanking participants for their feedback and reminding them that additional feedback could be submitted up until Thursday, August 8th. Participant feedback will be used to inform the finalization of the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs. Both EAs will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment for their review and approval in late fall 2013. Participant feedback on issues outside the scope of the two EAs will be incorporated into other Port Lands planning processes that are currently unfolding (e.g. the Port Lands Planning Framework, the Port Lands and South of Eastern Class EA, and various Precinct Plans). There will be opportunities to provide feedback on these processes directly through public meetings scheduled to start in late 2013.
Public Meeting Agenda

Don Mouth Naturalization EA &
Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA

Public Meeting
Wednesday, July 24, 2013
6:00 – 9:00 p.m.
EMS Training Centre (Toronto Fire Academy)
895 Eastern Avenue

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Open House – View display panels and one-on-one Q&amp;A with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Welcome / Agenda Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7:05 | Updates Presentation, Including:  
  - Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP)  
  - Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA (LDL) |
| 7:50 | Questions of Clarification |
| 8:00 | Discussion  
  - What do you like about the updated plans?  
  - What don’t you like about the updated plans?  
  - Do you have any suggested refinements? |
| 8:50 | Next Steps |
| 9:00 | Adjourn |
ATTACHMENT 2: WORKSHEET FEEDBACK

Seven individual participant worksheets were submitted at the conclusion of the public meeting. Feedback from these worksheets has been compiled below.

What do you like about the updated plans?

- Okay, so far
- The decision for a new Cherry St bridge, and the improved phasing
- Greenway going directly south and plenty of wetlands, accelerated action, clearer transit plans
- As much natural and floodplain land as possible
- More logical – the changes from the approved EA Master Plan looks good for the most part
- Consultation, response to flooding questions
- In general, appreciate the refinements of the Plans as they have evolved, support the Plan as proposed
- Thanks for the good work you’ve done

What don’t you like about the updated plans?

- No “transit first” but after flood protection, timelines/options
- No regional transit connections put forward
- With Essroc leaving and Polson/Lafarge in 10 years why does there have to be a hard edge on the west side of the Phase 1 area?
- Residential area looks dull in straight lines
- Little sense of community gathering
- We’ve lost the environmental, prize-winning setting of build up to best use light and sun
- Loss of parkland in Polson’s Quay
- The original design allowed for better spacing of green space, now there are many square blocks and green space at the end of a square block of buildings
- I really liked the original design, now it seems more dense as opposed to clusters of buildings with green land interspersed
- In previous meetings, there was a lot of attention paid to it being a walking community; can you safely build a community around a cement factory?
- Concerns are at detail level; e.g. Road cross-sections do not support transit on one side or the other, should be centre, prepared to be connected forever
- Overall concern that higher levels of governments (yes, I mean federal) must change its priorities and again become a partner in city building

Do you have any suggested refinements?

- Main purpose is for the public to enjoy the waterfront around the inner harbour by walking, biking, etc....
- Put in the green component right away
- Build walking and bike trails, plant trees and green the water’s edge so the city can enjoy its waterfront right away
- Would be nice to develop an area of the waterfront to use for quick exercises for the people who work downtown
- The south half of the Port Lands has potential today for high-tech and biotech industries. Jobs that may support the residential and commercial development in the north half
• Ideas: Roll on/off ferry terminal for great lakes and St. Lawrence connections
• Biotech campus to take advantage of Redpath, Lafarge natural gas plant and water treatment plant neighbours
• Surface LRT loop, like Chicago L-Train Loop with multiple lines
• Set aside substantial space for a key public attraction, such as a sports facility, museum, concert/entertainment venue
• There should be public park area on the lakeside everywhere
• Keep as much public space as possible
• Design for wildlife, birds need a migration corridor, design windows to prevent collisions as we have in downtown
• I think that a “catalyst” for the further development for the Lower Don Lands should be the building of a circular pedestrian/bicycle pathway around the inner harbour, similar to Stanley Park’s famous sea wall
• This sea wall/bicycle walkway is a major world attraction, I don’t see why we can’t build this circular pathway now
• Please include maps on “worksheet” to collect drawn ideas
• Keep the buildings as low as possible – not like the condos at the foot of Yonge
• Bike lanes should be a core component of the transportation planning, should be entire length; a useful example to consider is the Eglinton Connects, which has managed to incorporate bike lanes, generally in association with, but separate from pedestrian sidewalks
ATTACHMENT 3: ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS

Following the public meeting, members of the public were provided with the opportunity to submit additional comments and feedback by email on the DMNP and LDL EAs. The deadline for these additional submissions was Thursday, August 8th. The four submissions that were received are included in this attachment in full.
PROPOSAL

AN “EMERALD PATHWAY”,
Circling
“the Toronto Islands and Waterfront”

- For the *Public Good* – Making Big Things Happen!
- Costing Millions to Return Billions
- Enhanced quality of life for all
- Zero Carbon Footprint and Carbon Credit viability
- A venue small enough for the community and large enough for the WORLD
- A year round easily accessible meeting place for all to enjoy
Glimpsing the future of city’s Port Lands

Build Port Lands green bits now

Re Slow and steady works,
Editorial March 8

While it may be true that it will take
88 years to build out the commer-
cial potential and 16 years for the
residential component of the Port
Lands, there’s no reason why we
can’t put in the green component
right away.

Build the walking trails and bike
trails, plant the trees and green the
water’s edge, so Torontonians can
enjoy that component of the mix
now. The buildings can come later.

Bruce Gates, Toronto

Robert Deluce, 56

President and CEO of Porter
Airline has been busy with the
car launch on Oct. 33. He
wakes at 3 a.m. — though he says
he sometimes sleeps in until 4 —
and jumps on his computer to
deal with emails. “I’d love to be
able to work in a 45-minute run
or a bike ride. My cardio and my
exercise routine have taken a
major, fucking over the last six
months. I miss that more than
anything.”

—File from Patricia Huch
UNIVERSITIQUOTATION/PROPOSAL
CONCEPT PLAN COVER SHEET

Submission Date: July 14, 2011 (revised Nov. 16, 2012)

Organization Name: The Emerald Green Pathway Vision

Address: [Redacted]

Type of Organization: Non-Profit (without share capital)

Principal Contacts:
Howard Hollands, Phone: [Redacted]
E-mail Address: [Redacted]
Robert Hollands, Phone: [Redacted]
E-mail Address: [Redacted]

Proposal Title: The Emerald Green Pathway Vision for Toronto (The Emerald City)

Proposed Pathway & Tunnel Locations – see Cover Pages.
Project Duration: To be completed by July 2015, in time for the Pan-American Games

Proposed Starting Date: March 2013

Amount of City Funding Requested: $20,000.
- To fund promotion and presentation costs associated with project.
- To provide feasibility study of the proposal by city staff to ensure a close estimate of costs.

Financial Benefit to the City:
- Revenue derived from admission charges to tunnels.
($16 million based on 4 million visits a year at $4.00 each round trip) less operating and maintenance costs of $5 million.
- Extensive Advertising Opportunities (see Pages 14-15) $3 million/Year (estimate)
- Return on investments over life span of tunnels (50 to 100 years)

Names of Other Parties Receiving the Initial Proposal:
Porter Airlines; Toronto Port Authority; my former City Councillor Cliff Jenkins and Jaye Robinson; my present Councillor Ward 25, and other Councillors (Pam McConnell Ward 28, Adam Vaughan Ward 20, Paula Fletcher Ward 30, Bill Saundercok and Carol Stintz); MPP Kathleen Wynne, solicitor Margaret Turvey Haig (incorporation of organization); John Campbell and Elaine Baxter Trahair, Toronto Waterfront Assn; Wally Kowalenko, City Surveyor; Warren Brown CPA; Ray Hutton, McNally Corp. (boring and tunneling contractor); Ken Blundy, Toronto City Airport; Ann Saito, President, George Brown College.
The Proposal Contains Proprietary Information: YES

Name of Person Representing the Proponent: Howard G. Hollands / Robert F. Hollands

#1 Statement of Need: Identify and briefly explain the issue or need to be addressed by the proposed project.

Toronto and GTA need an accessible pedal and pedestrian paradise:

- An “Emerald Necklace” Pathway – an urban pathway to facilitate uninterrupted, easy access around Toronto’s inner harbor, which would connect Toronto Island to the mainland via two underground, underwater tunnels.
- Year-round access ensured via two pedestrian/bicycle tunnels from the mainland to the island.
- A pathway providing remarkable panoramic views of Toronto’s glorious inner harbour, waterfront and Lake Ontario.
- A circular closed circuit pathway to rival that of Vancouver’s world famous seawall with its continuous flow of pedestrian and bicycle traffic around the edge of Stanley Park.
- A family fun zone to support healthy living.

Quotes:
Toronto Star: “We need an Olympic Sized Saviour”
TD Bank – Keep Ontario Healthy – “Premier should set a goal of making Ontario the healthiest province in Canada to help control the escalating costs of healthcare and to provide an enhanced quality of life for all.”

- Let’s ensure that the inner harbour shoreline and Toronto Island will be permanently protected for public pleasure and the public good.
- Build an attraction for citizens and tourists alike that will promote Toronto as a city committed to green ideals and a healthier gentler world.

Needs:
As more and more people move into the city and into the downtown waterfront area, Toronto will increasingly need:

- A safe, natural environment and a year-round gathering place with easy, affordable access for regular physical exercise and outdoor recreation in order to relieve the stress of city living and provide a contrast to the hustle and bustle of the downtown area.

- A centerpiece for the city – a large outdoor venue, small enough for creating community, large enough for world events. A complement to the waterfront Blue Line project.

- A venue as attractive as an “Emerald Necklace”, maintaining pathway and island park space for affordable easy access to picnic grounds, enhanced swimming beaches, gardens,
park benches and a broad pathway suitable for pedestrians, strollers, bicycles, skateboards, rollerblades, senior’s electric carts (no motorized vehicles allowed).

- **A showcase** for major city events as well as fundraising walkathons, marathons, bicycle races, etc, which now require the closure of major downtown streets.

- **A safe aquatic park** (the inner harbour) for summer water sports and gradual replacement of our large ageing ferries with smaller, less expensive, more flexible ferries.

- With tunnels, the seven hundred permanent island residents and members of the four yacht clubs and marina as well as the public would have year-round access from the mainland to the islands. Note: Only one of the four present ferries operates from December to March due to winter ice conditions, effectively reducing winter use of the islands for X-country skiing, skating, hiking by the public. Why not promote a winter wonderland, and perhaps a winter carnival, to make more effective use of Toronto Island in the winter?

Toronto needs a powerful new symbol—a closed-loop, green foliaged pathway in the heart of the city, named “The Emerald Necklace” or alternatively, The Jack Layton OR Jane Jacobs National / Provincial Park.

**Other needs to be served by multi-purpose tunnels:**

1. A **new water main** under the Western Gap is planned which will supply Toronto water to the Toronto Island.

2. A **pedestrian tunnel** has recently been approved to provide access to the Toronto Island airport at Bathurst Street under the Western Gap for the exclusive use of Porter and Air Canada passengers. This tunnel will replace extensive use of the Toronto Airport ferry which now impedes the flow of marine traffic through the Western Gap. Why not extend this tunnel to Hanlan’s Point, enabling the public to access the pathway around the Island?

3. **OPTION:** An **aquarium tunnel**, as proposed by Ripley Inc and similar to that in the Atlanta Aquarium, could be integrated into the proposed Eastern Gap tunnel at the end of Cherry Street. It would provide a world class attraction as well as provide controlled access for bikers and pedestrians to and from Toronto Island. The rest of the ten acre Aquarium site could be developed as funds and qualified employees became available.
   [Since the Ripley Inc Aquarium is currently under construction next to the CN Tower, this option is no longer available.]
#2 Proposal Overview: A concise abstract describing the nature of the proposed initiative and the scope of work involved.

Project Name: The Emerald Necklace Pathway Vision.

Code Name: ENP (Emerald Necklace Pathway)

Proposal: To obtain the City of Toronto’s support and resources for building a seamless, safe, secure pedestrian/bicycle pathway (like an Emerald Necklace) around the perimeter of Toronto’s glorious Inner Harbour.

- A hub for recreational activities and to reconnect with nature
- A family fun zone and a destination for all citizens, visitors and tourists
- Immediate seamless access to the perimeter of the Inner Harbour and Toronto Island.

Profile of Proponent: (see also #7)

- A non-profit corporation without share capital
- A purpose complementary and not inconsistent with:
  1. the Waterfront Toronto Blue Line project;
  2. the Billy Bishop Airport pedestrian tunnel,
  3. the proposed construction of a new city water supply tunnel to Toronto Island,
  and
  4. the proposed Ripley Aquarium near the waterfront

Nature of Proposal Initiative: (see figures #1 A, B and C attached)

- Plan, design and construct (bore):
  1. Two (2) pedestrian/bicycle tunnels, one under the Eastern Gap at the south end of Cherry Street, and one under the Western Gap at Bathurst Street (beside or under the airport runway)
  2. Connect the tunnels to the Toronto Island main pathway at Hanlan’s Point and near the Ward Island Beach.
  3. Enhance and beautify (to City standards) the existing mainland pedestrian/bicycle pathways surrounding the Inner Harbour, especially Cherry Street.
  4. Plant a canopy of trees along the pathways to combat climate change.
  5. Integrate the Emerald Necklace Pathway with the Waterfront “Long Blue Line”, to eventually become the border to a world class “Stanley Park”

Nature and Scope of Work:

- Other Essential Qualities and Characteristics:
  1. A safe, secure, natural environment and year-round gathering place.
  2. Immediate easy access to Toronto Island via controlled tunnel entrances
  3. No automobile access, except for emergency and service vehicles.
  4. Tunnel ramps with no more than a one or two degree slope to promote pedestrian, bicycle and seniors’ use year-round.
5. A road-width pathway (a circular closed loop, like a necklace), to allow a continuous, uninterrupted flow of pedestrian and bicycle traffic on and around the Island and Inner Harbour.
6. A “Stanley Park seawall” setting that would include a safe, freshwater aquatic park (the Inner Harbour) suitable for both water sports and winter sports with the ENP serving as a viewing point for national and international events to be held in Toronto and the GTA.

- Initial Activities

1. Seek funding required to promote the Emerald Necklace Pathway Vision to City staff and Council, public and private partnerships and the public, emphasizing the world class nature of the ENP and the health benefits of daily exercise in a setting adjacent to but separate from the hustle and bustle of the city.
2. Conduct environmental impact studies and sustainability required for the project.
3. Consider adopting the environmental studies and tunnel specifications approved for the Billy Bishop Airport tunnel, should we form an alliance to extend the tunnel under or beside the airport land to Hanlan’s Point. The pedestrian tunnel would then serve the public walking/cycling the ENP as well as private airline passengers. See Figures 1.a, b, c, d attached.
4. Conduct public consultative meetings for interest and feedback on the ENP project.
5. Send project descriptions to
   - government agencies (Federal, Provincial, Municipal)
   - non-governmental organizations
   - down-town and Island residents.
   - newspapers, television and radio stations
   - various business organizations
6. Seek and evaluate bids from:
   - planning and design architectural companies
   - local tunneling and construction companies
   - landscape architects and Parks Board
   - security companies
   - wireless companies
7. Select and employ companies and city departments required to plan, oversee and carry out the project, to be completed by 2015, in time for the Pan American Games to be held in Toronto and GTA. Also an attraction for possible future Olympics.
#3 Planned Objectives & Outcomes & Expected Benefits to the City

Objectives:
To plan, design and build two single or multi-purpose pedestrian/bicycle tunnels joining the mainland to Toronto Island under the Eastern and Western Gaps, enabling a broad circular pathway around the Inner Harbour – similar to the Stanley Park seawall.

Outcomes:
1. Acceptance of Emerald Necklace Pathway (ENP) proposal for evaluation and approval by Toronto Office of Partnerships and other city staff.
2. Submission and promotion of ENP to City Council.
3. Environmental assessment and initial public meetings relating to Pathway.
4. Land acquisition, where necessary.
5. Plan, design and construct an Eastern Gap Tunnel, connecting Cherry Street to existing pathways on Toronto Island.
6. Plan, design and construct a Western Gap Tunnel, connecting existing pathways on Hanlan’s Point (Toronto Island) to the mainland at the foot of Bathurst Street, as proposed by the Toronto Island Water Supply Route Study. This tunnel could perhaps be combined with the already approved pedestrian tunnel to the Billy Bishop City Airport.
7. Involve city departments (mandatory)
8. Involve external entities (both mandatory and optional).
9. Consult with the Toronto Port Authority, the Toronto Waterfront Corporation, Toronto Island Water Supply Route Study and Ripley Aquarium authorities, to determine their interest and cooperation in building multi-purpose vs single-purpose tunnels.
10. Immediate “shovel-in-the-ground” employment for:
   o Summer students and unemployed to build and enhance the Emerald Necklace Pathway under the supervision of Parks and Recreation.
   o Tunneling Companies (local)
   o Landscape Architects, etc
   o Security Companies
   o Recreational Facilities
   o Wireless companies (The use of “intelligent pathways” around the Emerald Pathway to ensure a close, safe, secure link to the waterfront.)

Expected benefits to the City:
• As more and more people move into the city and into the downtown (waterfront) area, Torontonians need a year-round, safe secure natural park environment, “a Stanley Park”, with affordable easy access for daily physical exercise and outdoor recreation, enhancing the opportunity for Toronto to become the greenest city in North America - a powerful neto symbol – “The Emerald Necklace Pathway. Walking, running and biking are a key to happiness, providing major health and economic benefits for both citizens and tourists.
• The inner harbour shoreline will be permanently protected for public pleasure and the public good.

• The Emerald Pathway around the circumference of the inner harbour will complement what is already being done and proposed for the waterfront.

• Those living on the Islands will benefit from a year-round seamless, secure and convenient pathway from the islands to the mainland, equipped with closed circuit cameras and with restricted access after hours to ensure the Islanders’ privacy and security.

• Financial return to the city-$10,475,000.00 per year including the employment of 10 people to operate the tunnels (see page 18).
#4 Deliverables and Timelines: Identify the critical dates and proposed work schedule for:

1. Acceptance of proposal
2. Planning, Designing and Building two tunnels
3. Planning, Designing and Building Circular Pathway

Timelines, Deliverables: Proposed Work Schedule:
December 2012  Acceptance of Emerald Necklace Pathway Proposal (ENP)
by Toronto Office of Partnerships for Study and Evaluation.

- Provide “Order of Magnitude” cost estimate to be supplied by McNally Corp. based on selected tunnel diameters and length of tunnels (including ramps) required for project.
- Prepare cost/benefit analysis re. single purpose vs. multipurpose tunnels.
- Send ENP project description to City Parks Department and City Planning, Design, Construction departments and seek meeting with
- Other selected parties of interest
  - Mayor Rob Ford/Toronto City Council
  - Pedestrian and bicycle committees-- seek meeting dates. Prepare a “motion” to be delivered to the above committees
  - Selected Councillors affected by proposal – TTC Chair, Carol Stinz, Councillors whose wards impinge on ENP proposal
  - Toronto Waterfront Corporation – John Campbell
  - Toronto Water General Manager – Lou D. Gironomo
  - Toronto Port Authority (Federal Gouv.) – Alan Paul, Chief Executive
  - City Aquarium Evaluation Committee – Ripley Corp.
  - Porter Airlines/Air Canada
  - Provincial Gouv. – Transportation Minister – MPP Kathleen Wynn

March 2013  Neighbourhood Associations:
(prepare presentations & arrange meetings)
- York Key Neighbourhood Association
- Community Air Association
- Toronto Island Associations –
  - Wards Island Association
  - Algonquin Island Association
  - Toronto Island Marina
  - Toronto Island Restaurants (Island Paradise, Carousel Café, Rectory Café)
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- Toronto Island Yacht Clubs (RCYC, Queen City, Island Yacht Club & Harbour City Yacht Club)
- Island Art Club

- Health Council of Canada
  - Tourist Associations
  - Hotel Management Associations
  - Pan American Games Representative
  - Public interest groups
  - Metcalfe Foundation Grant
  - Toronto Park People
    David Harvey Lobby Group [www.parkpeople.ca](http://www.parkpeople.ca)
    Catherine Porter- cporter@thestar.ca

2013 Sept. Collect required data to establish baseline conditions
- Obtain copies of environmental assessments for study evaluation:
  - Toronto Port Authority (Billy Bishop Airport tunnel)
  - Toronto Water (Ewave Energy Corp.)

Seek Public/Private Partnerships to participate in Planning, Design & Build Pathway
- Toronto Port Authority
- Canada Pension Plan Investment Board
- Condominium Developers
- Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan / CAAT Pension Plan
- City of Toronto
- Fund Raising – Walk-a-thons, Bike-a-thons
- Parking lot revenues
- Tourist industry

Involv e Media Groups (Mandatory)
- Radio Interviews – John Tory
- TV Ontario – Steve Paikin
- CTV
- Toronto Star – Metro Paper
- Globe & Mail
- National Post
- CMA
- Citizen Opinion Surveys re Emerald Necklace Pathway Proposal
Involve External Entities (Optional)
- Wireless Companies – to create ‘intelligent pathways’ to ensure safe, secure links around pathway
- Recreational Companies
- Employment of qualified summer students and unemployed

Involve External Entities (Mandatory)
- Toronto area tunnelling companies and boring equipment companies
- Toronto area tunnelling and landscape companies
- Building architects
- Potential Public Private Partnerships

Determine Milestones of Project Proposal (Mandatory)
- Environmental Assessment – including examination of environmental assessments carried out by Toronto Port Authority and Toronto Water related to the Western Gap Tunnelling Projects.
- Land Acquisition: approximately 9 hectares (20 acres) fronting on the Eastern Gap Tunnel (Mandatory) and a future Aquarium site (Optional)
- Approximately three hectares (six acres) fronting on the Western Gap to accommodate the Western Gap Tunnel ramp (Mandatory)
- Appropriation of inner harbour water’s edge to prevent private ownership of shoreline (Mandatory)

2013/14

Construction of Western Gap Multi-purpose Tunnel
- Approximately 10m wide X 4m high X 120m long and 12m deep under the Gap (Mandatory)
- Ramps to tunnel would connect Hanlan’s Point (Toronto Island) to the mainland at the foot of Bathurst St. And would follow the same path as that proposed by the Toronto Island Water Supply Route Study
- Also possibly join forces with the Toronto Port Authority which has received Federal Govt. Funding to build a private pedestrian tunnel linking the Billy Bishop Airport with the mainland (currently under construction.)

Construction of Eastern Gap Multi-purpose Tunnel
- Approximately 10 m wide X 4m high X 200m long and 12m deep under the Gap (Mandatory)
• Ramps to tunnel would connect Wards Island pathway on Toronto Island to the south end of Cherry St. (Mandatory)

• To include the building of an Aquarium Tank (100m long, 60m wide and 12m deep) through which an acrylic portion of the Eastern Gap tunnel will pass before going under the Eastern Gap (Optional – model & diagram available)

**Common Elements for both tunnels**

• Provision of 2°, 3°, or 4° slopes of ramps to tunnels suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and seniors’ electric carts (Mandatory)

• Note: Ramp lengths depend on degree of slope selected.

• Alternatively fitted with moving sidewalks or escalators with elevator back-ups (Optional)

• Tunnels must be large enough to accommodate a maximum 4 million people over time per year as determined by an “order of magnitude” study to be provided by a selected tunnelling company (Mandatory)

• The above ramps (surface) would be available for alternative use (Optional)

• Suitable lighting, air conditioning and communication devices to ensure complete safety, security and comfort of citizens, tourists and visitors.

• Multi-purpose tunnels could save the city millions of dollars by combining the construction of the Emerald Pathway with that of the
  o Toronto water supply pipe to Hanlan's Point from Bathurst St. To Toronto Billy Bishop pedestrian tunnel.
  o Building an Aquarium Tank and acrylic tunnel into the Eastern Gap Tunnel as the first stage of the New Toronto Ripley Aquarium. The location of which would allow for a world class aquarium similar in size to the Atlanta Georgia Aquarium. (Atlanta Aquarium illustrated book available.)

**Involve City Departments (Mandatory)**

• Engage the cooperation and available services of the City Departments:
  o City Parks and Recreation Dept. (through Toronto Office of Partnerships, Planning, Design, construction, City Survey
  o Pedestrian/bicycle Committees
  o TTC
  o Economic Development Department
  o Concerge and Service of Deputy City Manager
  o City Councillors of Wards affected by proposal:
    o Pam McConnell – Ward 28
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- Paula Fletcher – Ward 10
- Adam Vaughan – Ward 22
- Jaye Robinson – Ward 25 (our City Councillor)

  - Lands Department and Legal Department
  - Toronto Waterfront Corp. – John Campbell
  - Involve Emerald Green Pathway Vision Company to:
    - Provide input where qualified for the planning, design, land acquisition and construction of Emerald Necklace Pathway

2012-2015 Act as coordinator (runner) to expedite the ENP project through various city departments in order to avoid delays in implementation

- Act as volunteer staff person to actually follow an application through the process and babysit it from desk to desk ie, walk it through the various offices and make sure it moves along.
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Cost Estimate: A bold but simple plan that will cost millions but will return multimillions over 50 to 100 years tunnel life.

- Two tunnels - $10,000.00 - $12,000.00 per metre x 1930 metres = 23,160,000
- Purchase or Rental of tunnel boring machine = 23,000,000
- Pathway development / improvement @ $1,000,000 per km = 10,000,000
- Gated Community and new School for islanders = 2,000,000
- Construction of Aquarium Tank - 100 m x 60m x 12m (optional) = 10,000,000
- Architectural planning and design = 3,000,000
- Contingency +15% - 10% = 10,674,000

Total Cost Estimate = 81,834,000

Capital Cost investment through Toronto Office of Partnerships joint venture with:

- Toronto Port Authority
- Toronto Water
- Ripley
- Canada Pension Plan Investment Board
- Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan Investment Board/ CAAT Pension Plan
- Provincial Government
- City of Toronto
- Federal Government
Private construction firms
Architectural firms
Eco trust funds
Infrastructure Ontario

Note: No community wants to be stagnating. This is an opportunity to improve both the security of the islanders and transportation to the mainland.

- Tunnel circumference – maximum 14 metres – minimum 10 metres, based on order of magnitude costs.
- Ramp slopes – minimum slope 2°, maximum slope 3° determines total length of tunnels.
- Tunnel diameter costs based on order of magnitude to be provided by McNally Corp. for example, to choose best tunnelling methods; sequential excavation; new Austrian tunnelling or other appropriate methods to be considered.

Risks: Possible cost overruns due to unforeseen tunneling problems and material costs.

RATIONALE FOR PROPOSAL – (NEEDS TO BE MET)

- The inner harbour shoreline will be permanently protected for public pleasure and the Public Good.
- The Emerald Pathway around the circumference of the inner harbour will complement what is already being done and proposed for the waterfront.
- The islanders lifestyle will be further enhanced by providing a seamless, secure and convenient pathway, from the islands to the mainland 24/7, equipped with closed circuit TV and restricted access, to ensure the islanders privacy and security.
- As more and more people move into the city and into the downtown (waterfront) area, Torontonians NEED a year-round, safe secure natural park environment, “a Stanley Park”, with affordable easy access for daily physical exercise, outdoor recreation, enhancing the opportunity for Toronto to become the greenest city in North America, -- a powerful new symbol -- “The Emerald Necklace Pathway. -- Physical activity – walking, running, biking, skating, cross-country skiing – is a key to happiness, providing major health and economic benefits for both citizens and tourists.
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Income Statement
City of Toronto – The Emerald Green Pathway (Vision) Year 1 (opening year)
The Emerald Necklace National Park

Revenue:
- Ticket sales at 4 million visitors x $4 per ticket 16,000,000
- Advertising on tunnel walls, etc. 3,000,000
- Sports, leisure activities, band concerts, marathons 4,000,000
- Other potential sources of funding: 12,000,000
  - Governments – National Parks status
  - Tourist industry – hotels, etc.
  - Developers, Associations, Clubs
  - Canada Pension Plan Development Board/ CAAT Pension Plan

Total 35,000,000

Cost of Sales:
- Ticket sales (printing costs) 1,000,000
- Advertising sales, promotion 2,000,000
- Administration of activities 1,000,000
- Seeking additional funding sources 1,000,000

Total 5,000,000
Gross Profit (Loss) 30,000,000

Operating Expenses:
- Accounting 100,000
- Advertising Promotion-T.B.D.
- Amortization/Depreciation 81,834,000 over 40 years 25% 4,700,000
- Bad debts 2,000
- Commissions Nil
- Contract labour/ service: police, security, safety 1,000,000
- Miscellaneous (specify) T.B.D.
- Delivery Expenses 1,000,000
- Equipment/Machinery: air conditioning, escalators, moving sidewalks 2,000,000
- Maintenance/Repairs 1,000,000
- Insurance: public liability, equipment failure, etc. 5,000,000
• Interest 1,000,000
• Legal 1,000,000
• Office expenses: bus cards, computer service, paper T.B.D.
• Operating supplies – paper, etc. T.B.D.
• Other (specify) – City Parks and Recreation coordination 2,000,000
• Permits and licences T.B.D.
• Property Taxes – (city owned)
• Rent – (city owned)
• Telephone 1,000
• Travel 2,000
• Utilities – lighting, air conditioning, heating 500,000
• Vehicle expenses – maintenance and supply costs 20,000
• Wages/Benefits – city employees @ $50,000 per employee x 10 500,000

Total Expenses 19,525,000

Net Income (Loss) Before Income Taxes
• Gross profit $30 million
• Less total expenses $19,525,000 = $10,475,000.
5. Responsibilities of the Proponent and the City:

Responsibilities of the Proponent:

1. Meet with city officials, provincial and federal government representatives and potential partners regarding their interest, investment and level of participation in the planning, design, organization and construction of the Emerald Necklace Pathway (ENP) and associated tunnels.
2. Help the city promote the ENP to the public – local communities, private and government organizations:
   - Conduct public interest surveys
   - Newspaper articles
   - Media interviews
   - Organize public meetings
   - Develop promotional materials
3. Provide consulting input, where appropriate, to facilitate the project.

Responsibilities of the City:

1. Toronto Office of Partnerships to evaluate the ENP proposal and, if acceptable, to recommend its adoption by a motion to the Pedestrian/Bicycle Committee of the Toronto City Council, who would then present it to council.
2. Do a cost/benefit analysis of single-purpose pedestrian tunnels versus multi-purpose tunnels to determine overall savings to interested parties – The Toronto Water supply group, Toronto Port Authority, Billy Bishop City Airport and the Ripley aquarium group.
3. On adoption of the proposal, in full or in part, the City is to be responsible for the planning, design, organization, construction and operation (oversight) of the ENP project.
4. Provide support in the promotion of the project.
5. Plan and arrange meetings with councillors and government representatives, and other interested parties such as service clubs, corporations and philanthropists who may share our enthusiasm for the ENP vision.
6. Provide an adequate budget to enable our non-profit organization to carry out the Proponents’ responsibilities as outlined above.

Proposed Timeline: To be completed by 2015, in time for the Pan American Games or to be part of a proposal for hosting future Summer Olympic Games.
#6 Other: (available on request)

Relevant Background Files on the EN Pathway Project:

1. Incorporation Documents
2. Toronto Office of Partnerships
3. Diagrams, maps and models of ENP
   - **Eastern Gap Tunnel**:
     - diagram of tunnel
     - aquarium model of proposed acrylic tunnel entrance
     - background materials – The Creation of the Georgia Aquarium – an illustrated book telling the story of how the aquarium in Atlanta, Georgia was conceived, planned, designed and constructed, with video to illustrate. (Bernie Marcus the co-founder of Home Depot was its major benefactor.)
     - Dubai Aquarium tunnel details
   - **Western Gap Tunnel**:
     - diagram of tunnel
     - articles re proposed Billy Bishop City Airport tunnel
     - Toronto Water Study (new pipe through tunnel to Toronto Island)
4. Possible Financial Costs of ENP Project based on proposed parameters (length and size) of tunnels under Eastern and Western Gaps.
5. Background for Emerald Necklace Pathway Vision
   - CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)
   - Maps of Toronto Island and amenities
   - Comparisons with Vancouver Stanley Park; Long Blue Line; NYC Central Park; Calgary city centre Princes Island Park.
   - Toronto Ferry Services
   - TTC
   - Billy Bishop City Airport
   - Toronto Port Authority
   - Marathons presently held in downtown area
   - List of important contacts
   - Fund-raising ideas
   - Pan American games
   - Related articles re benefits of regular exercise
7. Profile of the Proponent

Objectives of the Emerald Necklace Pathway (ENP) Vision:

1. The objects for which the corporation was incorporated are:

   The establishment and operation of a community, organization or support group for the purposes of:
   
   (a) promoting the establishment, construction and maintenance of a continuous pathway around the Inner Harbour of the City of Toronto for use exclusively by pedestrians, and persons using bicycles, skateboards and in-line skates, electric wheelchairs and cross-country skis (save and except for emergency vehicles).
   
   (b) Promoting the connection of such pathway from the mainland to Toronto Island by means of underwater tunnels or such other connections as may be appropriate, to further facilitate non-vehicular movement around the Toronto Harbour.
   
   (c) Promoting the construction of an aquarium at Cherry Street on the Eastern Gap site. One of the aquarium tanks would include a Plexiglas section leading to the Eastern Gap tunnel that would serve as a pathway through which pedestrians could observe fish as they proceeded to the tunnel under the Gap to the Toronto Island (optional).

2. The special provisions are:

The corporation shall be carried on without the purpose of financial gain for its members, and any profits or other accruals to the corporation shall be used in promoting its objects.

3. Biographical Information on Key Personnel:

   • **Howard Hollands, Director**

   Resident of Toronto for 40 years
   Co-author of The Emerald Green Pathway/Necklace Proposal
   Retired Professor (Seneca College); Personnel and Industrial Relations Manager
   Graduate of University of Western Ontario and Queen’s University
   No previous work experience in field of proposal but previous experience in marketing supervisory and management development programs to business and industry.

   • **Robert Hollands, son and Director**

   Resident of Toronto for 40 years
   Co-author of The Emerald Green Pathway/Necklace Proposal
   Attended Seneca College and studied Electronic Technology
   Work experience in field of proposal includes:
   Experience in wireless sensor and lighting automation and controls;
presently involved in business development with private and public partnerships; previous sales professional experience with Sprint Canada, Gandalf Data, AT&T Paradyne, 3M Corp.

- Marjorie Hollands, wife, Secretary to the Corporation

Resident of Toronto for 40 years
Registered dietitian and diabetes educator, at Women's College Hospital before retirement. Co-author of 6 books in Choice Menus series (HarperCollins) designed to help people with type 2 diabetes prevent/manage diabetes, involving research and analysis and computer skills.
Graduate of University of Western Ontario and University of Toronto
From: [Name]
Sent: August-08-13 1:08 PM
To: mcharendoff@trca.on.ca; info
Subject: July 24 meeting comments

Dear sir/madam,
I attended the July 24th meeting at the EMS Training Centre and would like to submit my feedback for the official record.
I am thoroughly familiar with all previous and current versions of the DMNP and LDL plans.

Q1. Likes.
The continued emphasis on naturalizing the mouth of the Don is very commendable. The plans presented tonight are thorough, achievable and will satisfy all my wishes for the re-naturalizing. The new channel is great.

The realignment of the Don Greenway is necessary and OK.

The new neighbourhood street plan is a very big improvement. The continuation of Commissioners St. as a strait, wide, arterial boulevard integrates it into the street plan of the larger city.

The new interior street grid plan is much improved. It maintains the rhythm and edge of Toronto’s angular urban grid. This is a huge improvement from the previous plan of crescents, loops and dead end streets. Excellent work.

If it’s actually possible to finance this newest plan then I’m delighted. Let’s get on with it!

Q2. Dislikes.
None.

Q3. Suggestions

Please ensure the new channel will be accessible to small watercraft such as canoes and rowboats. I want to be able to row north up the Don as far as possible.

No mention is made of the Gardiner/Lakeshore Blvd. access ramps but we use them daily and must be kept functional at all times, for the benefit of all Torontonians. This highway access is essential for keeping traffic volumes lower in surrounding neighbourhoods.

Thanks
I am replying to both Waterfront Toronto and the TRCA as there may be some overlap in my comments and I am not sure where the divisions in your respective responsibilities are. The meeting of July 24th was the first that I have attended, indeed I only became aware of the scope of this project a few months ago. My thanks to all of those who have sought to re-claim the Don for so long and to those who have conceived such a beautiful solution for doing so.

I do think that the original plan was superior, but I accept the need to modify that design with a view to easing the financing and accelerating the development: accelerating it but I hope not compromising it. Even if the La Farge plant can not be re-located I think that the concept borders on perfection. That leads me to my biggest concern of the moment, the perceived need to embelish or enhance the project with iconic built form.

Frank Lloyd Wright's Fallingwater is iconic. Perhaps it is one of the best examples of site inspired architecture designed for a purely natural site. I think that it is beautiful. The house without the waterfall would be a peculiar curiosit the waterfall without the house would be what it always has been, beautiful. Native laurel and rhododendron flowering in the spring and early summer, a mixed hardwood bush changing colour in the fall, ice encrusted riverbanks in the winter, the omnipresent sound of flowing water; naturally beautiful.

A "natural" river mouth, discharging its' flow in the centre of a large urban development, has to be relatively unique. I think that it is its' own catalyst. Will it draw everyone? Of course it won't. But then, has every citizen of the city, every tourist to the city, been drawn to the AGO, the ROM, Woodbine racetrack or the CN Tower? It will have its' own audience and we need to grow that audience. What better location than the heart of this new city within a city?

I have no doubt that something of beauty and originality could be built, but at best it may prove to be superfluous, and at the worst it may diminish what has already been beautifully imagined.

The built forms which are essential, which are not in any way superfluous, are the bridges. Perhaps, taken collectively, we could make their design and construction the iconic link between the natural and human. Although the bridges serve different purposes, have longer and shorter spans, and will be built over a long period of time, maybe they could be designed at the outset as separate installations of one over-arching art project. An international competition to design the complete set of required bridges before any one of them is built. We have the time.

An international competition would draw much attention to this development, attention that would be refreshed throughout the project: the initial announcement, the naming of finalists, the naming of the winner, the start and completion of each installation (ie a bridge), the completion of the construction of the entire set of bridges, pedestrian and vehicular, and finally, the ongoing enjoyment of experiencing great design. I don't have the ability to imagine this, but somewhere in the world there are those who do.

Thank you for all you have done and for affording me this opportunity to participate.

Sincerely,
John Campbell/CEO/Waterfront Toronto  
Michael Charendoff/Toronto Region Conservation Authority  

1 August, 2013

Dear: [Illegible]

Re. Reconfiguration of the Mouth of the Don River

I've attended Waterfront Toronto/Toronto Waterfront Revitalization meetings since they were first initiated. I attended the last one on July 24th at the EMS Training Centre.

Like most who have participated in these public meetings, I was motivated by the 'THEFT' of Toronto's Waterfront under previous city administrations with the complicity of dreadful, shortsighted planning.

The present draft, to the extent it was discussed on July 24th and to the extent that visual literature images project, is UNACCEPTABLE.

(1) Acceleration of the Process: the process has been contaminated ever since the intervention of Doug Ford and his ferris wheel, mega mall, corporate takeover attempts earlier this year. The introduction of the word "acceleration" has clearly had a damaging impact on the process. The reconfiguration of the mouth of the Don River is an historical opportunity. There is no room in the process for "acceleration" simply to pacify the objectives of those who have virtually no concept of nor interest in the naturalization of one of Toronto's greatest natural assets.

(2) Contraction/Minimizing of Green Spaces: as Ken Greenberg and others have pointed out, redrafts have already eliminated 40 acres of green space and increased development lands. We've had the Toronto Port Authority, one of the leading proponents of maximizing waterfront development while damaging natural spaces (the massive infrastructure of Porter Airlines on the Island Airport lands, the incredible airline noise and activity, the push for jet aircraft) carving sections off the draft proposal to facilitate shipping, an almost non-existent activity.

(3) Reconfiguration of Development Areas: I am particularly upset at the planning decision to create suburb-like box development of development units lined up like toy soldiers rather than the more flexible development patterns highlighted in earlier drafts. Waterfront Toronto presented this as an improvement from earlier drafts. I have two granddaughters involved in design; one an architect; one a superb designer. We often discuss the importance of design. DESIGN TRUMPS EVERYTHING. Check out the success of Apple Computer. The new development images remind me of the debacle that the Dept. of Indian Affairs has made in housing developments on northern reserves. Houses lined up like soldiers. It's ugly, its impractical and its an insult to creative design.
(4) The Floodway/Spillway/Wetlands Concept from the Existing Mouth of the Don River/Keating Channel, down through the Shipping Channel to empty into Lake Ontario in the Area between the Two New Soccer Pitches & the Old Hearn Generating Station:
The attached photocopy (Exhibit A) A Vision for Cherry Beach (drafted by Urban Design Associates of Pittsburgh) shows the natural flow-through of the Don River to Lake Ontario to the South. Exhibit B is a draft submitted by the East Toronto Climate Action Group. It echoes concepts of wetland/spillway areas directly SOUTH between the new soccer pitches and the Hearn Plant.

Most recent images provided by Waterfront Toronto exclude any details of the "spillway" area between the pitches and the Hearn.

QUESTION: has the SPILLWAY concept been scrapped? If so why? Is the spillway now simply a green space or is it a true WETLAND. I don't recall any detailed discussion of the scrapping of the SPILLWAY/WETLAND at any Waterfront Toronto meetings.

Concluding Comments: I'm hugely supportive of Waterfront Toronto's efforts. Sherbourne Common Park/Spillway, the Mini-Beaches etc. However the apparent 'cave-in' to ignorant political interests and pro-development interests is about to destroy/undermine a fabulous once-in-several centuries opportunity of the Don Mouth Reconfiguration.

It's very disheartening to have politicians elected in 2010 undermine a public consultation project now into its second decade. My sense is that too many important decisions are being impacted and made behind closed doors. You need to remind yourselves that you have enormous public and councillor support if you choose to PUSH-BACK.

You don't have to buy my arguments. Attached is a copy of Ken Greenberg's thoughts. As Ken points out, the plan that won international awards and was approved by Council in 2010 continues to contract and minimize. What was the point of the competition? The current draft is UNACCEPTABLE in the legacy of inadequacy it will leave this city in the future. An opportunity squandered.

cc: Ken Greenberg/Architect
    Christopher Hume/TorStar
A Vision for Cherry Beach

Intense and thoroughly urban, this proposal deals with the large tract of land in the east docklands south of the shipping channel. Although the scheme includes considerable expanse of green space, especially at the south end by the water, it also provides various types of housing ranging from four-storey buildings near Lake Ontario and Cherry Beach to high-rises along the shipping channel. Prepared by Urban Design Associates of Pittsburgh, the plan seeks to integrate the city and Lake Ontario in a way that makes the water a feature of daily life. It also separates recreational functions from residential and commercial with an extensive wooded area that allows for dramatically different uses within the precinct. The proposal doesn't shy away from the densities and even the tall buildings about which Torontonians sometimes have grave doubts. The strength of this approach is that it opens up the lake while adding a new neighbourhood to Toronto.
Latest temptation for 
Toronto's waterfront

Proposed changes to the award-winning plan for the Lower Don Lands risk repeating Harbourfront Corp.'s mistake that created the infamous wall of condos

KEN GREENBERG

After thousands of Torontonians spoke up last November to resist overturning the fruit of years of effort that had gone into shaping plans for the Lower Don Lands, the idea was to move forward not backward.

But, as evident in Waterfront Toronto’s revised proposal released last week, this exercise has been hijacked by the not too hidden agenda of the Ford administration to undo and undermine everything that has come before, especially anything that expresses a generosity of spirit for the public or that is not of a commercial nature.

The new plan for the 1,000-acre Port Lands cuts about 40 acres of green space and would add more development on the unsubstantiated theory that this would cut costs and entice developers. You can almost hear the Fords saying, “I told you so.”

The whole point of the international competition held by Waterfront Toronto and the city with great fanfare in 2007 was to connect the dots by looking holistically at the issues of flood-proofing, naturalization, parks, land use, transit and urban infrastructure with an eye to creating an exemplary new part of Toronto’s waterfront.

The outcome was a plan approved by council in 2010 that has won eight major international awards and brought Toronto to the forefront of forward-looking, sustainable city building.

The original Lower Don Lands plan would introduce urban development, native ecologies and public infrastructure on 280 acres accommodating housing for 25,000 residents and 10,000 employees. It would create a variety of hard and soft public spaces at the water’s edge, including a major public park at the heart of an urban river estuary with room for organized sports on four regulation-sized fields, informal pickup games, small boat launching, jogging

the lands by getting them into the hands of developers as quickly as possible with minimal commitments.

Our city is economically robust compared to most others. We are in the midst of a development boom that surpasses by far all other cities in North America, but even our heated market has limits. What is the unholy rush? We have lands on the waterfront in the East Bayfront and north of the Keating

This image from the original winning design for the Lower Don Lands shows a kayaker in the Keating Channel. The site encompasses 1,000 acres.

acres of parkland. It is about our capability to create a very special place where land meets water and the Don River enters the harbour and Lake Ontario, place for Torontonians and visitors to enjoy and share.

Council never voted to kill the plan for the Lower Don Lands and I would urge councillors to insist on an update on the progress of this study and its findings before this latest version goes too far. Let’s get the approved scheme back on the preferred starting point and do the one simple study that was never done which is to examine how it could be refined to deal with new technical inputs and phased in over a realistic time frame without sacrificing its quality.

Great cities do not seek to simply “monetize” their waterfront assets by unloading public land in the most exp
Background

The Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) was initiated in 2005 by Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and Waterfront Toronto as a key deliverable necessary to facilitate the regeneration of the Toronto Waterfront. The DMNP EA will transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a more naturalized river outlet, and eliminate the risk of flooding from the Don River to lands east and south of the river.

After consultation with regulators, stakeholders, and the public, a preferred alternative was chosen and the EA was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval in December 2010. The EA was amended in April of 2011 as part of the MOE review process to address comments received from stakeholders during the 30 day public review period. The remainder of the EA review process was paused in July 2011, prior to the completion of the MOE review and release of the EA amendments.

Public consultation was a primary objective of the PLAI and as a result, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and TRCA held several meetings with members of the public, a stakeholder advisory committee, and a Port Lands landowner and user advisory committee.

The PLAI resulted in an amended concept design based on the original preferred alternative from the DMNP EA. A key recommendation of the PLAI was the creation of an implementation plan that phases development, which allows for high infrastructure costs to potentially be offset by revenue generated from development.

For more information on the results of the PLAI, go to the Port Lands Consultation website:

http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca

Port Lands Acceleration Initiative

On September 21, 2011, Toronto City Council unanimously adopted a protocol, later to be called the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), to review the City's priorities for the Port Lands. In October 2011, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto and TRCA initiated planning on the PLAI. The PLAI included technical studies undertaken for land use assessments, flood modeling, value engineering studies, and funding mechanism studies. Ultimately, the goal of the initiative was to deliver a strategy for accelerating development and maximizing the value of the Port Lands as a unique city legacy.

Toronto City Council resolved on October 5, 2012 that the DMNP EA should be amended to reflect the results of the PLAI. The Ministry of Environment approved a further extension of the EA review pause until September 2013, in order to incorporate the amended concept design as the preferred alternative in the DMNP EA and to conduct appropriate consultation.

In the fall of 2012, TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto, developed a work program to amend the 2011 document to reflect the alignment and phasing strategy from the PLAI and to be coordinated with the amendment process for the Lower Don Lands Class EA.

As a part of the amendment process, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and TRCA have held meetings with a community liaison/stakeholder advisory committee, the Port Lands landowner and user advisory committee, and will be holding a public meeting on July 24, 2013 to present the DMNP EA amendment results and obtain feedback.
Q-2 Community Liaison Committee (CLC)
Meeting Materials and Minutes
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting purpose:

- To review the role of the CLC for new CLC members
- To review the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
- To update the CLC on the results of the technical screening to date
- To seek feedback on the presentation to be given to the public at Public Forum #3 on December 5, 2006

Feedback from CLC members:

- Presentation delivered by the consultant team was clear and straightforward
- A number of suggestions were made to make the presentation even more clear to members of the public participating at the December public meeting (e.g. clarifying terminology, adding graphics and/or photos, giving people a better sense of scale when looking at cross-sections, etc.)
- CLC members had heard very positive feedback from participants on the site walk – it helped people get a sense of the complexity of the project
Members Present:
Julie Beddoes West Don Land Committee
Carmela Canzonieri Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Dennis Findlay Port Lands Action Committee
Bogna Jaworski Task Force to Bring Back the Don
Clay McFayden Toronto Cycling Committee
Susan McMaster Woodgreen Community Services
Sharon Poitras Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
Kenn Ross Miziwe Biik
Blake Webb Office of George Smitherman, MPP
David White Parkdale Waterfront Group

Guests Present:
Michael Rosenberg Economy and Environment Coalition
Sharon Howarth

Staff and Consultants Present:
Ken Dion Toronto and Region Conservation
Adele Freeman Toronto and Region Conservation
Don Haley Toronto and Region Conservation
Deborah Martin-Downs Toronto and Region Conservation
Amy Thurston Toronto and Region Conservation
Michelle Vanderwel Toronto and Region Conservation
Nicole Swerhun Facilitator
Christopher Glaisek Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation
Pina Mallozzi Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation
Brenda Webster Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation
Steve Willis Toronto Waterfront Joint Venture
Anneliese Grieve SENES
Dale Leadbeater Gartner Lee Limited
Paul Murray Gartner Lee Limited
Jayne Naiman City of Toronto, Waterfront Project Secretariat
1.0 WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND EA TOR STATUS

Adele Freeman, Director of Watershed Management, TRCA, welcomed everyone and thanked the participants for attending the meeting. Ms. Freeman welcomed the new members and briefly outlined the role of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA). Brief introductions were made by all team members and meeting participants.

Ms. Freeman described the role of the CLC as follows. TRCA chose to set up a CLC for the DMNP Project based on the advice of members of the CLC for the Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project Class EA. CLCs are required for Class EAs but are optional for individual EAs such as that for the DMNP Project. The board report to the TRCA Authority outlining this process was made available to all meeting participants. All organizations that had previously appointed members to the CLC for the Terms of Reference stage of the DMNP project were contacted and asked to reconfirm their participation and reappoint CLC members.

The functions of the CLC are to:

- Identify items of public concern and interest with regard to the impact and design of the proposed alternatives
- Provide direct input on the proposed alternatives to the Conservation Authority throughout the planning and design process
- Assist in the design of the public consultation framework
- Attend and assist at public meetings organized by the Authority to facilitate the resolution of concerns relating to the proposed project
- Disseminate information

Ms. Freeman then gave a brief summary of the EA. The EA Terms of Reference (ToR) for the DMNP Project were approved by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) in August 2006. Ms. Freeman thanked the CLC members who deputed at City Hall and/or sent comment in to the MOE on the ToR. MOE complimented TRCA on the clarity of the ToR submission and made specific note of the icons used to describe the alternatives, a suggestion made by CLC member Clay McFayden.

2.0 SITE WALK #2 – OCTOBER 14, 2006

Adele Freeman updated the CLC on the public site walk and boat cruise held in October. More than 180 people attended, which was almost the capacity for the boat cruise. The weather was a challenge, with everything from sun, wind, rain and hail experienced. A number of CLC members attended the event, which was highly successful and well-enjoyed by those that provided feedback after the event. CLC members were encouraged to suggest any ideas for future public site visits.
3.0 PUBLIC MEETING (DECEMBER 5, 2006) ARRANGEMENTS

Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator, described the plans for the December 5 Public Forum. The event will be a combination of a presentation and an open house. The presentation will be the one shown to the CLC tonight, subject to any changes made in response to CLC suggestions. Since this work is of a technical nature, little discussion is expected; rather, questions and clarification may be needed. Tonight, the CLC’s input into whether the presentation is clear and “digestible” would be most valuable.

The team anticipates 50 to 200 people will attend. There will be approximately 10 stations for the Open House for people to walk around, check out the visuals and talk to staff from TRCA, TWRC, the consulting team and other experts. Michael Moir of York University is confirmed to present the industrial history of the area, as he did at the Site Walk.

CLC feedback was requested on the proposed focus questions for the Public Forum. The team doesn’t anticipate many comments on the technical data but expects questions and comments on the criteria. There will be an information station on this issue.

4.0 DON MOUTH NATURALIZATION AND PORT LANDS FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT UPDATE

Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Limited, began the presentation. As the material breaks clearly into three topics, questions were requested to be held until the end of each of the three sections.

The first section of the presentation described the study area, project goals and objectives. It then outlined the five step process for the EA. The first step is to develop a long list of alternatives based on discharge points, river characteristics, channel shape (cross-sections) and habitat types. Step 2 is to determine what works technically and is the focus for this presentation. The four alternative discharge points identified during the EA ToR phase were reintroduced: single discharge point to the Inner Harbour (Alternative #2), single discharge point to the Ship Channel (Alternative #3), two discharge points with primary channel to the Inner Harbour (Alternative #4W), and two discharge points with primary channel to the Ship Channel (Alternative #4S). The “Do Nothing” alternative required as part of all EAs also remains for the EA process to evaluate the various alternatives against. Five different channel cross-sections, typical of river mouths along the north shore of Lake Ontario are also identified as follows: lacustrine, riverine, created wetland, combination lacustrine/riverine, and lacustrine/created wetland cross-sections.

4.1 EA Step 1: Questions, Comments & Advice

Responses, where provided, are written in italics.
(J. Beddoes): Some of the cross-sections show high banks and deep valleys for the river channel. How would such high banks be created?

A: The height of the banks will be in the area of a few metres.

(S. McMaster): The slides refer to “average flow”. What is the “average flow”? When does the “average” flow occur?

A: “Average flow” is the volume of water you see in the river under normal base flow conditions.

(C. McFayden): You will need to explain the “5-year flood level” better.

(C. Canzonieri): A sense of scale is needed so that it is easier for the public to understand this presentation.

A: We will add that. The width of the channel is about 300 m with the depth only a few metres. Significant vertical exaggeration is used in these generic images. We can include a picture of a person in the image to give a sense of vertical scale.

Dale Leadbeater, Gartner Lee Limited, presented the middle portion of the presentation, on habitats.

The project team began with an almost infinite number of possibilities for habitat options. As the area is not the same as it was historically (area is landfill, air and water quality have decreased, soils are different, different species are present, etc.), other north shore Lake Ontario sites were examined as potential templates for the Don Mouth. Six habitat types were identified as most often occurring: submergent marsh, emergent marsh, meadow marsh, thicket swamp, treed swamp and upland forest. These habitats form a gradient of decreasing amounts and periods of standing water. Marshes contain herbaceous plants and are either permanently (submergent) or frequently (emergent) flooded. Marsh meadows are also frequently flooded, but with sufficient periods of time between floods to allow some shrub-like vegetation to establish. Swamps contain some woody plants and are dry for part of the year. Upland forests can sustain infrequent floods (approximately every five to ten years) but are otherwise dry.

Ms. Leadbeater identified two key factors to consider when making decisions about which habitat types would work best with the different river channel cross sections being considered. Two key factors to consider include:

- Water depth: Because Don River water is so cloudy, plants will only grow in the river if the water is no more than 40 – 50 cm deep during regular flow. Deeper water will prevent light from penetrating to allow germination of seeds and growth of seedlings.
- “Roughness”: This is defined as the amount of resistance to water a vegetation community provides. Here, a threshold value exists; big floods can pass unimpeded until vegetation reaches this value, at which point water flow is expected to be impeded during flood events.
Therefore, the long list of possible mouth locations, cross-sections and habitat types could be narrowed down by determining combinations of these factors that will not allow the vegetation to grow or would impede water during a high precipitation event, exacerbating flooding.

Screening the single channel options (alternatives 2 and 3), no lacustrine cross-section could work, as the water level would always be above 0.5 m. Natural river channel cross-sections also would not work, as the water would not overflow the deepest portion of the channel except during quite rare flooding events. As the Regulatory Flood volume would be ten to twenty times that usually in the Don, the channel would be quite wide and deep for the overflow portion. This cross-section was therefore screened out as not meeting the naturalization objective, since the river needs to flood on a regular basis to create wetland habitat. While the treed swamp and upland forest habitats could take hold in this dry area, trees offer too much resistance to a large flood. Therefore, these habitat types would not meet the flood protection objective and this cross-section in its entirety was excluded as a viable option.

The matrix table presented to the CLC (see attached presentation, page 12) showed the options that were screened out and the twelve options that can be considered for the two single-channel options.

For the two primary channel with overflow spillway (4W and 4S) options, the size of the primary channel can be reduced, as the overflow channel would be designed to convey the volume of water under the Regulatory Flood. The lacustrine cross-section continues to not be feasible, as the water is still too deep for any vegetation other than Submerged Marsh, and this vegetation is too vulnerable to siltation to be sustainable. The lacustrine cross-section was therefore dropped from the options for these alternatives. Page 13 of the attached presentation details the 24 options that remain under alternatives 4W and 4S.

Ms. Leadbeater clarified that under 4W and 4S, only the primary channel would contain water flow during normal conditions. While some lake water will spill into the overflow spillway, only during a flooding event would the spillway contain water.

4.2 Habitats: Questions, Comments & Advice

(J. Beddoes): Will turbidity change as the water quality upstream is improved?
A: Yes, for coarse sediments but little change will be seen in fine sediments. These are very difficult to remove.
A (D. Martin-Downs): Turbidity is also due to algal growth from nutrient inputs. While the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan (WWF) might be expected to decrease nutrient input and therefore algal growth, this change would be slow, possibly results would be seen in 25 years. We cannot say at this time how much turbidity may be affected by WWF.

(C. Canzonieri): Be sure to use clear language regarding 4W and 4S options. Rather than stating that “a split channel is not possible” say that it is not possible to have two wet channels at all times.
A: Thank you, we will do that.
Paul Murray then continued the presentation, discussing the next steps for the project. Page 14 of the attached presentation details the 14 possible combinations of cross-sections and alternatives plus the habitat types that work for each. This number will be reduced to 5 to allow the process of narrowing down to a single preferred alternative to be successful. Fleshing out the details of the 14 options will allow further screening against all project objectives to reduce these options to 5 alternatives.

The detailing of the alternatives will include looking at the possibility of landforms in particular locations to control flooding, control of the heavier particles of sediment and managing contaminated soils.

To reduce the options from 14 to 5, criteria to screen the options need to be developed. See Attachment 2 for the proposed criteria. The CLC, public and agencies are being asked to provide comment on these criteria.

The timeline for the EA was provided on page 18 of the presentation. We are now at the end of Step 2. After incorporating public feedback on the criteria and proceeding with our analyses, we expect to come back to the public at the end of Step 4, anticipated to be in the spring of 2007.

4.3 Next Steps: Questions, Comments & Advice

(C. McFayden): What is the timeline when this will be built?
A (A. Freeman): Optimistically, construction will commence in 2010 with some potential for preliminary soils prep work starting in 2009.
A (S. Willis): There are approvals required beyond the EA, property issues, matters of funding, etc. that must be worked out. It is a very complex process. 2010 is ambitious but doable.
A (A. Freeman): There may be a phased approach.

(S. Poitras): Feedback received from local residents I talked to during the boat tour suggested that they were unaware of the complexity of the project. The boat tour helped to make clear how complex the project is.
A (P. Murray): There is another site tour planned. Likely this will be in the early summer, when we have a short list of the alternatives. We could then stake out the areas on the ground to illustrate them.

(S. McMaster): I suggest clarifying how the matrix on page 14 shows 14 options. Also, with the complexity of the infrastructure issue, I suggest using three or four slides to describe the issues.

(B. Webb): What is the timeline for approval of the EA?
A (A. Freeman): We hope to submit the EA to the MOE for approval in March 2008 and optimistically anticipate approvals to be received in late 2008.

(B. Webb): When are the public consultation points?
A (A. Freeman): There will be three more, at least. We will also be presenting this material to individual groups beyond the formal public meetings.
A (N. Swerhun): The approximate dates are available in the project newsletter (distributed at the meeting). The Site Walk scheduled for the fall of 2007 may be moved up to the late-spring or early summer.

(J. Beddoes): Has there been contact with the media? There are many articles suggesting that nothing is happening on the Toronto waterfront.
A (A. Freeman): We are working on this, in cooperation with TWRC.

Nicole Swerhun questioned whether the CLC understood all of the presentation, and participants confirmed that they had and complimented Dale Leadbeater on her engaging presentation style.

(S. Poitras): Was a clear definition given for lacustrine?
A (N. Swerhun): No, we should add one.

(C. Canzonieri): More visuals are needed for interest.
(J. Beddoes): The scale of the banks seems exaggerated, as though they were 100 m in height.
(C. McFayden): For the overflow landform, a diagram showing the water going one way, then with the overflow channel containing water during a flood would be helpful.
A (P. Murray): We can address these changes.

5.0 CLC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS REGARDING DMNP EA DISCUSSION

Dale Leadbeater suggested stations showing the volume of water in Regulatory Flood levels as compared to base flow rates, plus a sample of Don River water to show its turbidity. Deb Martin-Downs suggested fish and wildlife photos. Don Haley suggested and will provide a chart showing the change in the height of the lake over time and a graph showing the fluctuations of the river level. Clay McFayden suggested adding in the periodicity with which the DVP floods. Ken Dion clarified that the August 19, 2005 storm was a 1 in 5 year event; a canister showing this level will be added to Ms. Leadbeater's display.

Sharon Poitras asked about the question period and its facilitation. Nicole Swerhun clarified that as facilitator, she will be responsible to make certain that all those wishing to ask questions will be given a chance, and no one will be permitted to monopolize the question period. The Open House will also allow one-on-one discussions with the project team. Public Forum and Open House proceedings are summarized and these notes will be posted on the project website.

CLC discussion then focused on the timing of the event. It was agreed to begin the presentation at 7:00 pm, allow 45 minutes to one hour plus questions, and return to the Open House afterward at 8:30 pm.
6.0 NEW BUSINESS

Christopher Glaisek, Vice President Planning and Design, TWRC, questioned what the CLC thought of a plan to bring in international design teams, similar to the Central Waterfront Design Competition held earlier, to help bring in an over-riding vision that brings together the Don Mouth Naturalization Project and all the other adjacent and overlapping projects (i.e. East Bayfront, Commissioners Park, roadway and transit EA).

Sharon Poitras raised a concern that members of the public may fixate on a particular visual as what they want, even though the details are not yet worked out for it. Adele Freeman clarified that the Task Force to Bring Back the Don’s visual has been around for a long time and is often presented as what’s going to happen at the mouth - although it far predated the current EA. Don Haley expressed concern that visuals should not be presented for options that are not technically feasible. Chris clarified that the intent of the competition is to stimulate a vision for this area to consolidate the planning efforts of the various ongoing projects, and that any concepts that win the competition, must undergo and meet the same rigorous technical evaluation standards that all alternatives being considered through the EA process. Even if a particular design does not meet the evaluation criteria set out by the EA, components of that design may be incorporated in one or more of the remaining alternatives.

Ken Dion asked CLC members whether any of their groups had newsletters being released shortly. Dennis Findlay confirmed that PLAC will send out the Public Forum notice as soon as it is received (it is being finalized and is expected to be released November 22).

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Adele Freeman thanked the CLC members for attending this meeting and the Gartner Lee team for providing this presentation. Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Attachments:
1. Presentation: Community Liaison Committee: Meeting #5
2. Comparative Criteria Evaluation Table for Step 4

Meeting minutes taken by Michelle Vanderwel.
## Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Step 4 – Reduce List to 5 Alternative Methods

Please send your comments by DECEMBER 21, 2006 to:
Marc Rose, Gartner Lee Ltd. Email: mrose@gartnerlee.com; Phone: 905-477-8400, ext. 388; Fax: 905-477-1456
AND
Michelle Vanderwel, Toronto and Region Conservation. Email: mvanderwel@trca.on.ca; Phone: 416-661-6600, ext. 5280; Fax: 416-667-6278

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Naturalization</td>
<td>1.1 Sediment</td>
<td>1.1.1 Potential for sedimentation to influence diversity (resilience) of sustainable vegetation communities</td>
<td>Degree of turbidity</td>
<td>Turbidity affects the ability of plants to survive. Plant survival also depends on the amount of sedimentation accumulating on the substrate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of sediment deposition in offline wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Hydraulics and Hydrology</td>
<td>1.2.1 Potential for hydraulics and hydrology to affect sustainability of vegetation communities</td>
<td>Frequency and duration of flooding conditions</td>
<td>Wetland communities must be inundated with water seasonally or permanently in order to survive. The type of wetland community that will grow is dependent on frequency and duration of flooding conditions and the depth of water during floods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of water during flooding conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Geomorphology</td>
<td>1.3.1 Potential for diversity of geomorphological forms</td>
<td>Variation of geomorphological forms within channel bed</td>
<td>The diversity of wetland and aquatic vegetation communities increases with the diversity of geomorphology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Water Quality</td>
<td>1.4.1 Potential for light penetration to affect naturalization opportunities for aquatic vegetation</td>
<td>Cross-sectional area with water depth greater than 0.5 metres</td>
<td>The maximum depth of aquatic vegetation depends upon light penetration in the water column. Given the turbidity of this section of the Don River, most plants cannot grow in depths greater than 0.5 metres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Aquatic Species and Habitat (lake and river)</td>
<td>1.5.1 Potential for negative and/or beneficial effect on aquatic species of federal, provincial and local concern, and on their critical habitat</td>
<td>The area of habitat created / protected to support species of federal, provincial and local concern</td>
<td>The greater the area of habitat created, the more likely that it is able to support the species that are being protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.2 Potential for loss and/or improvement to aquatic habitat function</td>
<td>The number and total area of potential / existing habitat types for fish</td>
<td>Submerged and emergent marshes provide critical habitat for distinct communities of fish. The total area and number of habitat types contributes greatly to the ability of the alternatives to support fish and communities, as plant community and species richness of wetlands tends to increase with increasing area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.3 Potential to maintain passage for migratory aquatic species</td>
<td>Width and depth of river channel</td>
<td>Migratory fish require access to upstream spawning and nursery habitat to reproduce. The width and depth of the river channel must be sufficient to accommodate this migration. As well, the presence of instream features, such as weirs, can impede fish movement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of barriers to fish migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Terrestrial Species and Habitat</td>
<td>1.6.1 Potential for negative and/or beneficial effect on terrestrial species/communities of federal, provincial and local concern and on their critical habitat</td>
<td>The area of habitat created / protected to support species of federal, provincial and local concern</td>
<td>(Same as 1.5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.2 Potential for loss and/or improvement to terrestrial wildlife habitat function</td>
<td>The number and total area of potential habitat types for birds and amphibians</td>
<td>Birds and amphibians are well studied and are easy to census, and are therefore suitable indicators for determining habitat quality and function. The shape and area of each habitat patch determines its ability to support wildlife species. Circular-shaped patches are most conducive to supporting wildlife habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The shape and area of habitat patches for birds and amphibians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3 Potential to maximize landscape connectivity for terrestrial species</td>
<td>The length and width of connected north-south area available for naturalization with terrestrial vegetation</td>
<td>The Don River provides opportunities for a north-south movement corridor for migrating birds. Enhancing the quality of this corridor requires minimizing the gaps between habitat patches and increasing the overall size of each habitat patch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity of corridor to important natural areas outside of study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Flood protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hydraulics and Hydrology</strong></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Potential to impact flooding conditions elsewhere</td>
<td>Extent of flooding outside the floodplain</td>
<td>During Step 1 of the E.A, the alternative methods were optimized such that they could convey the Regulatory flood within the defined floodplain. However, the addition of infrastructure, recreational features, and habitat types during Step 3 may influence flood conveyance and result in flooding outside the floodplain. Alternatives that can convey the flood within the floodplain are preferred over those that cannot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect/improvement on the existing local community due to change in flood risk</td>
<td>Number and type of existing uses within Spill Zones 1 and 2 removed from flood risk</td>
<td>Removal of flood risk from Spill Zones 1 and 2 is one of the main objectives of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Potential for loss of developable land as a result of flood protection works</td>
<td>Amount of developable land within project footprint</td>
<td>The development potential of land within the project footprint may be limited depending on the nature of flood protection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect/improvement on planned and proposed land uses</td>
<td>Amount of planned and proposed development within project footprint</td>
<td>Planned and proposed development may be affected by flood protection, depending on the nature of flood protection works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Socio-economics</strong></td>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect/improvement on the local infrastructure due to change in flood risk</td>
<td>Amount (length and area) of existing infrastructure within floodplain</td>
<td>All infrastructure located within the floodplain may be affected by flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Potential for intermittent flooding of infrastructure</td>
<td>Amount of infrastructure located below water level associated with 2 year flood / 5 year flood / 10 year flood</td>
<td>The height of infrastructure compared to flood levels will determine the potential for intermittent flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect/improvement on planned and proposed infrastructure due to change in flood risk</td>
<td>Amount (length and area) of proposed infrastructure within floodplain</td>
<td>(Same as 2.3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Ability to accommodate potential changes in extreme precipitation and water flows resulting from climate change</td>
<td>Maximum volume of water that can be conveyed within floodplain</td>
<td>It is likely that the volume of water associated with the Regulatory Flood will increase due to climate change. The floodplain should be sized to accommodate such increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>Cost to implement the flood protection alternatives</td>
<td>Cost of constructing new river mouth</td>
<td>The cost of constructing the new river mouth will vary greatly, depending on the discharge point and the complexity of geomorphologic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>Annual operations and maintenance costs</td>
<td>Cost of flood protection activities</td>
<td>Flood protection activities include dredging, and ice and debris removal. These costs will vary depending on the discharge point and the recreational and habitat features associated with the river mouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Operational Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sediment</strong></td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Potential to manage sediment without impact on naturalized area</td>
<td>Number of sediment management locations within naturalized areas</td>
<td>The greater the number of sediment management locations within naturalized areas, the greater the potential impact. In addition, the area of naturalization that is within the footprint of sediment management also has the potential to be impacted, depending on the type of management proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area of naturalization within footprint of sediment management locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of sediment management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Debris</strong></td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect of debris management on naturalization</td>
<td>Number of debris management locations within naturalized areas</td>
<td>(Same as 3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area of naturalization within footprint of debris management locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of debris management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ice</strong></td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effect of ice management on naturalization</td>
<td>Number of ice management locations</td>
<td>(Same as 3.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area of naturalization within footprint of ice management locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of ice management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Step 4 – Reduce List to 5 Alternative Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Socio-economics</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effects/improvement to existing and proposed recreational opportunities as a result of operational management activities</td>
<td>Extent of recreational features within management areas</td>
<td>The use of recreational features may be affected by management of sediment, debris, and ice, depending on the frequency and location of management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>Potential for navigation of river mouth</td>
<td>Dimensions (depth, length, and width) of river mouth Elevation of bridges and other horizontal infrastructure compared to water elevation</td>
<td>Navigation of the river mouth may be necessary for dredging. The dimensions of the river mouth will affect the ability of a scow to travel upstream, as will the elevation of bridges and other infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integration with Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.1 Socio-economics</td>
<td>Potential for nuisance effects (noise, dust, accessibility) on local community due to infrastructure modification/relocation</td>
<td>Proximity of community features to proposed modification/relocation of infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure modification/relocation has the potential to create significant nuisance effects for businesses and other uses within the vicinity of the construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Rail, Road and Utilities Infrastructure</td>
<td>Potential for adverse effects/improvements to recreational opportunities as a result of infrastructure modification/relocation</td>
<td>Total area dedicated to recreation that is displaced by infrastructure</td>
<td>Certain recreational features, such as the Martin Goodman Trail, may be temporarily or permanently displaced by changes to infrastructure, such as removal of the Gardiner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recreational and Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td>5.1 Hydraulics and Hydrology</td>
<td>Potential for flooding of recreational amenities</td>
<td>Footprint of recreational features within floodplain</td>
<td>Any recreational features located within the floodplain have the potential to be flooded, albeit infrequently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat</td>
<td>Potential for changes to use of river mouth for boating</td>
<td>Compatibility of recreational boating with naturalization</td>
<td>Naturalized areas will limit the amount of the river mouth that can be used for recreational boating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Air Quality</td>
<td>Potential for air emissions (dust) to affect recreational users</td>
<td>Proximity of construction to recreational opportunities</td>
<td>Dust associated with construction activities (i.e., truck traffic, grading, etc.) may affect recreational users such as cyclists.</td>
<td>(Same as 5.3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>Potential for noise effects</td>
<td>Proximity of construction to recreational opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 Public Health</td>
<td>Effects of aquatic habitat on West Nile Virus transmission</td>
<td>Number of offline wetlands and proximity to recreational/cultural features Areas of standing water, such as offline wetlands, are breeding grounds for mosquitoes and therefore may facilitate transmission of West Nile Virus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 Socio-economics</td>
<td>Potential for change in landscape or views</td>
<td>Extent of terrestrial habitat that acts as visual buffer</td>
<td>Depending on their placement, terrestrial habitat such as upland forest communities may help to screen out industrial uses of the Port Lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6.1</td>
<td>Opportunity to enhance/degrade existing and proposed pedestrian/cycling linkages</td>
<td>Length of new pedestrian/cycling trails</td>
<td>Among the recreational features that will be considered as part of a revitalized river mouth include new pedestrian and cycling trails that will link the Port Lands to the Martin Goodman Trail, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.3</td>
<td>Potential for marine-based recreation opportunities</td>
<td>Dimensions (depth, length, and width) of river mouth in context of navigable waterway</td>
<td>Canoeists and kayakers currently use the Don River for recreational purposes. The revitalized river mouth should maintain this recreational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.4</td>
<td>Potential to create recreational linkages with adjacent / nearby parks and open spaces</td>
<td>Extent of linkages to Commissioners Park, parks within East Bayfront Precinct Plan, and Lake Ontario Park</td>
<td>There are a number of proposed parks in the Port Lands and East Bayfront areas. The revitalized river mouth should enhance the linkages between the network of parks, as suggested in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Potential for infrastructure modification/relocation to enhance/impact recreational and cultural opportunities</td>
<td>Amount of land available for recreational / cultural features due to modification / relocation of infrastructure</td>
<td>Modification or relocation of infrastructure, including roads, rail lines, etc., has the potential to increase the amount of land available for recreational and / or cultural purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.1</td>
<td>Potential to create cultural opportunities around archaeological resources</td>
<td>Number of archaeological resources within footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>As demonstrated in the East Bayfront Precinct Plan, redevelopment of the waterfront, including the river mouth, into a cultural focal point should incorporate archaeological resources wherever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.2</td>
<td>Potential to create cultural opportunities around built heritage resources</td>
<td>Number of built heritage resources within footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>(Same as 5.8.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.3</td>
<td>Potential for effect from construction of naturalized area on traditional uses of lands by Aboriginal peoples</td>
<td>Extent of traditional uses of lands within footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>The revitalized river mouth must respect and wherever possible enhance traditional uses of lands by Aboriginal peoples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.4</td>
<td>Potential for effect from construction of naturalized area on archaeological resources</td>
<td>Significance of archaeological resources within footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>Depending on the nature of the archaeological resources, it may be necessary to relocate such resources prior to construction of naturalized areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8.5</td>
<td>Potential for effect from construction of naturalized area on built heritage resources</td>
<td>Significance of built heritage resources within footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>(Same as 5.8.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1</td>
<td>Potential to facilitate and integrate with planned and proposed land use change</td>
<td>Consistency with land use designations from Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, East Bayfront Precinct Plan, and other relevant approved planning documents</td>
<td>The revitalized river mouth must be consistent with other plans for the study area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2</td>
<td>Potential for removal of, or changes to, existing land use change to existing land uses.</td>
<td>Number and type of displaced land uses</td>
<td>The footprint of the revitalized river mouth will result in a change to existing land uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3</td>
<td>Potential for disruption effects on the planned and proposed surrounding community</td>
<td>Location of operational management areas in relation to planned and proposed land uses</td>
<td>Ongoing management of sediment, ice, and debris may negative impact future users of the Port Lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>Opportunity for visual integration with future development plans for the area</td>
<td>Consistency with urban design component of future development plans</td>
<td>The vision for the waterfront is driven by the need for inspiring urban design. The revitalized river mouth must be consistent with this vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Potential for disturbance of contaminated soils</td>
<td>Area of contaminated soils to be managed / remediated for the project</td>
<td>Construction has the potential to disturb contaminated soils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2</td>
<td>Ability to manage contaminated soils and groundwater contamination</td>
<td>Ease of remediation / risk management</td>
<td>Preference should be given to remediation / risk management options that limit the risk to human and environmental health and safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.3</td>
<td>Constraints imposed by existing soil and groundwater contamination</td>
<td>Extent of areas where remediation or risk management is not feasible</td>
<td>It is possible that certain areas of contamination are too difficult or too costly to address within the scope of this project. These areas nonetheless pose a risk to human and environmental health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4</td>
<td>Consistency with applicable provincial legislation</td>
<td>Proximity to footprint of river mouth</td>
<td>The extent of contamination within the study area must be appropriately documented, as required by Ontario Regulation 153/04, Record of Site Condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.5</td>
<td>Cost of management of groundwater and soil contamination</td>
<td>Total cost associated with remediation or risk management</td>
<td>(Same as 5.6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Potential to create bike paths and pedestrian linkages with and between waterfront areas and the rest of the city</td>
<td>Number of new linkages created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting purpose:
To brief and seek feedback from CLC/CSC members on:

- The work completed to date to integrate the results of the Design Competition for the Lower Don Lands with the EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
- The evaluation of alternatives and the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA
- The public open house planned for Saturday, March 29, 2008

Feedback from CLC members:

- Participants indicated that they’re comfortable with the approach taken to integrate the Design Competition and Don Mouth EA projects. Several members also expressed support and appreciation for the effort made by Waterfront Toronto and the TRCA to bring the two projects together.
- Participants also said they’re very comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA (4WS).
- A number of suggestions were made regarding opportunities to refine/enhance the presentation, including: highlight the extensive consultation efforts made in 2007 (Design Competition was very public, and Don Greenway Workshop); be transparent about where costs were considered as part of the evaluation process and the influence cost had on selection of the preferred alternative; let people know
about the work that will be done on the Don Narrows; and highlight how key priorities expressed by the public through the design competition will continue to be preserved through the design stage of the EA (e.g. connections).

Members Present:
Julie Beddoes West Don Lands Committee, GWNA
Karen Buck Citizens for a Safe Environment
Moyra Haney Don Watershed Regeneration Council
David Jackson Distillery District, West Don Lands Committee
Stephen Kauffman Home Depot
Clay McFayden Toronto Cycling Committee
Aynsley Morris Task Force to Bring Back the Don
Anna Prodanou Toronto Island Community Association
David White WaterfrontAction
John Wilson Task Force to Bring Back the Don

Staff and Consultants Present:
Ken Dion Toronto and Region Conservation
Adele Freeman Toronto and Region Conservation
Don Haley Toronto and Region Conservation
Michelle Vanderwel Toronto and Region Conservation
Nicole Swerhun Facilitator
Christopher Glaisek Waterfront Toronto
Andrea Kelemen Waterfront Toronto
Marisa Piattelli Waterfront Toronto
Brenda Webster Waterfront Toronto
Ken Greenberg Greenberg Consultants
Liz Silver Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc.
Angela Wu Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc.
Paul Murray Gartner Lee Limited
Marc Rose Gartner Lee Limited
Jamie McEwan City of Toronto, Waterfront Project Secretariat
1.0 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Nicole Swerhun, facilitator, welcomed everyone to the joint meeting of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Project Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and the Lower Don Lands Community Stakeholder Committee (CSC) and explained her role as an independent facilitator. Brief introductions were made by all team members and meeting participants.

Nicole Swerhun then outlined the meeting agenda and explained that the project team wished to receive the input of meeting participants on the content and format of the Public Meeting/Open House well in advance of the March 29 meeting date. Presentations would be given in full then CLC/CSC members would be invited to ask questions and give their comments for the remainder of the meeting.

Adele Freeman, Director of Watershed Management, TRCA, also welcomed everyone and thanked the participants for attending the meeting.

2.0 UPDATE PRESENTATIONS

2.1 The Don River as a Centrepiece of Waterfront Revitalization and City-Building in Toronto

Christopher Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto, gave a presentation on the history behind the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Design Competition and how this competition fits into the DMNP EA.

The LDL Design Competition was launched not as a substitute for the EA nor to change the EA process, but to find common ground among many studies going on in the lower Don area, and to produce a compelling concept for the Lower Don Lands with the river as a central feature of an urban landscape that provides for new waterfront development and new linkages to the rest of the city. The CSC, TRCA, Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the City all provided input into the process.

Ten objectives were identified in the request for qualifications for the LDL Design Competition:
1. Naturalize the Mouth of the Don River
2. Create a Continuous Riverfront Park System
3. Provide for Harmonious New Development
4. Connect Waterfront Neighbourhoods
5. Prioritize Public Transit
6. Develop a Gateway into the Port Lands
7. Humanize Existing Infrastructure
8. Enhance the Martin Goodman Trail
9. Expand Opportunities for Interaction with the Water
10. Promote Sustainable Development

The Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc. (MVVA) team was chosen as the winning consultant team having produced a design best meeting these objectives.
Since May 2007, MVVA have worked closely with the EA team to integrate the new river alignment proposed in MVVA’s vision into the EA process such that it can be fairly evaluated against the original EA alternatives.

The EA process is continuing, and many other planning processes will follow, including: precinct planning, park design, transit planning, and others.

2.2 Outcome of Step 3 & 4 and Next Steps in the Environmental Assessment

Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Ltd., gave a presentation on the outcome of steps 3 and 4 of the Environmental Assessment and the next steps. The CLC/CSC were reminded of the project goals and objectives:

Project Goal: To establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

Project Objectives:

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed
5. Encourage additional compatible recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/handicap accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with TWRC’s Sustainability Framework and applicable provincial legislation

The study area was noted to include the Don Narrows.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the DMNP Project included four potential discharge points: a single channel to the Inner Harbour, a single channel to the Ship Channel, a primary channel to the Inner Harbour with an overflow spillway to the Ship Channel and a primary channel to the Ship Channel with an overflow spillway to the Inner Harbour. Four other discharge points were considered, but these were not selected for further consideration beyond the ToR stage as they did not meet the project goal and objectives.

It was noted that improvement of water quality was not an objective of this EA and cannot be addressed solely at the mouth of the river. However, the City is working on several projects along the Don to address water quality, including the initiation of an EA that will examine opportunities for diverting Combined Sewer Outfalls (CSO) discharges away from the Don.
CLC/CSC members were then shown slides for the original Alternatives 2, 3, 4W and 4S and the new alternative 4WS, the latter having developed through coordinated efforts of the MVVA team and TRCA/GLL team. It was noted that the ToR was drafted such that the study area could be expanded and new alternatives considered in the event that opportunities arose to do so. Each Alternative showed, in general terms, where wetlands, open space/terrestrial habitat, aquatic habitat, development area, and proposed roads, would be located. Common to all Alternatives was a primary sediment management facility in the form of a sediment trap north of Lakeshore Boulevard. Here, the channel was widened and deepened which would decrease water velocities and allow for the heaviest sediment (sand and coarse silt) to drop out and be managed at this point. Some sediment would remain entrained which may require additional management further downstream.

The four alternatives that were considered during the ToR but not carried forward as having not met the project goal and objectives were revisited. Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8 were evaluated against the goals of the Design Competition and again did not meet those goals. As such, they were again excluded from further evaluation through the EA. It was noted that Alternative 5 from the ToR at first glance appears somewhat like the new Alternative 4WS. The difference was that Alternative 5 assumed the formation of a delta marsh with no opportunities for development south of the Keating Channel. Alternative 4WS of course offers opportunities for several precincts to be built, while providing one primary channel and two overflow spillways (the Keating Channel and realigned Don Greenway into the Ship Channel). Alternatives 5, 6, 7, and 8 were evaluated against the goals of the Design Competition and again did not meet those goals. As such, they were again excluded from further evaluation through the EA.

During Step 4, the alternatives were evaluated to determine how well each alternative met the project objectives using a series of criteria and indicators that were established for each objective. An example was shown of how each alternative was evaluated against each criterion used for the Naturalization objective to develop an overall rating for that objective of least preferred, moderately preferred or most preferred. This was repeated until an overall rating for each objective could be determined for each Alternative. Each criterion and objective was considered on an equal basis (no weightings were established) during the evaluation. The overall results of the evaluation clearly depicted Alternative 4WS as being the most preferred, Alternatives 2 and 3 as moderately preferred and Alternatives 4W and 4S as the least preferred. As such, Alternative 4WS was selected as the preliminary preferred alternative.

Extensive consultation and a number of confirmatory studies are now required to solidify Alternative 4WS as being the preferred alternative. The studies include but are not limited to the following: hydrology and sediment management, management of contaminated soils and groundwater and risk analysis of the shipping lane in the area of the promontory.

A timeline was presented. Submission of the completed EA is anticipated in early 2009. The earliest date for implementation would be the end of 2010. Implementation would need to be phased over a number of years. Additional work, such as soil management plan, is required to be developed by Waterfront Toronto.

2.3 Planning the City Around a Naturalized Don River Mouth
Liz Silver, MVVA, gave a presentation on the Design Competition and the ongoing work the MVVA team has done to the design to integrate it into the EA process.

The key to this design is integration. The river is the centre of the Lower Don Lands plan. The City’s Secondary Plan included a balance between park and urbanism. This design has kept that balance while moving the actual location of areas to be developed or restored as natural habitat.

The MVVA team toured several Toronto sites and looked at park topology. Two types were identified: the square City-developed parks and the organic ravines. Their design incorporates this “organic” feeling. Images were shown to give the CLC/CSC members a feeling for how the design could look at the site. Different habitat types were shown. Recreation was shown, as integrated with the City. A gentle grade led to wetlands. Preserving the Keating Channel and moving the river led to an urbanized way to interact with the water. The promontory was developed as a landscape icon – it will be a built-up hill visible from a distance and allowing a view of the new parks and the water.

2.4 Questions, Comments & Advice

Responses, where provided, are written in italics. Answers were provided by Paul Murray, Gartner Lee, unless otherwise indicated.

Clarifications

(K. Buck): When deciding on the most preferred alternative, were any of the objectives or criteria rated as more important than others? Specifically, the ones relating to cost?
A: Objectives and criteria were not prioritized. The only place that cost comes into play is for soils and groundwater management, which is one of approximately 50 criteria used.

(K. Buck): Was cost a factor in the Operational Management and Infrastructure objective?
A: Not directly. There were some surrogates for cost used.

(J. Beddoes): My congratulations to the team. Will we be able to access the tables that show all of the criteria for each objective, and the rankings for each?
A (K. Dion): We do have the detailed tables but are still working on revising them based on feedback from various stakeholders. We will make the tables available at the March 29 event.

It was agreed that the tables would be available March 29 (perhaps in poster form). A comment period of a few weeks will follow to allow the public to give their feedback on the criteria.

(J. Wilson): What is happening with the Don Narrows?
A: The EA will look at opportunities for naturalization in the Don Narrows. During Step 5, a walk will be organized so that locations can be noted. The CLC will be involved with this walk.
A (K. Dion): The Don Narrows naturalization will be common to any alternative chosen and will be focused on improving the aquatic habitat within the channel. This area has serious
challenges as any naturalization works must not increase the frequency of flooding to the adjacent railways and DVP.

(A. Morris): Regarding the sediment trap, how does this design move us ahead of the current situation with sediment trapped in the Keating Channel and dredged out?
A: The good thing about the Keating Channel was that it worked for sediment management. We will need to replace this function, since it is too difficult to dredge in open water. Dredging will need to continue, unless a delta was allowed to form (but this option presents difficulties, as discussed above).

(A. Morris): Did the MVVA design propose the Keating Channel be closed off?
A (L. Silver): The competition version of the design had the Keating Channel open to the river. However, to integrate the design with the EA, it was necessary to close it off. There would be a weir, and possibly a pumping system would be needed for water circulation to the Harbour. The Keating Channel would be an overflow channel, receiving river water only during a flood situation.

There was discussion about the presentation. It was agreed that since several stakeholder meetings are still upcoming, it would not be possible to release the presentation to CLC/CSC members at this time. The presentation, in its final form as presented at the March 29 event, will be available at that time.

(K. Buck): What is the issue with shipping that requires a confirmatory study? Is it the amount of dockwall?
A: No, it relates to the shipping lane, which the Toronto Port Authority has identified as possibly affected by the promontory that is a feature of alternative 4WS.

Facilitated Discussion Questions
1. Are you generally comfortable with the approach taken to refine the EA? Why or why not?
2. Are you generally comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative for the EA and how it was chosen? Why or why not?
3. What do you see as the two or three key issues and/or opportunities that need to be addressed prior to finalizing the EA?
4. Are there any key messages and/or additional information that would be helpful to share with the public on March 29th?
5. Do you have any other advice for the TRCA or Waterfront Toronto?

(J. Wilson): I suggest that during the public presentation, you continue to emphasize the consultation on the design competition and the Don Greenway, so that the public is aware that there has been consultation over the last year.

(J. Wilson): Regarding the presentation that was done on the ToR, with slides repeated here – it would be helpful to explain how the habitat types and river cross-sections apply to 4WS.

(K. Buck): At every public forum, it is important to have a session where all of the public is together and able to ask questions of the EA team. Everyone needs to hear what others say.
(A. Freeman): The March 29 event will be held on a Saturday, from 10 am to 3 pm, with the presentation at 11 am followed by a question/answer session with the EA team for about 30 minutes. The EA team will then be available for the rest of the day for more specific questions from individuals.

There was general agreement among CLC/CSC members that they were comfortable with the preliminary preferred alternative. However, concern was raised that perhaps some of the public may not be, especially those that had raised the vision of a delta or other visions that were not carried forward in the EA.

(A. Morris): Has there been any analysis for Alternatives 5 through 8 that can be shown to those that question the exclusion of these alternatives?
A: Yes, we can provide this information during the individual question/answer period to anyone who asks.

(K. Buck): A strength of this analysis was that the Design Competition was then brought into the EA and the design modified to fulfill the conditions of the ToR. This needs to be emphasized in the presentation.

(C. McFayden): On the timeline slide, regarding the next steps in implementation: can you give some very general estimates of when some steps may occur?
A (C. Glaisek): We have funding for some of these steps, but not all of them. For example, it would be a few years for detailed designs to be developed. We could list estimates such as this, they would be approximations.

(D. Jackson): You will likely be asked what happened to the playing fields.
A (C. Glaisek): The MVVA design from the design competition did maintain ball fields. We held the Don Greenway workshop and were told that people preferred no formalized playing fields in the Don Greenway. They can be put elsewhere, for instance in Lake Ontario Park. There will still be the same number of fields created, but their location is not yet decided.

(D. Jackson): You need to emphasize that there has been a public process for this.

(J. Beddoes): Regarding further work, people may ask what will happen if the confirmatory studies suggest the preliminary preferred alternative will not be viable.
A: We would anticipate that the alternative may need refinement during this stage rather than being completely ruled out.
A (K. Dion): We have done some preliminary study, so we do expect the confirmatory studies will not result in any surprises.

(D. Jackson): Regarding public access to the water and connectivity – this was an important element in the original MVVA design. Is the element of how the community interacts with the water still maintained?
A (A. Freeman): We are working to complete the EA and this work is being done in collaboration with MVVA. Anything that is suggested in the EA that may impact accessibility will be identified by MVVA.
A: During the next stage of the EA, the design will be developed further. Accessibility will be addressed at a more detailed level as the project progresses.

(D. Jackson): It is important to explicitly state that the EA and the MVVA design process each have goals but that they are complementary rather than compromising each other.
A (L. Silver): As we work with the EA team, questions such as are key drivers. (?)

Adele Freeman pointed out that during the West Don Lands project, TRCA staff have worked during the detailed design and implementation phases of the project to ensure that the components of the EA are not compromised. Similar monitoring would happen during these phases of the DMNP Project.

(J. Beddoes): Be sure to highlight public access during the meeting. Although it’s not part of the EA, it is important to the public to emphasize that, for instance, there will be lots of routes into the area so roads won’t be overloaded. People will not separate this EA and the process of what else is going on in the area.

(K. Buck): Emphasize that the ToR was approved before the MVVA design, and the fit has been made with this design and the ToR. Also, note that the design competition had quotas for greenspace, development, etc.

(K. Buck): Keeping the Keating Channel was a plus, as it is a cost-saver and it joins the lower Don to downtown.

(C. McFayden): The two projects flow into each other but the public won’t see the areas beyond the lower Don. An image would help (B. Webster confirmed that a suitable image could be provided).

(J. Wilson): The drawings do not show any greenspace south of the Ship Channel to link to Lake Ontario Park. Although there was text, it should be emphasized. A (A. Freeman): We can do that, without putting it in a specific location, since we are not yet sure where exactly it would be on the ground.

There was discussion on when a walk of the Don Narrows could occur with CLC/CSC members. It was suggested that the fourth weekend in May would work best (May 24 or 25, 2008). The suggested format was to meet along the banks of the Don, hear a one-half hour introduction on the project, walk the Narrows with various experts providing talks along the way for a few hours, then an afternoon session would involve a workshop. The MVVA team would also be present. CLC/CSC members suggested that the following agencies provide input: Hydro One, Enbridge Gas, Toronto Works, Toronto Water, Toronto Transportation, NECP (Natural Environment & Community Programs, Toronto Parks), neighbourhood associations, local Councillors, the cycling community, and the pedestrian community (although an appropriate organization to represent pedestrians was not known by CLC/CSC members).

Adele Freeman clarified that the EA will focus on the area within the banks of the Don Narrows. However, any issues that arise during the walk of the area will be noted and there may be other avenues to address the issue.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT
Adele Freeman thanked the CLC/CSC members for attending this meeting. All members were encouraged to attend the March 29 event and to forward the notice of the event to their contacts. Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Meeting minutes taken by Michelle Vanderwel.
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting purpose:
• To present and receive feedback on the draft joint presentation for the May 9th Public Forum

Feedback from CLC members:
• Give more details on the hydrology models used
• Show model results side-by-side
• Use the term “lengthen” rather than “widen” when referring to the Lakeshore bridge
• Explain the difference between river-fed and lake-fed systems
• Use bigger and brighter graphics and images
• Make sure language is consistent throughout the presentation
• Provide a glossary of terms
• Give more detail on the project’s next steps
Members Present:
Julie Beddoes West Don Lands Committee, GWNA
Karen Buck Citizens for a Safe Environment
Robert Doumani Aird & Berlis
Dennis Findlay Port Lands Action Committee, Waterfront Action
David Fisher Transit Advocate
Moyra Haney Don Watershed Regeneration Council
Sharon Howarth Environment Advocate
Stephen Kauffman Home Depot
Clay McFayden Toronto Cycling Committee
Sylvia Pellman St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
Jane Robinson Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association
John Wilson Task Force to Bring Back the Don

Staff and Consultants Present:
Ken Dion Toronto and Region Conservation
Adele Freeman Toronto and Region Conservation
Don Haley Toronto and Region Conservation
Deb Martin-Downs Toronto and Region Conservation
Michelle Vanderwel Toronto and Region Conservation
Shari DeCarlo Waterfront Toronto
Christopher Glaisek Waterfront Toronto
Brenda Webster Waterfront Toronto
Steve Willis MMM Group
Ken Greenberg Greenberg Consultants
Gullivar Shepard Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc.
Paul Murray AECOM
Marko Prgin AECOM
Marc Rose AECOM
Michael Thompson AECOM
Karin Wall AECOM
Jennifer Tharp City of Toronto, Parks Forestry & Recreation

Facilitators Present:
Nicole Swerhun Swerhun Consulting
David Dilks LURA
1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Chris Glaisek, Vice President, Planning and Design, Waterfront Toronto welcomed everyone to the joint meeting of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Project Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC).

Chris Glaisek explained that the purpose of tonight’s meeting was to obtain guidance from the CLC/SAC on how to frame the presentation to be made May 9, 2009 to the public.

2.0 AGENDA REVIEW, MEETING PURPOSE & INTRODUCTIONS

Nicole Swerhun, facilitator, Swerhun Consulting and David Dilks, facilitator, LURA explained their roles as independent facilitators for the DMNP Project CLC and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan SAC, respectively. Brief introductions were made by all team members and meeting participants.

3.0 DON MOUTH NATURALIZATION & PORT LANDS FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT PRESENTATION

Brenda Webster, Project Manager, Waterfront Toronto, went over the purpose of the meeting, described Waterfront Toronto’s sustainability measures and the integration of the DMNP EA with other projects in the area managed by Waterfront Toronto or the City of Toronto.

Adele Freeman, Director, Watershed Management, Toronto and Region Conservation, reminded CLC/SAC members of the project’s goal and objectives and summarized the work done since the last public meeting.

Don Haley, Water Management Technical Advisor, Toronto and Region Conservation, discussed the flood protection and hydraulics aspects of the project. The results of the modelling done of flood protection measures were shown as an animation that depicted the water levels flowing through the outlets to the lake at different storm events under existing conditions and under containment by the concept design.

Deb Martin-Downs, Director Ecology, Toronto and Region Conservation, discussed the naturalization assumptions, proposed ecological communities, and interaction between hydraulics and ecology.

Ken Dion, Senior Project Manager, Toronto and Region Conservation, discussed Next Steps of the DMNP EA.

Brenda Webster then discussed the final two slides on the remediation strategy.
4.0 DISCUSSION & FEEDBACK

Responses, where provided, are recorded in *italics*. Responses are listed by the slide number as presented.

Slide 13
• Can you explain more about the question each model asked? Or are they the same?
• Show the location where each measure will be located as an inset photo of the site

Model run animation
• The peak flow graph to the left was distracting – show this another way
• A side-by-side graphic showing the comparison of the model results at the Regional Flood level without flood protection and with these measures is needed.

Slide 14
• If possible, can the old bridge which currently carries hydro wiring across the river be reused elsewhere or otherwise recognized for its historical value?

Slides 17 – 20
• A large map to show this location is needed – where are these cross-sections?

Slide 21
• Here, or preferably earlier, remind participants of the meaning of 2 year, 25 year and Regulatory Floods
• Also, give people a baseline by examples – what level is the usual summer storm? Perhaps relate to recent storm events
  *Don Haley responded that the usual storm event is less than 1 year return. As a comparison, August 19, 2005 storm that flooded DVP was between 5 and 10 year event.*
• The suggestion was made that people may wish to know the name of the models used

Slide 28
• Mention the fact that the sediment is mostly sand and is not toxic
  *Don Haley confirmed that the sediment is relatively clean and most can be reused as fill for various restoration projects*
• Make sure that what is said matches what is on the slide – e.g. sediment management was described as a “major issue” but that is not reflected in the text on the slide
• Add the picture from the site walk with all of the material dredged from the Keating Channel

Slides 29 – 32
• Please explain the term “vault”, perhaps provide pictures
• The picture of the dredger is great but needs to be shown earlier. Also recommend including image of dewatering technology.
  *Don Haley explained that there are actually two types of dredging machine.*
• Please make it clear that there are two types of dredger

Slide 33
• Please use the term “lengthen” rather than “widen” when referring to the Lakeshore bridge. Although the bridge would be wider, the roadway would be longer, and people may misinterpret this as road widening.

Slide 34
• You could clarify what is meant by “underground infrastructure” and give examples.

Slide 35
• Please explain the difference between river-fed and lake-fed systems and the significance of each

Slides 37 – 40
• Use brighter colours; don’t worry about using a natural palette
• Use bigger pictures, identify species when possible
• In the landscape communities slides, be aware that the term “swamp” has a bad connotation, so the pictures of treed swamp and thicket swamp should be larger and clearer.

Slide 42
• Riparian forest is mentioned here but not earlier – phrasing should be consistent

Slide 43
• Please make inset pictures bigger/clearer

Slides 45 – 46
• For the Next Steps, please give more detail – e.g. what is planned for 2009 onward, to whom is the EA submitted and why, what the follow-up steps to the submission of the EA are.

General comments on TRCA presentation
• Please provide a glossary of terms
• “New river mouth” was a term used late in the presentation, but it should be introduced much earlier on
• What is the status of the Special Policy Area (SPA) status for this area? This is a question that will concern developers interested in developing the area
  Adele Freeman explained that the SPA applies until flood protection is in place. Then an Official Plan amendment is needed to remove the restrictions. We will take this comment under consideration and have appropriate messaging ready for any questions on May 9.
• The Gardiner is still shown on some of these slides. You should explain how the Gardiner EA relates to this project and how a rerouting of Lakeshore might work.
  Adele Freeman explained that TRCA has been in consultation with the Gardiner team. Our outcomes inform the Gardiner EA as a new base condition for their design options. It was agreed that Waterfront Toronto would add a point on this to the introduction to this presentation.
• It would be great to be able to provide people with more visuals. At the Open House, images could be shown on laptops. Perhaps CDs could be available with some of this information and images. Renderings from more angles, if possible, would be great.
  Four topic-focused tables at the Open House can show imagery and it can be discussed in detail.
• Perhaps all thumbnail photos could be made larger
• “Morphology” is a term that was mentioned during the presentation but is a term that the public may not be familiar with
• One participant suggested reducing the number of slides but others said that the level of detail was good and not to worry about overwhelming participants with information

Slides 47 – 48
• Could you explain how contaminated soil will be remediated? What do we currently know about the soil quality?
  Brenda Webster explained that Waterfront Toronto has an RFP going out at the end of April. In May, a groundwater management staff member will be added.
  Steve Willis added that plans are to excavate the new valley to a deeper depth than required, and then to build back up with clean fill to provide a barrier between ecological zones and remaining underlying contaminated soils. Groundwater studies will be conducted to assess approach to manage movement of contaminated groundwater through area. It will be a very challenging and detailed job, but these are the basics of the plan.
• What is the expected cost for remediation, or at least to an order of magnitude? Could this be a “game stopper” for the project?
  Steve Willis replied that the work to date does show that these sites are contaminated, but local precedents exist for the type of contamination and for clean-ups, for instance the Filmport site. Studies will need to be completed, and also it must be kept in mind that technologies change what is possible and what the costs are. The techniques to be used will depend heavily on what contaminants are found – different technologies are used for gasoline contamination versus heavy metals. We are using quite conservative numbers at this point, but an examination of costs is part of the ongoing studies.

5.0 LOWER DON LANDS MUNICIPAL CLASS EA AND KEATING CHANNEL PRECINCT PLAN – PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Ken Greenberg, Greenberg Consultants Inc, and Gullivar Shepard, Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc., gave a presentation on the Lower Don Lands Municipal Class EA and the Keating Channel Precinct Plan. Details on this presentation and the feedback received are available to SAC members through Andrea Kelemen, Waterfront Toronto.

6.0 DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED FORMAT FOR PUBLIC FORUM

Nicole Swerhun went over the proposed outline for the May 9 public meeting. It was agreed that the large table discussions would be collapsed into two tables for the DMNP EA; one will be on Naturalization and the second on Sediment Management, Flood Protection and Hydraulics. Additional tables will be available for the Lower Don Lands EA and the Keating Channel Precinct Plan.

Overall, the outline for the public meeting was approved.
7.0 MEETING ADJOURNMENT

CLC/SAC members were thanked for attending this meeting and encouraged to attend the May 9 event. Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Meeting minutes taken by Michelle Vanderwel.
Community Liaison Committee Meeting

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

& Lower Don Lands Master Plan EA

Monday April 29
5:30 – 7:30 pm

WATERFRONToronto Boardroom
20 Bay Street
Environmental Assessment Public Consultation

Introduction

Monday April 29
5:30 – 7:30 pm

WATERFRONTToronto Boardroom
20 Bay Street
• 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
• 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
• 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
- 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
- 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
- 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
Planning Framework

• 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
• 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
• 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
• 2012 PLAI Recommended 4WS Realigned
• Revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 4WS Realigned option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval

• Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction
DMNP EA establishes:

- River channel and spillway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization
- Adaptive management strategy
- Proposed Regulatory Flood Zone
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Flood protection features

DMNP EA Study Area
LDL EA MP establishes:

- Location and basic dimensions of relocated municipal infrastructure
- Right of ways to protect in future precinct planning
- Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
- Coordinated stormwater management strategy
Spill Zone During the Regulatory Flood
Revised Preferred Alternative (4WS Realigned)

2010 EA Preferred Alternative

2013 Working Design
Phased Implementation of Flood Protection (PLAI Outcome)
Flood Protection: Extent of Existing Flooding
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct New Cherry St. Bridge
B. Remove Old Cherry St. Bridge and Abutments
C. Continued Dredging in Keating Channel
D. Raise grade in Cousins Quay, Polson Quay, and 309 Cherry St.
E. Construct Promontory Park at Cousins Quay (May or May Not Proceed in Phase 1)
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Interim Spillway with Naturalized Wetland at Ship Channel
B. Construct New Commissioners Street Crossing
C. Lengthen Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge and Keating Rail Bridge
D. Construct Sediment and Debris Management Area
E. Relocate Utilities including Hydro Duct Bridge and Gas Line
F. Construct Valley Wall Feature on Don Roadway
G. Modifications to Eastern Avenue Underpass
H. Construct Flood Protection Feature on Former Unilever Site (FPL or VWF)
I. Raise Grade in Remaining Areas Surrounding 309 Cherry Street
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Valley System, including the Low Flow Channel and Flood Control Weirs
B. Construct New Cherry Street South Bridge
C. Construct Basin Street Crossing
D. Raise Grades in Remaining Areas of the Lower Don Lands
Flood Protection Work:
A. Naturalize Polson Quay Dockwall
Work Undertaken Since the PLAI

- Refined Hydraulic Modelling
  - Confirmation of River and Valley Configuration
  - Refinements to Proposed Phasing
- Identification of EA Amendment Requirements and Coordination with Class EA Amendment
- Development of Revised Effects Assessment Framework
  - Phased and Final Condition
Revised Effects Assessment

- Phased Development / Construction
- Nuisance Effects on Area Residents & Businesses
- Realigned Greenway
- Timing of Sediment Management System
- Change to Promontories
- Accommodation of Lafarge

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA | CLC Meeting
29 April 2013 | Slide 21
**Project Schedule**

- Conduct Effects Assessment  
  Spring, 2013
- Community Liaison Committee Meeting #2  
  June, 2013
- Host Public Meeting  
  June/July, 2013
- Review/Incorporate Public Feedback  
  July/Aug, 2013
- Complete Draft EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
  *(Circulated for Agency & Public Review)*
- Submit Final EA report  
  Fall, 2013
Environmental Assessment
Public Consultation

LDL EA MP

Monday April 29
5:30 – 7:30 pm

WATERFRONT Toronto Boardroom
20 Bay Street
Planning Framework

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA | CLC Meeting
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Addendum to the approved LDL EA MP to reflect to the changes emanating from the PLAI and infrastructure updates to support:

- Realigned flood protection plan
- Revised phasing plan
Scope for LDL EA MP:
- Water
- Sanitary
- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit
- Stormwater
Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP

Seeking Full Approval of Phase 1+2 in 2010 LDL EA MP

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Stormwater

Rainfall

Pollutants

ROOF (Green Roof, Slow Drain)
- Storage for Wetlands
  - High Quality Wetland
    - Riverine Wetland
      - River

ROAD (Public)
- Minor System
  - OGS
    - Storage Tank
  - Ballasted Flocculation (TSS Treatment)

NON-ROAD NON-ROAD (Private)
- Minor System
  - Swale
    - Storage Tank
  - Ballasted Flocculation (TSS Treatment)

PARKLAND
- Minor System
  - Swale
    - Storage Tank
  - Major System

UV

MOE Level One Stormwater Quality Control Measure

River

Lake
• Have the changes to the DMNP EA and LDL EA MP been communicated effectively?

• Is there any additional information that you would find useful at this point?

• Do you have any advice or ideas regard how best to approach the public meeting?
Next Steps

- Revise based on CLC Meeting feedback
- Prepare boards for DMNP EA and LDL EA MP public meeting on June 20
- Prepare draft and final Addendum report
Questions

• What is the timing of the phases as it will displace existing businesses?
  – Driven partly by private sector development
  – First two phases constructed within first 10 years
• When would Cherry St be constructed and what would design look like?
  – Within first 10 years
  – Has to be high enough for flood conveyance and graded to accommodate transit
  – When might design piece for Cherry bridge happen?
• Will Don Roadway be built to accommodate transit at some point in the future?
  – Depends on design of VWF and property requirements
• Will crossing across the spillway be built as a bridge or causeway (i.e., above the floodline)?
Questions

– Commissioners will ultimately be a bridge and Basin Street will be above regulatory flood

• Why is spillway no longer part of Phase 1? What is the estimated cost for bridge replacement?
  – Need to raise Cherry St. when quays are raised, therefore bridge is required; costs are the same as what was included in PLAI

• What impact is raising of Cherry St. bridge going to have on Lake Shore? What will happen to historic buildings due to redevelopment?
  – Design of Cherry St. requires Lake Shore to be regraded
  – Heritage buildings will be dealt with incrementally

• How much will Cherry be raised? Are the grades the same as LDL?
  – Cherry will need to be lowered where it goes under rail embankment

• Will grade changes affect approach to soil management?
  – May be able to cap rather than full excavation; however, will be done on case-by-case basis

• WDL EA will be connected to Keating Channel for stormwater
Questions

- Will sewer system be separated? Will all buildings be connected to new stormwater systems? Will green building standards be used?
  - Yes
Work is underway to revise the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the 2012 Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI). The DMNP EA Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and LDL EA Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) have been combined and will meet twice before the revised EAs are submitted to the Ministry of Environment for approval in the fall of 2013. The first of these two combined Committee meetings was attended by 12 people (see attached participant list).

The purpose of the meeting was:

- To provide CLC/SAC members with a background on the need for changes to the two EAs
- To provide CLC/SAC members with an update on the proposed changes to the two EAs, and
- To seek feedback from CLC/SAC members on how effectively the changes to the EAs have been communicated, if there is any additional information that would be useful, and what advice or ideas they may have on how to share the changes to the EAs at a public meeting (see attached agenda).

The summary below organizes feedback from CLC members into key advice for the Project Team to consider. This summary was subject to participant review prior to being finalized.

**FEEDBACK SUMMARY**

Feedback from CLC/SAC members focused on 7 key areas, including: the Context of the PLAI; Why Changes are Beneficial; Changes to Phasing; Timing of Phases; Changes to Grading; Connecting Transit; Use Current Conditions; Update Graphics.

- **CONTEXT OF PLAI**
  
  It would be useful to provide more information about the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), including where it came from/why it was undertaken and how the public and stakeholders were involved in the consultation process.

- **WHY CHANGES ARE BENEFICIAL**
  
  Be clear about why the changes to the EAs are needed and are beneficial – this will be helpful with sharing the changes at the public meeting. People who have not been involved in the process to date might think that the changes to the EAs focus on more condos and less parkland – a “sales pitch” would help alleviate this potential concern.

- **CHANGES TO PHASING**
  
  It is important to clearly communicate how the phasing of flood protection and associated development has changed from what was last publicly shown at the PLAI. In particular, it should be made clear that while the first phase of development always involved relocating the Cherry Street bridge, it now also includes removal of the existing Cherry Street bridge and its abutments. It should also be made clear that the former phase one – the creation of a spillway west of the Don Road Way – is now part of the phase two activities.
Be as clear as possible on the timing of phases, particularly the timing of the first phase. A better understanding of when different phases may happen will help businesses that lease space in the Port Lands make locational decisions.

Clearly communicate where grade changes will take place and by how much the grade will be changed. Consider providing more information on whether grade changes will affect things like access for local businesses, the preservation of historic buildings and soil remediation.

It would be helpful to have more information on how the transit routes that are proposed in the LDL EA will connect to existing and future transit in the surrounding area, including the potential for future transit along the Don Roadway connecting to the north and along Commissioners Street connecting to the east.

It would be useful to show the existing conditions (e.g. street alignments, bridges, etc.) in the Port Lands and use them as a reference for discussing changes to the EAs at the public meeting.

There are some specific graphics that could be updated to increase their clarity:

- Clearly identify the study area;
- Make sure that the stormwater connection for the Keating Lands is not identified as being a part of the Lower Don Lands EA (it is a part of the West Don Lands EA amendment process).

NEXT STEPS

The meeting wrapped up with representatives from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto thanking CLC/SAC members for their feedback. The second CLC/SAC meeting will be held in June, prior to the public meeting later in the summer of 2013. The revised DMNP and LDL EAs will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment for approval in the fall of 2013.
CLC/SAC Meeting Attendance

Citizens for a Safe Environment – Karen Buck
Cycle Toronto – Clay McFayden
Don Watershed Council – Margaret Buchinger
Film Ontario – Sarah Ker-Hornell
Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association – Jane Robinson
Transit – David Fisher
Waterfront Action – Dennis Findlay
West Don Lands Committee – Cindey Wilkey
West Don Lands Committee – Julie Beddoes

Regrets
Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD)
Citizens for the Old Town
CODEBLUE TO Corktown Residents & Business Association
East Toronto Community Coalition

Mississaugas of the New Credit
Miziwe Biik
Port Lands Action Committee
Riverside Area Residents Association
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
South East Downtown Economic Redevelopment Initiative
Toronto Green Community
Woodgreen Community Services

Observers
Castlepoint – Elsa Fancello
Cole Engineering (Port Lands Landowners Group) – John Oostveen
Rose Corp/Port Lands Landowners Group – Dan Berholz

CLC/SAC Meeting Agenda

Don Mouth Naturalization EA & Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA

Community Liaison Committee/Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
April 29th
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Waterfront Toronto, Boardroom
20 Bay Street, Suite 1310

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Welcome / Agenda Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>Review of Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Updates / Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have the changes to the EAs been communicated effectively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there any additional information that you would find useful at this point?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you have any advice or ideas regarding how best to approach the public meeting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Meeting Adjourns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2013

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

& Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study

Landowners and Users Advisory Committee Meeting

& Joint Community Liaison Committee and Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Port Lands Planning Context

- **Lower Don Lands Design Competition**
- **Port Lands Acceleration Initiative**
- **Official Plan Amendment 388**
- **Amended Secondary Plan**
- **DMNP EA**
- **LDL MP EA**
- **LDL MP EA Revision**

**Timeline:**
- **2004-2007**
- **2007**
- **2007-2010**
- **2011-2013**
- **2014**
October 2012 City Council Direction

- Amend the DMNP EA based on the 2012 “4WS Re-aligned” option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval;
- Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction;
- Protect the proposed valley and stream corridors from encroachment by development;
- Complete a high-level framework plan for the entire Port Lands;
- Confirm precinct boundaries and initiate precinct planning, inclusive of business and implementation planning, for the Cousins Quay, Polson Quay and Film Studio Precincts
The Need for Flood Protection

- Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land
DMNP EA establishes:
- River channel and Greenway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization and city building
- Adaptive management strategy
- Proposed phasing strategy for removing regulatory flood zone
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Flood protection requirements
The LDL MP EA Study:

- Servicing infrastructure necessary to support revitalization and refines it to coincide with the optimized river valley.
- Phases 3 and 4 are being completed for Schedule C projects including streets and coordinated stormwater management infrastructure.
- Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA

LDL MP EA Study Area
• Phase 1 Spillway no longer necessary
• Construct new Keating Channel bridge
• Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments
• Raise grades of Cousins and Polson’s Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
• Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
• Fill Essroc Quay
2013 PLAI – Phase 2 – Flood Protection

- Construct Greenway
- Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge
2013 PLAI – Phase 2 – Development

- Development to Munitions Block
- Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected
2013 PLAI – Phase 3 – Flood Protection

- Construct Polson Slip bridge
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs
2013 PLAI – Phase 3 – Development

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise grades north and south of river valley
• Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Building the permanent condition in a phased approach both:
- minimizes/eliminates throwaway costs of interim construction and
- meets accelerated urban development goals
Progression of the DMNP EA

Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, 2003

Approved EA Terms of Reference, 2006

Lower Don Lands Design Competition, 2007

DMNP EA Conceptual Design, 2010

Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), 2012

DMNP EA Amendment, 2013


Terms of Reference  EA Process  EA Submission  EA Paused  PLAI  EA Amendment
Develop Long List of Alternatives Based on:
1. Discharge Points
2. River Characteristics
3. Channel Shape (Cross-Section)
4. Habitat Types (What Grows in the Channel)

Evaluate Alternatives and Identify a Short List of Alternatives Based on Technical Feasibility, Including:
- Recreational Opportunities within the River Valley System
- Integration with Infrastructure
- Management of Sediment, Debris, and Ice; Navigation

Comparative Evaluation of Short List of Alternatives

Select Preferred Alternative for Further Evaluation

Confirm and Describe Preferred Alternative
Amended Preferred Alternative

- Realignment of the Greenway
- Phased Implementation of Flood Protection
- Accommodation of Lafarge During Phasing
- Rationalizing Developable Land and Naturalization
- Removal of Inner Harbour Promontories
How does the Amended Alternative Fulfill the Project Goals?

Flood Protection

Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land

Naturalization

Aquatic Habitat: 17 Hectares
Naturalization (Terrestrial / Wetland): 20 Hectares

Revitalized City Environment

Phased flood protection allows development to proceed in step with completion of the new river valley

Note: areas of aquatic and terrestrial habitat were confirmed to be 14 and 16 hectares respectively (July 10, 2013)
Overview of the Effects and Mitigation

**Flood Protection**
- Phased construction of river will progressively remove lands from flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere
- Permanent removal of 240 ha of land from flooding

**Naturalization**
- Creation of 17 ha of high quality aquatic habitat
- Creation of 20 ha of naturalized habitat (wetland/terrestrial) which is expected to attract locally significant species

**Recreational and Cultural Opportunities**
- New river mouth provides greater recreational opportunities than the existing river (e.g., boating, trails, enjoyment of naturalized landscapes)
- Heritage resources within the footprint of the river valley system will be conserved, relocated, raised, or commemorated

Note: areas of aquatic and terrestrial habitat were confirmed to be 14 and 16 hectares respectively (July 10, 2013)
Overview of the Effects and Mitigation

**Operational Management and Constructability**
- Flood protection minimizes throwaway costs between phases
- Sediment management uses existing infrastructure where possible and allows for the use of dredgate during lakefilling
- Design and phasing limits impacts to existing operations and shipping

**Planned Land Use**
- Nuisance effects on existing/future residents and businesses (e.g., noise, dust, and traffic) due to construction will be mitigated

**Sustainability Framework**
- Minimal effects from transporting soils off-site
In 2010 City Council approved a Transportation and Infrastructure Master Plan (Phases 1 and 2) for the entire LDL and completed the EA process (Phases 3 and 4) for the Keating Precinct.

The completed EA was approved for the lands west of Cherry Street. The remainder was put on hold pending the completion of the Gardiner Expressway EA.

2012 PLAI Plan requires revisions to the approved Master Plan.

Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA are being completed for all lands south of the Keating Channel.
Scope for LDL EA MP:
• Water
• Sanitary
• Roads
• Bridges
• Transit
• Stormwater
Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Roads – Cross Sections

Figure 11-2  Cross-section for Cherry Street between Lake Shore Boulevard and Villiers Street

West

East

Figure 11-20  Cross-section for Commissioners Street
(formerly Villiers Street Alternative 1)

South

North
**Rocks – Basin Street Alternatives**

**Alternative 1 – Bridge** – structure comprised of a deck on piers

**Alternative 2 – Causeway and Bridge** – combination of filled embankment and smaller bridges where the water has to pass through – underneath the bridge deck could be completely open or box culverts.

**Alternative 3 – River Ford** – where the road is built at grade down into the spillway and floods during 1 in 25 year events and is impassable at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1: Bridge</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Causeway</th>
<th>Alternative 3: At-grade river ford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>The bridge would provide both movement of peak flood flows and the potential for some natural elements beneath the bridge depending on final bridge design.</td>
<td>The causeway would provide for movement of peak flood flows, but since the structure would have more structural impediments, it would require more land for the spillway north of the roadway. Since the water would move through culverts beneath the road, there is no opportunity to naturalize that area.</td>
<td>The at-grade river ford would provide both movement of peak flood flows and the potential for some natural elements adjacent to the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Since all three routes occupy the same general area, and there are no nearby residences, the three alternatives would have the same social impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>Likely to add the most economic benefit, as it would provide full access to all planned development lands.</td>
<td>Less economic benefit, as the causeway would require a larger spillway to the north to accommodate flood waters, reducing the future development area.</td>
<td>Likely to add the most economic benefit, as it would provide full access to all planned development lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
<td>No significant cultural resources are likely to be affected by any of the alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Both the bridge and causeway would provide numerous opportunities for the accomplishment of sustainable construction practices for the roadway.</td>
<td>Also requires lands owned and leased by TPLC, but the causeway would cause the need for a larger area north of the roadway to be set aside as open space to accommodate flood water backup created by the causeway, so less property is available for development.</td>
<td>The roadway would probably require more maintenance and rebuilding after every major flood event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Property</td>
<td>Requires land currently owned and leased by TPLC. The road would be constructed in the future at the time of redevelopment, so any leased land holdings could be addressed by then.</td>
<td>Requires land currently owned and leased by TPLC. The road would be constructed in the future at the time of redevelopment, so any leased land holdings could be addressed by then.</td>
<td>Requires land currently owned and leased by TPLC. The road would be constructed in the future at the time of redevelopment, so any leased land holdings could be addressed by then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>The bridge and the causeway would provide adequate transportation access to allow future development and network traffic distribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The river ford would also provide adequate transportation access and traffic distribution most of the time, but in the event of a major flood, access would be cut off in this route, so there would not be a secondary egress route, so this option is inferior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>All three alternatives would be built in an area where the municipal services are being completely reconstructed for the flood protection spillway, so there is no difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete Phases 3 and 4 of Class EA: Infrastructure Location not Changed from 2010

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Next Steps
• The City has included in its Development Charges report to City Council provision for City-wide development charges. This is now before City Council.

• City is exploring the potential for area-specific development strategies.

• The landowners have formed a group to explore front-ending of infrastructure costs once the EA has been adopted.

• City, WT, and TRCA will continue to pursue funding from senior levels of government when and if funds are available coordinated with other City and Waterfront renewal efforts.
Next Steps

• Revise presentation based on meeting feedback

• Prepare materials for DMNP EA and LDL MP EA Study public meeting on July 24

• Prepare draft and final DMNP EA amendment

• Prepare draft and final LDL MP EA Study
Questions of Clarification
Questions of Clarification

- Have the changes to the DMNP EA and LDL MP EA Study been effectively communicated?

- Is there any additional information that you would find useful?

- Do you have any advice or ideas on how to approach the public meeting?
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA & Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA
COMMUNITY LIASON COMMITTEE/STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
5:30-7:30pm, Thursday July 4th, 2013
Waterfront Toronto, 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310

Work is underway to revise the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the 2012 Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI). The DMNP EA Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and LDL EA Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) have been combined and will meet twice before the revised EAs are submitted to the Ministry of Environment for approval in the fall of 2013. The second of these two combined Committee meetings was attended by 10 people (see attached participant list).

The purpose of the meeting was:
- To provide CLC/SAC members with an update on the proposed changes to the two EAs, and
- To seek feedback from CLC/SAC members on what they like, don’t like, and any suggested refinements to the updated plans (see attached agenda).

The summary below organizes feedback from CLC/SAC members into key advice for the Project Team to consider. This summary was subject to participant review prior to being finalized.

OVERALL FEEDBACK AND ADVICE

- Overall, CLC/SAC members felt that the changes to the EAs were reasonable and that they were presented in a relatively clear and easy to understand manner with good illustrations. Participants had a number of specific suggestions on refinements to improve the clarity of the presentation and some other key pieces of information that could be included in the presentation.

- The visual refinements to the presentation included: making the green space a deeper shade of green to help it stand out more; making the transit lines stand out more; drawing a clearer link between renderings and the area that they are depicting on plan views; and drawing a clearer link between the plan view of the spillway and the cross-section of the spillway.

- Language refinements to the presentation included: changing raise the grade to raise the ground level; provide more explanation of the valley wall feature; and use another term for front-ending infrastructure costs.

- Additional key pieces of information that could be incorporated into the presentation included: emphasizing the “goodies” (e.g. connections, bike trails, greenspace etc.) that this plan delivers for those who live outside of the area; emphasizing how this plan will help mitigate flooding in Leslieville; that raising the ground level acts to cap contaminated soil and therefore reduces costs; that planning for the rest of the Port Lands will be undertaken soon in a separate EA process; and providing a comparison of the amount of greenspace between the 2010 preferred alternative, the PLAI preferred alternative and the 2013 preferred alternative.
QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION

The following are the questions of clarification that were asked during the CLC/SAC meeting. They have been grouped into seven categories: Flood Protection; Parks and Open Space; Phasing; Transportation; Land Use; Heritage; and, Environmental Management. Responses that were provided to these questions of clarification at the meeting are noted in *italics*.

**FLOOD PROTECTION**

How is the Eastern Avenue underpass being modified?  
*Where Eastern Avenue passes underneath the railway line, we have to raise the level of the road and surrounding land either to the east or west of the underpass in order to prevent spill into South Riverdale during a flood event.*

How is flood protection being met at hard edges (e.g. dockwalls)? Are hard edges high enough? Does the ground level have to be raised?  
*Generally speaking, the amount that the ground level has to be raised varies throughout the Port Lands. To ensure that the dockwall areas remain publicly accessible, where the ground level is raised adjacent to them it will be done in a way that provides for a transition.*

Who will pay for raising the ground level?  
*Changes to the ground level of individual properties will be paid for by the owners of those properties when they seek to redevelop their land.*

Will the raising of the ground level in Phase 1 of flood protection result in greater flooding in areas outside of Phase 1?  
*No it will not. Flood modelling for phase one shows us there are no off site impacts following the completion of Phase One.*

Is there any legislative framework that would help enable funding from higher orders of government?  
*There are mechanisms for the Ministry of Natural Resources to fund Conservation Authorities, and we have been talking to them for a while about raising their level of funding. There is also a Federal-Provincial framework for flood protection, but it hasn’t been funded for 20 years. There might be an increasingly greater impetus to fund that program now.*

Is it possible to put the grading on the property deed so that property owners are responsible for maintaining safe grade over long period of time? How can we ensure that absorptive soil is used?  
*We are not yet at this level of design, but it is something that can be secured when development applications are submitted to the City. Grading is something that is addressed through Site Plan Applications. Also, each stage of development over time is likely to occur within a context of greater and greater levels of standards.*

I’m concerned that the width of the channel has been reduced. Is it possible to oversize the channel?  
*The final width of the valley was always 150m. It will now be 200m wide north of Basin Street, and 150m south of Basin Street.*
Does Phase 1 create any new green space?
*It is hard to imagine Cousin’s Quay being redeveloped without the promontory park also being built. This isn’t to say that it is required to happen, but that development is likely to push creation of this new park – a new park makes the area more attractive to buyers.*

Will infrastructure be phased in the same order as flood protection?
*Some infrastructure will have to happen in coordination with flood protection. For example, there are certain types of infrastructure, such as bridges and roads, that have to be redone when the ground level is raised.*

How separated are bikes from motor vehicle traffic? I would prefer that the bike lanes are different from what’s on Sherbourne because they do not work well as separated bike lanes.
*The way that bike lanes are shown on the road cross-section is really notional at this point as the placement of bike lanes will happen at a more detailed design stage. There is definitely the opportunity to provide physically separated bike lanes. There is an opportunity to do something different from Sherbourne as that was a retrofit and here we’ll be building new.*

Do these EAs include a network of cycling trails?
*All of the light lines on the preferred alternative 2013 are off-road cycling trails. They are notional for now as they are not subject to Class EA approval. Their precise location and design will be undertaken at a more detailed design stage.*

Will there be transit on the Don Roadway? It is very important to have transit here and it was included in the 2006 Master Plan.
*The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan did show transit on the Don Roadway, however some of the assumptions on the level of development and how it would connect to the broader system need to be looked at again. The City will be undertaking a separate EA for the area of the Port Lands outside of the DMNP and LDL EAs that will look at transit.*

Are landowners concerned about a drop in land values if the airport runway is extended? A drop in land values might have some impact on their willingness to develop, and in turn contribute development charges to fund flood protection.
*The Land Owner and User Advisory Committee didn’t express any concern in this regard. The various potential impacts of a runway extension will be considered through a separate study and consultation process that the City is undertaking.*

I’m concerned about temporary uses in the Port Lands. What will be the policy for these uses, and how will it impact the EAs?
*Where properties are publicly owned, e.g. through the Toronto Port Lands Company, the properties have limited leases and proposed uses are reviewed by the City before the lease is granted. Where properties are owned privately, individuals are permitted to develop uses under the current zoning by-law. Even if the by-law is changed, these uses would be considered a "legal non-conforming use".*
Are there any places where raising the land will mean moving historic buildings? Are there any objections from current landowners to having their buildings demolished to raise the land? Rather than moving or demolishing heritage buildings, consider building berms around them.

*Impacts on heritage resources will be identified in the EAs including possible mitigation. Through the precinct planning process, more detailed strategies will be developed.*

No landowners have expressed any issues about demolition. Lafarge has raised issues about how land raised around them and we will look at that in the detailed design stage.

Will storm water retention standards be increased? The City’s current standard of 5mm is too low. *There has been lots of discussion on this. This plan will take many years to implement and standards and technology are likely to change over this time. In the EA we have to use the engineering standards of today, but at the same time be flexible and use a principle-based approach so that it’s possible to use any technology as it comes. If standards are increased, that means that a facility may have to be built differently, but it will still have to meet performance standards in EA.*

Is work being done on an environmental management plan, like with West Don Lands? *Not yet, but there will have to be one when the time comes. It will be the responsibility of whoever is actually constructing the spillway and river (e.g. Waterfront Toronto, TRCA). Individual properties will also have to do their own environmental management plans as they redevelop.*

**NEXT STEPS**

The meeting wrapped up with representatives from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto thanking CLC/SAC members for their feedback. The project team will use this feedback to refine the presentation materials in preparation for the July 24th public meeting. Following the public meeting, draft final versions of the DMNP and LDL EA amendments will be prepared, with the final version to be submitted to the Ministry of Environment in late fall 2013.
CLC/SAC Meeting Attendance

Citizens for a Safe Environment – Karen Buck
CODEBLUE – Anna Podranou
Cycle Toronto – Clay McFayden
Don Watershed Council – Margaret Buchinger
Toronto Green Community – John Wilson
Transit – David Fisher
Waterfront Action – Dennis Findlay
West Don Lands Committee – Cindy Wilkey
West Don Lands Committee – Julie Beddoes

Regrets
Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD)
Citizens for the Old Town
Corktown Residents & Business Association
East Toronto Community Coalition

CLC Meeting Agenda

Don Mouth Naturalization EA & Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA

Community Liaison Committee/Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Thursday, July 4, 2013
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Waterfront Toronto
20 Bay Street, Suite 1310

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Welcome / Agenda Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>Updates / Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Questions of Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you like about the updated plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What don’t you like about the updated plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you have any suggested refinements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Meeting Wed, July 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit Draft Amended DMNP EA (Fall 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit LDL Class EA Addendum (Fall 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observers
Rose Corp/Port Lands Landowners Group

Film Ontario
Gooderham and Worts Neighbourhood Association
Mississaugas of the New Credit
Miziwe Biik
Port Lands Action Committee
Riverside Area Residents Association
St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association
South East Downtown Economic Redevelopment Initiative
Woodgreen Community Services
Good afternoon,

As a member of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA), we wanted to keep you informed regarding project related activities and updates.

Work is underway to amend the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) in 2012.

A public meeting was held on July 24th, 2013 to provide an update on the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs and to seek feedback on the updated plans. The attached draft summary provides highlights of overall feedback, followed by participants’ questions of clarification and answers provided by project team members at the meeting. Should you have any comments and/or suggested edits to this draft summary, please forward them to Alex Heath (aheath@swerhun.com) no later than Wednesday, September 4th, 2013. Meeting material, including a project backgrounder, agenda, display boards, and presentation, are available for download on the project website at www.trca.on.ca/dmnpea

If you have any questions regarding the status of the DMNP EA, or wish to be removed from the DMNP EA distribution list, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Alexis Wood, BSc, MES
Project Manager, Highland Creek Watershed | Toronto and Region Conservation | Head Office - 5 Shoreham Dr. North York, ON M3N 1S4 | Mailing Address – 70 Canuck Avenue, Toronto, ON M3K 2C5 | email: awood@trca.on.ca | phone: 416 661-6600 ext 5243 | fax: 416-667-6278 | web: www.trca.on.ca

DRAFT DMNP LDL July 24th Public Meeting Summary.pdf

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Q-3 Newsletters
TORONTO IS ONE STEP CLOSER TO NATURALIZING THE DON RIVER MOUTH

Naturalizing the mouth of the Don River and providing flood protection to the Port Lands was a project identified as one of the top priorities for all three levels of government when they first announced the establishment of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC) in 2001. This month, planning for this work moved a significant step forward when Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) received approval for the Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Project from the Ontario Ministry of Environment.

The ToR is the first step of an Individual Environmental Assessment (EA). It sets out how the river mouth will be redesigned during step two, the EA. While developing the ToR TRCA received valuable input from the Community Liaison Committee (CLC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the public, and the submitted ToR reflects this input. Toronto City Council received the DMNP ToR June 21, 2006.

The public and other stakeholders will continue to have an important role in informing the decision-making process. Between September 2006 and March 2008 there will be a number of public meetings and site walks to give people an opportunity to share their perspectives, priorities, and advice. See page 2 of this newsletter for more information on upcoming public events.

The DMNP Project will transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, sustainable, more naturalized river outlet to the lake, while at the same time, removing the risk of flooding to 230 hectares of urban land to the east and south of the river.

Project has the potential to create a jewel on the waterfront

Renaturalizing the river mouth is a complex endeavour. It needs to combine the precision of engineering (to ensure that floodwater, debris and sediment can be effectively transported to the lake), with the flexibility that nature needs to thrive and adjust to a wide variety of environmental conditions. This is particularly challenging for the mouth of the Don since it is located in an area with a rich cultural and industrial heritage that is also densely occupied by the roads, buildings, boats, bridges, trails, and other infrastructure that is essential to making our city work.

It is critical that the redesigned river “works”. The river channel needs to be big enough to hold enough water to prevent flooding, and the land beside and within the river needs to be planted with vegetation that will thrive. The impact on other land and water uses in the area needs to be identified and managed, and opportunities for public use in the area need to be explored. Also, the cost of all of this, including management of contaminated soils and groundwater, and the long-term maintenance, needs to be reasonable given the resources available.
Many decisions need to be made when redesigning the mouth of a river. Some of these include:

- How wide does the river channel need to be at the mouth?
- How much water does the river channel need to hold?
- How much land is needed on either side of the channel to convey the extra water that comes down the river during large storms?
- What types of plants will thrive and provide much needed habitat for fish and wildlife?
- How will contaminated soils and groundwater be managed?
- Where should the channel be located to work best for the river, the surrounding infrastructure, and to accommodate public use?

These types of questions, and many more, will be considered by TRCA and their consultant team as they develop and evaluate options to redesign the mouth of the Don River. Public and stakeholder consultation is an important part of this process, and there are a number of public meetings and events that will continue to be held during the project. A general schedule has been provided to give you an idea of how you can get involved.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION...**

visit our project website
(see address at the bottom of this page)

If you have specific questions regarding the project please contact:
Michelle Vanderwel
Don Watershed Clerk
Phone: 416-661-6600 x5280
Email: mvanderwel@trca.on.ca

**Schedule Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Site Walk #1</td>
<td>Start process of comparing ways the river mouth could be redesigned. Opportunity for TRCA to hear public feedback on criteria used to consider alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
<td>Focus on small set of alternatives most likely to work. More detailed look at each alternative. Discuss process of narrowing down alternatives to one preferred alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
<td>Design Workshop — seek feedback on key elements of river mouth (e.g. habitats, location of boardwalks, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Public Meeting #3</td>
<td>Present and discuss preferred alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Public Meeting #4 &amp; Site Walk #2</td>
<td>Review the impact of the preferred alternative on neighbouring uses. Discuss ways to mitigate these impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Conceptual Design Complete</td>
<td>Public review of draft EA prior to official submission. To be submitted to provincial and federal governments for Environmental Assessment approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

Specific dates of upcoming meetings will be confirmed shortly and distributed widely.
**Project Background**

Naturalizing the mouth of the Don River and providing flood protection to the Port Lands was a project identified as one of the top priorities for all three levels of government when they first announced the establishment of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC) in 2001.

In August 2006, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) received approval for the Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Project from the Ontario Ministry of Environment.

**Functions**

- Naturalization
  - Quality and quantity of habitat created
  - Resilience to change
  - Biodiversity
  - Costs

- Flood Protection
  - Additional flood proofing
  - Potential to flood infrastructure
  - Costs

- Operational management of the river
  - Ease of sediment management/removal
  - Ease of debris management/removal
  - Ice management
  - Costs

- Integration with infrastructure
  - Magnitude of change
  - Loss of infrastructure
  - Constructability
  - Costs

- Recreational and cultural opportunities
  - Removal/abatement to existing resources
  - Navigability
  - Provision of new resources
  - Opportunities for cultural interpretation

- Coordination with other planning efforts
  - Consistency with other planning efforts
  - Consistency with TWRC Sustainability Strategy

These objectives will form the basis for fleshing out details of the various alternatives and will also form the basis of developing comparative evaluation criteria to reduce the number of alternatives.

**Timeline**

There are six steps in the EA process before a functional design is developed. The following chart reflects the approximate timing for each step:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop long list of alternatives (these are conceptual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assess technical feasibility of alternatives and identify a short list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flesh out details of short list of alternatives (i.e., recreation, infrastructure, sediment management, navigation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce short list of alternatives (if necessary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Comparatively evaluate short list to identify preferred alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess preferred alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop functional design of preferred alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start construction</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Starting to Make Decisions about Don Mouth Design**

When it comes down to it, there are two key factors driving the design of the new Don Mouth – the amount of water that the river mouth needs to contain to prevent flooding integrated with the ability of plants to grow in and along the river under the influence of lake and riverine water levels.

Over the last two months, the TRCA and their consultant team have been working with a long list of potential options that exist for the Don Mouth through a technical screening process to develop a list of functional options. The purpose of this process is to eliminate those options that are unable to meet the naturalization and flood control objectives of the project.

This newsletter introduces the technical screening process, and the results that have been generated to date. Additional detail will be available at the December 5th Public Meeting (see page 4).

**Refresher on the Don River Mouth Functions**

Generally speaking, there are two elements of a river that influence how it functions: the river’s form (the shape, size, and physical characteristics of the river, etc.) and its features (plants and vegetation communities, etc.). The technical screening process takes a close look at each of the different potential discharge points for the Don Mouth, and determines how to design each of those discharge points to convey the Regulatory flood (extreme conditions) and have thriving natural animal and plant communities under day-to-day conditions.

Things to consider:

- What shape and size does the river mouth need to be able to carry enough water to protect the Port Lands from flooding?
- How does the design of the river mouth (in terms of water depth, speed and clarity) influence which vegetation communities thrive?

---

**For more information**

Visit our website at: [http://www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/](http://www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/)

Or contact:

Michelle Vanderweld
Don Administrative Clerk
Phone: 416-661-6600  x5280, Fax: 416-667-6278
E-mail: mvanderweld@trca.on.ca

---

**Highlights of the 2nd Don Mouth Site Walk**

On Saturday, October 14th 2006, over 180 people turned out for the second Don Mouth Site Walk. Braving a mix of bright sun, rain, snow, hail, and then more sun, the day included a number of stops around the study area to discuss some of the big opportunities and challenges that go along with this project.

The boat cruise was especially popular, and Captain Muran ferried the Island Princess between the Keating Channel and the Ship Channel with three different loads of passengers who enjoyed a rare view of the Port Lands, East Bayfront, and the central waterfront. Thanks to everyone who was able to come join us, and hoping to see you on December 5th at our next public meeting.

---

**Don Haley, TRCA, talks to one of the Site Walk Groups**

---

http://www.trca.on.ca/water_protection/don_mouth/ default.asp?load=flood_protection

---

**Island Princess, Don Mouth Site Walk**
Step 1. A Closer Look at Different River Forms

For the Don Mouth, five different possible forms have been identified (described as different potential cross sections of the river mouth). They include:

1. Lacustrine environment (*of or relating to lakes*)
2. A natural river channel
3. A created wetland river channel
4. Lacustrine + natural river channel
5. Lacustrine + created wetland

The main difference between these cross sections is the width and depth of the main river channel, and the presence of a wetland adjacent to the river channel.

To give you a sense of scale, in the natural river channel form, the width of the channel would be approximately 60 metres (or about the same width as the Keating Channel).

Step 2. Technical Screening Criteria

There are two screening criteria that are being used to determine the technical feasibility of different conceptual designs of the Don River mouth:

- Do the cross sections convey the peak flows associated with the Regulatory flood? To answer this question, it’s also important to know whether the vegetation communities growing in and along the new Don Mouth would impede water flow and therefore increase the risk of flooding.
- Do the cross sections provide for plant growth? This includes understanding whether the water depth, under average conditions, is shallow enough to promote plant growth; and determining how susceptible vegetation communities are to the high turbidity that occurs in the Don.

The results of the technical screening are summarized below. As you’ll see, there are a few cross sections that do not work with certain discharge points, for example for Discharge Points 2 and 3:

- A lacustrine environment is too deep to support vegetation communities;
- A natural river channel floods too infrequently to support most wet vegetation communities; and
- Trees provide too much resistance to flood waters (and therefore would contribute to flooding).

For Discharge Points 4S and 4W there are also designs that will not technically work for the primary channel:

- A lacustrine environment is too deep to support vegetation communities except submerged marsh; and
- A submerged marsh won’t survive in a lacustrine environment because of too much silt.

The secondary channel or overflow spillway for Discharge Points 4S and 4W will appear as a depressed area up to 300 m wide to convey floods equal to or greater than a 50 year storm. The spillway could exhibit a wide spectrum of wet and dry habitat types and other compatible uses.
### Evaluating Alternatives

The alternatives for the DMNP EA were evaluated to determine how well each alternative met the seven project objectives. A number of criteria and indicators were developed for each objective to determine which alternatives were most preferred. The table below illustrates how the alternatives “measured up” against each objective to determine an overall preliminary preferred alternative. The results show that Alternative 4WS was most preferred for the following reasons:

- Contains the highest quality of habitat and provides over 50 hectares of naturalized area and recreational space.
- Provides the greater adaptability for flood protection than single and even double discharge alternatives.
- Best meets the intent of the Waterfront Secondary Plan.
- Allows for the greatest reuse of material on site and has the lowest cost for soils management.

#### Summary of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
<th>Objective 5</th>
<th>Objective 6</th>
<th>Objective 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalization</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Management andConstistency</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Infrastucture</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and Cultural Opportunities</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Other Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Virginia Waterfront Sustainability Framework (ongoing vision)</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Moderately preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Least preferred</td>
<td>Most preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the full evaluation results, please see [http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization](http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization) and/or contact TRCA or Waterfront Toronto.

---

#### What's Next for the Don River Mouth and the Lower Don Lands?

If Alternative 4WS is confirmed as the preliminary preferred alternative, the TRCA and Waterfront Toronto teams will commence several confirmatory studies, including more detailed studies of hydrology, sediment management and management of contaminated soils and groundwater and analysis of the impacts to navigation in the Inner Harbour resulting from the proposed promontory.

### What's Inside

- **EA Update**
- **Design Competition Update**
- **Next Steps for the Don River**

---

#### Bringing the River and the City Together!

The Don River is one of Toronto’s great assets, and a centrepiece of many major revitalization initiatives on the waterfront. Over the last year a lot of work has been underway to consolidate the different studies and projects happening in the area around the mouth of the Don and in the Port Lands, including naturalization and flood protection, parks, infrastructure, transportation and transit links, and community development.

One of the lead projects, currently undergoing an Environmental Assessment (EA) process, is the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Project (DMNP), which is being led by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and a consultant team led by Gartner Lee Limited (GLL). The goal of this project is to transform derelict brownfields into a naturalized river mouth, to provide protection for up to 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding, and to provide a great public amenity.

In early 2007, Waterfront Toronto undertook a Design Competition for the Lower Don Lands to provide a unifying vision for merging the natural and urban fabric into a green, integrated and sustainable community. This newsletter provides an update on the results of the Lower Don Lands Design Competition, how the resulting vision has been integrated into the EA for the DMNP Project, and what’s happened with the EA.

---

#### Community Role Has Been Critical

Naturalizing the Don River mouth started as a vision for many people who were passionate about the River and its contribution towards improving the health of Toronto. At public meetings over the last 10-15 years, community members have consistently highlighted this vision, and it’s to their great credit that the DMNP is where it is today.

Community insights and advice continue to provide critical guidance to our work, both as part of the EA for the DMNP, and other projects in the Port Lands and across the waterfront. Since 2006 there have been several public meetings, workshops, public presentations and site tours related to both the Don Mouth EA and the Lower Don Lands Design Competition. Welcome to all those who are new to this project, and a big thank-you to those who continue to share your enthusiasm, wisdom, and perspectives with us.

---

#### Comments? Questions? Want more information?

Visit our website at: [http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization](http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization) or please contact:

Michelle Vanderwel  
Toronto and Region Conservation  
Phone: 416-667-6278  
Fax: 416-667-6280  
E-mail: mvanderwel@trca.on.ca

Or please contact:  
Andrea Kolemen  
Waterfront Toronto  
Phone: 416-214-1344  
Fax: 416-214-4591  
E-mail: a.kolemen@waterfronttoronto.ca
Linking the Don Mouth EA and the Lower Don Design Competition

In 2007, Waterfront Toronto launched the Lower Don Lands Design Competition, to augment the EA by building in community design elements early in the process. The Design Competition sought to have a unifying vision developed for the many planning activities in the lower Don area, while having a natural river corridor playing a central role to the urban landscape. The City of Toronto, TRCA and the local community all participated in the process.

In May 2007, the team led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates Inc. (MVVA) was chosen as having produced a vision for the Lower Don Lands best meeting the objectives of the Design Competition. Over the last nine months, Waterfront Toronto and the MVVA Lower Don Lands team will continue to work closely with TRCA and GLL’s EA team through a number of parallel processes that will facilitate the planning for servicing and transportation infrastructure, community development, and park design.

Objectives of the Lower Don Lands Design Competition

1. Naturalize the Mouth of the Don River
2. Create a Continuous Riverfront Park System
3. Provide for Harmonious New Development
4. Connect Waterfront Neighbourhoods
5. Prioritize Public Transit
6. Develop a Gateway into the Port Lands
7. Humanize Existing Infrastructure
8. Enhance the Martin Goodman Trail
9. Expand Opportunities for Interaction with the Water
10. Promote Sustainable Development

Alternatives Considered in the EA

The Terms of Reference (ToR) guiding the DMNP EA identified four potential discharge points for the mouth of the Don River: a single channel to the Inner Harbour (referred to as Alternative 2), a single channel to the Ship Channel (Alternative 3), a primary channel to the Inner Harbour with a spillway to the Ship Channel (Alternative 4W), and a primary channel to the Ship Channel with a spillway to the Inner Harbour (Alternative 4S). Four other discharge points were considered, but these were deemed unable to meet the project goal and the seven project objectives. The new river alignment resulting from the Design Competition was refined, integrated into the DMNP EA and identified as Alternative 4WS (a primary channel to the Inner Harbour with spillways to the Ship Channel and Inner Harbour).

Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 4S and 4WS were then further developed by:

- Determining the extent of the floodplain and other flood protection requirements
- Identifying the location of wetland, aquatic, and open space/terrestrial habitat
- Determining the need to build or relocate bridges and roads
- Identifying the location of sediment, ice, and debris management features and facilities

DMNP Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed
5. Encourage additional compatible recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/handicap accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with TWRC’s Sustainability Framework and applicable provincial legislation
The Task Force to Bring Back the Don

The Task Force to Bring Back the Don has a longstanding goal of improving the Don Narrings. Their efforts have included work that is compatible with the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA.

The Task Force’s mandate is broader than that of the EA, so they address issues like improved accessibility (trail and stairs), naturalization on valley walls in partnership with property owners (e.g., City of Toronto, Bridgepoint Health), stewardship teams planting and weeding next to the trail (in partnership with Parks, Forestry & Recreation), stormwater management (e.g., advising on BOMF’s green parking lot), and public art.

The Task Force would welcome further ideas that may be identified in this workshop to extend their efforts.

Naturalization Opportunities Continued

- Cabled floating mats of wetland vegetation;
- Strategic placement of wetland vegetation "boxes" on sheetpiles in areas that are less prone to flooding;
- Active vegetation management to gradually phase out invasive species with native species along the top of banks and along the inside of sheetpiles; and
- Identifying areas where sheetpiles may be replaced with alternative bank protection measures that improve habitat structure but do not threaten the stability of transportation and utility infrastructure.

Next Steps

TRCA and our Consultant Team led by Gustafson Lee Limited will consolidate the ideas generated during the Don Narrings Naturalization Workshop and write up a detailed meeting summary. All participants will receive copies of the meeting summary.

Each idea raised will be examined to determine whether:
- There would be a significant and measurable improvement in aquatic habitat;
- There would be increases in fish density or fish diversity as a result of the naturalization technique;
- There would be unacceptable risk to transportation and utility infrastructure;
- The naturalization technique would be sustainable, manageable over the long-term and would be cost-effective; and
- The naturalization technique could be implemented as a stand-alone project.

Possible Naturalization Opportunities

Current thoughts for habitat enhancement within the Don Narrings that will need to be tested to determine whether they are viable, include but may not be limited to the following:
- Strategic placement of artificial bed structure (bar deposits, embayment stone, etc.) in areas that are less prone to flooding;
- Create offline backwatered areas within the sheetpiles;
- Naturalization Opportunities Continued

The Don Narrings

A component of the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project includes an examination of opportunities to improve the ecological conditions found within the Don Narrings. The Don Narrings is the 2km long section of river that has been straightened and over-widened and which is located in the east of the Don Valley Parkway (DVP), in the west by the Don Watershed Trail, Bala Subdivision railway tracks and Balsam Avenue. In the north by Riverdale Park, and in the south by CN’s Kingston Subdivision railway crossing over the Don.

Opportunities for ecological enhancements will be limited to the area of channel between the east and west channel walls and the narrow strips of vegetation between the DVP and the top of bank in the east, and the Don Watershed Trail and top of bank in the west.

The Don Narrings Naturalization Workshop

SATURDAY MAY 24, 2008
1:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
South Regent Park Community Centre
203 Sackville Green

The primary objectives of the Workshop are to present the existing ecological conditions in the Don Narrings, and to brainstorm ideas as to what can be done to improve the ecological conditions recognizing the constraints that are associated with the area.

Presentations, site walks and round table discussions will be part of the Workshop. Participants should be expected to walk at least 3km, including the need to climb many stairs. As such, good foot wear and weather appropriate clothing is highly recommended. Some light snacks and refreshments will be available.

What's Inside
- What are the Don Narrings
- Existing Conditions within the Narrings
- Opportunities and Constraints
- Next Steps

Comments? Questions? Want more information?

Visit our website at: http://www.bcr.ca/en/don_mouth_naturalization

Or please contact:
Michelle Vanderwiel
Toronto and Region Conservation
Phone: 416-661-4600 x5280
Fax: 416-661-5275
E-mail: mvdenderwiel@crca.ca
Early to mid-1800s—Lower Don River possessed a meandering drowned river mouth with associated wetland complexes that extended into former Ashbridge’s Bay Wetland near the current Queen Street bridge over the Don.

Mid-1850s to mid-1890s—Numerous bridge crossings were constructed over the lower Don River, including an at-grade crossing of the Grand Trunk Railway just north of ON’s existing elevated railway crossing, and an at-grade Bailey bridge crossing of Eastern Ave, just south of the present day elevated Eastern Avenue crossing.

1887 to 1890—“Don River Improvement Project” was a large scale engineering exercise that straightened and widened the lower Don River using vertical wooden piles in order to provide flood protection, prevent ice jams and encourage large-based industry up the Don River. The creation of the Don Narrows did not meet any of its initial objectives to the extent anticipated and was one of the greatest political boondoggles in Toronto’s history.

1890—The Canadian Pacific Railway constructed railway tracks along the west bank of the Don Narrows (now known as the Bala Subdivision).

1918 & 1925—In February of both years, major ice jam flooding hit the Don Narrows area causing extensive damage to the area.

1928—the Grand Trunk Railway crossing over the Don was elevated by 5m using an earth fills embankment and bridge span along today’s current alignment of the Kingston Subdivision.

Mid-1950s—The DVP and Bayview Avenue Extension were constructed on the east and west banks of the Don Narrows respectively. Steel sheetpiles were used adjacent to the original wooden piles along the Don Narrows to reinforce the foundations of these critical pieces of infrastructure.

Mid-1960s—The Gardiner Expressway was completed which provided an elevated expressway connecting the DVP with the downtown area of Toronto.

Existing Conditions

The Don Narrows are typically 35 to 40 m wide with vertical steel sheetpiles walls that are 4 to 5m higher than the channel bed. In some areas, sediment deposition has created low-lying vegetated banks along the inside base of the sheetpiles. Vegetation in these areas typically consist of disturbance resistant tree species such as Manitoba maple and crack willow, and other invasive species such as Japanese knotweed and dog strangling vine.

Surveys conducted in 2003 indicated that a submerged meandering channel (called a thalweg) had developed between the sheetpiles, and that there were some submerged, low-lying sandy bed forms, including a large low-lying sand bar located underneath the Riverdale Park Pedestrian bridge. Approximately 40,000 m³ of sediment passes through the Don Narrows every year (mainly consisting of sand with some silt and clay). This volume of sediment would bury a 1 km long section of the Don Narrows by 1 m every year, if the sediment did not pass through. The water is usually very murky with light penetration into the water column being limited to about the top 50 cm depth.

The Don Watershed is almost entirely urbanized and, as such, the flows are very flashy in the Don, with significant and rapid increases in water levels in the River, even during small and moderate sized rainfall events. Contributing to the rapid runoff in the Don are the many storm sewers and combined sanitary sewers that discharge to the river throughout the Don Narrows.

Flood events that have a 50% chance of occurring on any given year (called the 2 year return period flood) will overlap the sheetpile walls in the Don Narrows and flood out over the DVP, Bala Subdivision and Bayview Avenue and many locations. Because there is essentially no channel slope from Riverdale Park to the Inner Harbour, lake effect backwashers will frequently extend upstream through the Don Narrows to Gerrard Street during baseflow conditions. Baseflows are the flows conditions observed in rivers during dry weather periods when groundwater discharges are the principle source of water in a river system.

Overall, the channel of the Don Narrows has been ecologically separated from its surrounding floodplain. The Don Narrows possess poor bed structure, high rates of sediment transport and deposition, a flashy and murky urban hydrology, and a general lack of vegetative cover, resulting in poor aquatic habitat conditions in the Don Narrows.
Bringing the River and the City Together!

The Don River is one of Toronto’s great assets, and a centerpiece of many major revitalization initiatives on the waterfront. Over the last year a lot of work has been underway to consolidate the different studies and projects happening in the area around the mouth of the Don and in the Port Lands, including naturalization and flood protection, parks, infrastructure, transportation and transit links, and community development. One of the lead projects, currently undergoing an Environmental Assessment (EA) process, is the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Project (DMNP), which is being led by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and a consultant team led by AECOM (formerly known as Gartner Lee Limited). The goal of this project is to transform derelict brownfields into a naturalized river mouth, to provide protection for up to 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding, and to provide a great public amenity.

Following our last public meeting held on March 29, 2008, the DMNP EA team has worked closely with Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands design team to develop an integrated approach to blend the natural and built form into a spectacularly green, integrated and sustainable community.

Come Join Us...

...on Saturday, May 9, 2009 to receive an update on the exciting work underway to naturalize the mouth of the Don, provide flood protection, and integrate this incredible asset into the urban fabric of Toronto. The purpose of this public meeting is to present the concept design for the preferred alternative to naturalize the Don Mouth, and to hear the public’s feedback on the design.

Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Infrastructure EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan team will also present the recommended Precinct Plan elements (including massing and zoning proposals) and the recommended road and transit layout and infrastructure design for Keating Channel Precinct.

Saturday, May 9, 2009
St. Lawrence Hall
157 King Street East, Toronto
10:00 am – 3:00 pm
(Presentations start at 11:00 am)

Preliminary Preferred Alternative

On Saturday March 29, 2008, over 210 people attended a public meeting at St. Lawrence Hall to observe and comment on the results of the evaluation of alternatives and selection of Alternative 4WS as the preliminary preferred alternative for the DMNP EA. Most of the meeting attendees expressed support for 4WS as the preliminary preferred alternative, offering recommendations along the following key themes:

- Increase the total amount of naturalized area shown
- Develop a plan to ensure that finances are available to implement the project
- Ensure global issues such as climate change are accommodated in the design
- Address water quality issues

Alternative 4WS

It was identified at that time that confirmation of Alt. 4WS as the preferred alternative would occur following a series of additional studies: hydraulic modeling and sediment management; soils and...
The first objective of the DMNP EA is to “Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach”. In order to meet this objective, the concept design was developed using the following assumptions:

- A mosaic of aquatic, wetland and upland ecological communities will be established including:
  - Open Space/Terrestrial Habitat
  - Valley Slope Transition (Riparian Forest)
  - Levee System (Thick Swamp/Meadow Marsh)
  - Lake Connected Wetlands (Emergent Marsh, Submergent Marsh, Meadow Marsh)
  - Seepage Wetlands (Treed Swamp, Thicket swamp, Meadow Marsh)
  - Aquatic
- Levees will provide physical barriers between the river channel and lake connected wetlands
- Small feeder channels through the levees will provide hydraulic connections between the lake and the smaller floodplain wetlands
- A large levee will separate the Greenway wetland/floodway from the river up to around the 25 year flood level. This wetland will be fed directly by lake water through the Ship Channel at all other times

Landscape Communities

- A range of wetland access controls will be considered to reduce the presence of invasive species to the lake connected wetlands
- Vegetation communities are expected to be highly disturbed following very large flood events
- The river between Lake Shore Blvd and the elevated CN Kingston Subdivision crossing does not contribute to the total amount of habitat created due to the need for sediment and debris management in this area
- Naturalization opportunities in the Don Narrows, north of the elevated CN Kingston Subdivision crossing, will be documented as part of the DMNP EA impact assessment newsletter anticipated in Fall 2009
- Providing diverse topographic and bathymetric variability within the design will provide a robust ecological community with a built-in groundwater studies; and navigation risk assessment. These studies have advanced sufficiently to confirm 4WS as being our preferred alternative, from which a concept design can be developed.
Flooding, Flood Conveyance and the Hydraulic—Ecology Connection

The second objective of the DMNP EA is to “Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2.” The two images side-by-side below depict the extent of flooding under the existing conditions under the Regulatory Flood (on the left) and containment of the Regulatory Flood by the concept design (on the right). Under the existing conditions, immediately downstream from CN’s elevated railway crossing of the Don, flood flows are split by the Gardiner Expressway ramps which force flows south to Lake Shore or southeast into the eastern Port Lands / Film Port area. For the flows that travel south to Lake Shore Blvd., flows are again split with some of the flows being diverted westward through the Keating Channel, and the remainder of flows overtopping the south wall of the Keating Channel and flowing south and west through the western Port Lands area.

For the concept design, the image depicts containment of the Regulatory Flood. Key components of the concept design include: removal of a utility bridge downstream from the elevated railway crossing, widening and deepening of the channel north of Lake Shore; widening of the Lake Shore Blvd. crossing; a Flood Protection Landform east of Don Roadway between the elevated railway and Lake Shore, weirs upstream and downstream of Lake Shore; and two flood spillways (the Keating Channel and the Greenway wetland to the Ship Channel).

The image below depicts the relative volume of water that will flow through the river mouth, Keating Channel, and Greenway wetland over a range of flood events. At baseflow conditions, essentially no water from the Don River will flow through the Keating Channel but it will become activated as a spillway at higher flood levels.

**Hydraulic—Ecology Connection**

NOTES:
- This model is still being refined and does not show full extent of flooding through the South Riverdale and Port Lands area.
- This is a working version of the model which focuses on confirming containment of the Regulatory Flood south of the elevated railway crossing. It is not to be considered a final model run, particularly for areas north of the elevated railway crossing.

The image below is a generic cross-section of the proposed river valley depicting the idealized topography in relation to normal lake levels and a number of flood levels within the Don.
Sediment, Debris and Ice Management

The third project objective requires maintaining "the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management". Key elements of the management program include debris booms, a sediment trap, debris management area, and hydraulic barge north of Lake Shore Blvd; a transportable dewatering system and sediment transport barges at the mouth of the Greenway wetland to the Ship Channel; and a dredge conveyance pipe connecting the sediment trap area to the dewatering facility. Ice jams will be managed between the new Commissioners St and Lake Shore Blvd crossings.

Sediment and Debris Management Features North of Lake Shore Blvd

1. Sediment Trap
2. Sediment/Debris Management Area
3. Debris Booms
4. Barge Dock
5. Service Road
6. Don Valley Trail
7. Water column rootings
8. Sediment Hydraulics - Connect
9. Potentially Adjustable Upstream Weir
10. Sidewalk Weir
11. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Pipe

Navigation Impact Study

A key component of the additional confirmation studies includes the analysis of impacts of the preferred alternative on navigation within the area. The following key elements of the preferred alternative were examined for their impacts on navigation: the promontories within the Inner Harbour; the proposed changes to sediment and debris management within the Inner Harbour; and the impacts of allowing flood flows, sediment and debris through the Greenway wetlands into the Ship Channel. To date, the study has not identified any impacts that cannot be readily mitigated nor managed.

Additional Soils and Groundwater Studies

Ultimately, a major challenge in implementing the concept design will be dependent on how soil and groundwater contaminants are cleaned and reused when the new river channel and valley is constructed. Understanding the type, concentration and location of contaminants throughout the Port Lands will be essential in developing a soil and groundwater strategy that will minimize soil handling costs, prevent inadvertent exposure of contaminants to the environment, and will maximize reuse of material within the area.

Building upon past studies conducted in the Port Lands, the DMNP EA team led a new study to collect information on soil and groundwater contaminants focusing on areas that will be naturalized and in areas lacking recently collected data. The study did not produce any surprising results and it is anticipated that most of the soils and groundwater can be remediated through a site-specific risk assessed approach.

This new information will be fed into Waterfront Toronto’s comprehensive soils remediation strategy for the Lower Don Lands.

Next Steps

Subject to input on the preliminary concept design, the impact assessment for concept design will proceed throughout the spring and summer of 2009. Based on the results of the impact assessment, mitigation measures will be developed, which may require refinements to the concept design.

Key elements to be considered includes building in adaptability to change (i.e. human or natural change), defining operational management requirements, and building in design flexibility to address planning and design changes that may occur in the future.

It is anticipated that a final public meeting will be held in fall 2009 with submission of the completed EA in late 2009 to early 2010.

For more information, please see http://www.trca.on.ca/don_mouth_naturalization and/or contact TRCA or Waterfront Toronto directly using the contact information at the bottom of this page.
From the date of submission and subsequent approval of the EA we can expect environmental change to occur within the study area. To address these changes, and to ensure that up-to-date information is available for the detailed design, a comprehensive monitoring program has been recommended in the EA. The EA will also recommend a comprehensive post-construction performance monitoring program as part of the EA approvals, to ensure that the new river mouth functions as designed. This will allow us to adapt the operational management of the river system and to gain further knowledge of large-scale ecological restoration. Compliance monitoring will also be required as part of the EA approvals to guard against negative effects during the construction period of the project.

Most of the information collected for the various monitoring programs identified in the EA can be used for other monitoring program needs. For example, fisheries data or soils data collected during the monitoring stage can be used as part of the performance monitoring stage as well.

Subject to the input gathered during the final PIC on January 27, 2010, the DMNP EA team will:

- Complete the draft EA Report
- Release a draft of the EA for a 30 day public and agency review in Spring 2010 prior to the official submission of the EA to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE)
- Officially submit the EA for approval to the MOE in Summer 2010
- Officially submit the Federal EA for approval in late Summer or early Fall 2010
- EA approvals anticipated by Spring 2011
- Detailed design and construction is dependent on funding availability.

Your continued help is critical for the DMNP project to be realized. In order for the DMNP project to proceed from the EA approvals stage to detailed design, additional funding is required. Grassroots support for a naturalized Don River mouth has been instrumental in shaping public policy to get us to this watershed moment.

Your support is even more important now in order to let our elected officials know that the public is 100% behind this vision for the Don River mouth. Be loud! It’s the dawn of the “Rise of the New Don”.

Visit our website at:

Or please contact:
Jinho Lee
Toronto and Region Conservation
Phone: 416-661-6600 x2580
Fax: 416-667-6278
E-mail: jlee@trca.on.ca

Andrea Kelemen
Waterfront Toronto
Phone: 416-214-1344 x248
Fax: 416-214-4591
Email: lowerdon@waterfronttoronto.ca
WT recognized the challenges of creating a vibrant wetland in the proposed location identified in the Secondary Plan. In 2007 they held an Innovative International Design Competition to revisit how the natural river and surrounding urban area could be integrated to maximize the benefits of both the green and built form. In May 2007, a vision proposed by Michael Van Valkenberg Associates, Inc (MVVA) was deemed to have best met the urban and environmental needs in the area.

This vision became ALT 4VS in the DMNP EA, was selected as the preliminary preferred alternative in 2008, and later refined in 2009 as the preferred concept (bottom right of Page 1). This concept forms the basis of the EA submission scheduled for 2010.

### PROJECT BENEFITS AND EFFECTS

Unlike most projects requiring an EA process, the outcomes of the DMNP project are strongly beneficial for all aspects of the environment. The intent of the DMNP project is to transform a degraded area with limited potential for use into a spectacular public greenspace surrounded by a progressive and sustainable urban fabric. The project epitomizes excellence in landscape and urban design, and incorporates state-of-the-art technologies and science, combined with progressive ecological management principles. The final outcome is an environment far superior to the existing conditions.

For the DMNP EA, the detailed impact assessment was based on the following high level questions: Does the project provide flood protection? Does the project provide for a naturalized river mouth? Does the river integrate within the overall urban context of the area?

### Ecological Project Benefits

Studies were undertaken to determine the influence of lake levels on the ecological communities in nearby coastal wetlands in order to mimic those features at the mouth of the Don.

The project will create over 40 ha of high quality habitat where there is currently no functional habitat or only highly degraded habitat. This will include the creation of 13 ha of wetlands and levees, 12 ha of new and enhanced aquatic habitat, and 21 ha of upland forest, and parks open space for active and passive recreation. Key features of the concept design include:

- **Aquatic habitat will be of much higher quality than currently found along the dockwalls of the Inner Harbour and Keating Channel.**
- **Proposed Ship Channel wetland (top left Page 3) will be protected from the turbid waters of the Don, will provide a diverse range of habitat function for a variety of fish species, reptiles, amphibians, birds and small mammals, and allow for the establishment of more sensitive vegetation, such as wild rice.**
- **Upland forest habitat will be found along the valley walls.**
- **Potential for creating unique seepage wetland communities along the valley walls using clean stormwater from future adjacent urban development, rather than the lake or river.**
- **Extensive open space areas to provide a transition between the future built urban form of the River Precinct and the naturalized areas. Details of this transition zone will be defined through Waterfront Toronto’s River Precinct planning process.**

### Flood Protection Benefits

To ensure flood protection, the new river mouth must convey up to 1,700 m³/s of flood water (the Regulatory Flood) into Lake Ontario. To confirm that this capacity is achieved, a parallel peer review process was established between the DMNP EA team and WT’s Lower Don Lands team. Through this process, there is strong confidence that the risk of flooding to adjacent urban areas can be permanently alleviated, thereby:

- **Removing the risk of river flooding to more than 200 hectares (ha) of land and approximately 1,000 existing homes, commercial businesses and industrial uses.**
- **Releasing the Lower Don Lands and eastern Port Lands for intensified mixed-use development.**
- **Maximize the benefits of both the green and built form. In May 2007, a vision proposed by Michael Van Valkenberg Associates, Inc (MVVA) was deemed to have best met the urban and environmental needs in the area.**

This vision became ALT 4VS in the DMNP EA, was selected as the preliminary preferred alternative in 2008, and later refined in 2009 as the preferred concept (bottom right of Page 1). This concept forms the basis of the EA submission scheduled for 2010.

### Benefits to the City

In addition to the flood protection and ecological benefits already described, the DMNP EA also:

- **Improves opportunities for the use of more efficient sediment management technologies.**
- **Allows for the possible reuse of dredgeate for development and habitat purposes; currently this material is treated entirely as a waste byproduct.**
- **Allows for continued removal of garbage and debris from the river, and allows for the effective management of ice jams.**
- **Provides adaptational capacity in the naturalization and flood protection components against the possible effects of climate change.**
- **Greatly improves trail and small watercraft recreation uses.**
- **Provides a great public open space for Toronto’s central waterfront, similar to High Park in the west.**
- **Allows for integrated planning to identify efficiencies in the design and implementation of infrastructure crossings (e.g. bridges and utilities), stormwater management, public access nodes to the open space areas, and comprehensive consideration of soils and groundwater management.**

### Construction Impacts of the Project

It is recognized that there are some potential negative effects associated with this project, relating primarily to construction activities. These effects are minor compared to the overall benefits of the final project, and can be mitigated or managed using current Best Management Practices (BMPs), and implementing a progressive Environmental Management Plan. A list of the most significant effects and their mitigation strategies have been summarized below:

- **Significant gains in high quality habitat and the use of BMP lakefilling guidelines will offset impacts of lakefilling 8 ha of poor quality habitat.**
The Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) was initiated in 2005 by Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) and Waterfront Toronto. The DMNP EA will transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a more naturalized river outlet, and eliminate the risk of flooding from the Don River to lands east and south of the river. After consultation with regulators, stakeholders, and the public, the preferred alternative was chosen and the EA was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval in 2010 (see Preferred Alternative from December 2010 below). The EA was amended in April of 2011 as part of the MOE review process to address comments received from stakeholders during the 30 day public review period. The remainder of the EA review process was paused in July 2011, prior to the completion of the MOE review and release of the EA amendments.

The Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Project (DMNP) was initiated in 2005 by Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) and Waterfront Toronto. The DMNP EA will transform the existing mouth of the Don River into a more naturalized river outlet, and eliminate the risk of flooding from the Don River to lands east and south of the river. After consultation with regulators, stakeholders, and the public, the preferred alternative was chosen and the EA was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval in 2010 (see Preferred Alternative from December 2010 below). The EA was amended in April of 2011 as part of the MOE review process to address comments received from stakeholders during the 30 day public review period. The remainder of the EA review process was paused in July 2011, prior to the completion of the MOE review and release of the EA amendments.

**Background**

On September 21, 2011, Toronto City Council unanimously adopted a protocol, later to be called the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), to review the City’s priorities for the Port Lands. In response to the City’s resolution, the co-proponents (TRCA and Waterfront Toronto) requested that the MOE pause their review and approvals of the DMNP EA until October 2012. The Ministry approved the extension with the expectation that there would be firm direction on amendments to the DMNP EA based on the outcome of the PLAI. In October 2011, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto and TRCA initiated planning on the PLAI. Key activities included, but were not limited to the following: confirmation of the best approach to provide flood protection to the Port Lands within the framework of the approved DMNP EA Terms of Reference; conduct a reevaluation of City priorities for development within the Port Lands; development of a business plan and strategy for implementation of the necessary flood protection and infrastructure works; and provision of value engineering for the construction of the valley system and other infrastructure elements. Ultimately, the goal of the initiative has been to deliver a high-level road map for accelerating development and maximizing the value of the Port Lands as a unique city legacy.

Public consultation was a primary objective of the PLAI and as a result Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and TRCA, held several meetings with members of the public, a stakeholder advisory committee, and a Port Lands landowner and user advisory committee. Technical studies undertaken for the PLAI included land use assessments, flood modeling, value engineering studies, and funding mechanism studies.

The PLAI resulted in an amended concept design based on the original preferred alternative from the DMNP EA. A key recommendation is the creation of an implementation plan that phases development (see Image bottom of Page 2), which allows for high infrastructure costs to potentially be offset by revenue generated from development. Toronto City Council resolved on Oct. 5, 2012 that the previous DMNP EA...
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative cont.

should be amended to reflect the results of the PLAI. The Ministry of Environment approved a further extension of the EA review pause until September 2013, in order to incorporate the amended concept design as the preferred alternative in the DMNP EA including consultation activities.

For more information on the results of the PLAI, go to the Port Lands Consultation website: http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca/

Environmental Assessment Amendments

In the fall of 2012, TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto, developed a work program to amend the 2010 document to reflect the alignment and phasing strategy from the PLAI and to be coordinated with the amendment process for the Lower Don Lands Class EA.

Next Steps

May / June 2013 – Public meeting to review the proposed changes to the DMNP EA. Date and location TBA.

Questions? Please Contact:

Alexis Wood . Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation
Phone: 416-661-6600 (ext. 5243)
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: awood@trca.on.ca
Aquatic habitat will be of much higher quality than currently found along the dockwalls of the Inner Harbour and Keating Channel.

Proposed Ship Channel wetland will be protected from the turbid waters of the Don, will provide a diverse range of habitat function for a variety of fish species, reptiles, amphibians, birds and small mammals, and allow for the establishment of more sensitive vegetation, such as wild rice.

Upland forest habitat will be found along the valley walls.

Benefits to the City

In addition to the flood protection and ecological benefits already described, the DMNP EA also:

- Allows for the possible reuse of dredgedate for development, habitat or other reuse purposes: currently this material is treated entirely as a waste byproduct.
- Allows for continued removal of garbage and debris from the river, and allows for the effective management of ice jams.
- Provides additional capacity in the naturalization and flood protection components to allow for climate change.
- Provides greater trail, small waterfront and nature appreciation recreation uses.
- Conserves, relocates, raises or commemorates heritage resources within the footprint of the DMNP EA works.
- Minimizes impacts to existing port operations and shipping through design and phasing.
- Allows for integrated planning to identify efficiencies in the design and implementation of infrastructure crossings (e.g. bridges and utilities), stormwater management, and public access nodes to the open space areas.
- Mitigates nuisance effects on existing/future residents and businesses due to construction.
- Treats and reuses excavated soil on-site where appropriate.
- Ensures that remaining soils required disposal off-site will have minimal effects on traffic, air quality and noise.

From the date of submission and subsequent approval of the EA, we can expect environmental change to occur within the study area. To address these changes, and to ensure that up-to-date information is available for the detailed design, a comprehensive monitoring program has been recommended in the EA. The EA will also recommend a comprehensive post-construction performance monitoring program as part of the EA approvals, to ensure that the new river mouth functions as designed. This will allow us to adapt the operational management of the river system and to gain further knowledge of large-scale ecological restoration. Compliance monitoring will also be required as part of the EA approvals to guard against negative effects during the construction period of the project.

Most of the information collected for the various monitoring programs identified in the EA can be used for other monitoring programs needs. For example, fisheries data or soils data collected during the DMNP EA Preferred Concept, 2009.

Adaptive Management & Monitoring

On September 21, 2011, Toronto City Council unanimously adopted a protocol, later to be called the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), to review the City’s priorities for the Port Lands. In October 2011, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto and TRCA initiated planning on the PLAI. The PLAI included technical studies undertaken for land use assessments, flood modeling, value engineering studies, and funding mechanism studies. Ultimately, the goal of the initiative was to deliver a strategy for accelerating development and maximizing the value of the Port Lands as a unique city legacy.

Public consultation was a primary objective of the PLAI and as a result, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and TRCA held several meetings with members of the public, a stakeholder advisory committee, and a Port Lands landowner and user advisory committee.

The PLAI resulted in an amended concept design based on the original preferred alternative from the DMNP EA. A key recommendation of the PLAI was the creation of an implementation plan that phases development, which allows for high infrastructure costs to potentially be offset by revenue generated from development.

For more information on the results of the PLAI, go to the Port Lands Consultation website:
http://www.portlandsconsultation.ca/

Port Lands Acceleration Initiative, 2012

EA Amendment Process

Toronto City Council resolved on October 5, 2012 that the DMNP EA should be amended to reflect the results of the PLAI. The Ministry of Environment approved a further extension of the EA review pause until September 2013, in order to incorporate the amended concept design as the preferred alternative in the DMNP EA and to conduct appropriate consultation.

In the fall of 2012, TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto, developed a work program to amend the 2011 document to reflect the alignment and phased strategy from the PLAI and to be coordinated with the amendment process for the Lower Don Lands Class EA.

As a part of the amendment process, Waterfront Toronto, the City of Toronto, and TRCA have held meetings with a community liaison/ stakeholder advisory committee, the Port Lands landowner and user advisory committee, and will be holding a public meeting on July 24, 2013 to present the DMNP EA amendment results and obtain feedback.

Comments? Questions? Want more information?
Visit our website at:
http://www.trca.on.ca/dmnpea
or
or
Michael Charendoff
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-641-6600 x5280
Fax: 416-667-6278
E-mail: mcharendoff@trca.on.ca
Waterfront Toronto
Phone: 416-214-1344
Email: info@waterfronttoronto.ca
Flood Protection Benefits

To ensure flood protection, the new river mouth must convey up to 1,700 m$^3$/s of flood water (the Regulatory Flood) into Lake Ontario. To confirm that this capacity is achieved, a parallel peer review process was established. Through this process, it has been determined that the risk of flooding to adjacent urban areas can be permanently alleviated through a phased approach, thereby:

- Removing the risk of river flooding to more than 240 hectares (ha) of land and approximately 1,000 existing homes, commercial businesses and industrial uses.
- Providing a phased approach of releasing the Lower Don Lands and Port Lands for intensified mixed-use development where collection of private development fees are utilized for future phases of the flood protection works to proceed.

### PROJECT BENEFITS AND EFFECTS

The outcomes of the DMNP project are strongly beneficial for all aspects of the environment. The intent of the DMNP project is to transform a degraded area with limited potential for use into a spectacular public greenspace surrounded by a progressive and sustainable urban fabric. The project epitomizes excellence in landscape and urban design, and incorporates state-of-the-art technologies and science, combined with progressive ecological management principles. The final outcome is an environment far superior to the existing conditions.

For the amended DMNP EA, the detailed impact assessment was based on the following high level questions: Does the project provide flood protection? Does the project provide for a naturalized river mouth? Does the river integrate within the overall urban context of the area?

### Flood Protection Benefits

To ensure flood protection, the new river mouth must convey up to 1,700 m$^3$/s of flood water (the Regulatory Flood) into Lake Ontario. To confirm that this capacity is achieved, a parallel peer review process was established. Through this process, it has been determined that

### Proposed Flood Protection Phasing

The approach to phasing flood protection and naturalization established under the PLAI has been optimized as a result of the amendment process. Under this optimized phasing, throwaway costs are minimized and/or eliminated, and urban development goals have the opportunity to be met sooner.

#### Phase 1
- Construct new Keating Channel bridge at Cherry Street
- Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments at Cherry Street
- Raise grades approximately 1-2 m at Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts

#### Phase 2
- Construct Greenway including Ship Channel wetlands
- Construct flood protection landform (FPL) on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway from Lake Shore Boulevard to Ship Channel — extends to around Saulter Street in the east (the valley wall feature results in fewer development restrictions than what is associated with a FPL)
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore and Keating Spur bridges
- Remove and/or relocate hydro utility bridge
- Construct Commissioners Street Bridge

#### Phase 3
- Construct Polson Slip bridge at Cherry Street
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flow control weirs
- Raise final grades in Lower Don Lands

#### Phase 4
- Raise grades at Lafarge
- Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall

### Ecological Project Benefits

Studies were undertaken to determine the influence of lake levels on the ecological communities in nearby coastal wetlands in order to mimic those features at the mouth of the Don.

The project will create over 30 ha of high quality habitat where there is currently no functional habitat or only highly degraded habitat. This will include the creation of 16 ha of wetland and terrestrial habitat, and 14 ha of new and enhanced aquatic habitat. Key features of the concept design include:
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Technical Advisory Committee:

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Albanese</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Toronto Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Allan</td>
<td>Environment Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Anderson-Brown</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Bruce</td>
<td>Planning Solutions (consultant to Federal TWRI Secretariat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathie Capizzano</td>
<td>City of Toronto – CCO/Facilities &amp; Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Chalupka</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Clarke</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Davies</td>
<td>TEDCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman DeFraeye</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Parks, Forestry &amp; Recreation/Urban Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol-Ann Fletcher</td>
<td>Korex Don Valley ULC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Francey</td>
<td>GO Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Harvey</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Parks, Forestry &amp; Recreation/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthanne Henry</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Parks, Forestry &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kaufman</td>
<td>Home Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kearsey</td>
<td>TEDCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon Lu</td>
<td>TEDCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Lundy</td>
<td>Toronto Port Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Ma</td>
<td>Health Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Marjanovich</td>
<td>City of Toronto – Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laud Matos</td>
<td>Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren May</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica McKillop</td>
<td>TEDCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rusu</td>
<td>City of Toronto – DCM/Technical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Jiangfan Shu</td>
<td>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff and Consultants:

<table>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dion</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele Freeman (Chair)</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Ontario Ministry of Culture</td>
</tr>
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<td>Task Force to Bring Back the Don</td>
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Observers:

Meeting Notes:

| J.E. Simpson                             | ERH Associates (Audio recording, 1st version of Draft Summary Notes) |

Material circulated in advance of, or available at, the meeting:

- Draft Agenda for TAC DMNP Meeting #9 (2006.11.21)
- 'Summary Notes: Lower Don EAs – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #8 (Dec. 14, 2005)' (TRCA; printed copies at meeting)
- 'Outcome of Steps 1 & 2 and Next Steps of the Environmental Assessment – Public Forum / December 5,2006.' (Gartner Lee Ltd.; PowerPoint presentation, printed handout)
- 'Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Step 4 – Reduce List to 5 Alternative Methods' (Gartner Lee Ltd. TRCA; printed handout at meeting, MS Word DOC via e-mail on 2006-11-22)

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

Adele Freeman, as Chair, brought the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

The Chair welcomed the attendees to this Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting and advised that the DMNP EA [Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment] is the second portion of a two-part body of work being performed on behalf of TWRC (Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation) on the lower end the Don River.

She encouraged first-time attendees not to hesitate to ask questions of the other TAC members who have, in some cases, been attending these meetings for nearly four years. The Chair also advised that a Terms of Reference for the TAC is available for those new members wishing to better familiarize themselves with the nature and mandate of the committee.

TAC members, TAC Alternate Members, consultants and TRCA staff then present introduced themselves for the record.
2.0 EA ToR Status and Site Walk #2 – October 14, 2006

Ken Dion advised that the TRCA and project team submitted the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the DMNP EA in the Spring of 2006, and received approval of them from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment in August.

In light of the extended “time lag” since the last Public Forum meeting (January 2006), and to further the aim of keeping the public informed, invigorated, excited about, and involved in the project, an event featuring a Site Walk and a Boat Cruise was held on October 14.

Dion recounted:

Approximately 180 people turned out for the event, despite the adverse weather conditions that day. The attendees were broken up into three large groups, and each group led on a guided tour around the Don Greenway and 480 Lakeshore Blvd. area. The boat cruise component involved a trip between the Keating Channel and the Ship Channel.

Speakers from TRCA and the project consultant teams made presentations, as did a number of other experts not formally associated with the project. The latter included representatives from the Toronto Port Authority and TEDCO, an archivist from York University and City of Toronto staff, to name but a few.

It was “a really, really good day”, and strong positive feedback was received. Worth noting is that nearly 50% of the attendees had not previously been involved with the DMNP EA, thus bringing new minds and ideas to the project as it moves forward.

3.0 Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Update

Marc Rose advised that he, along with Dale Leadbeater and Paul Murray, would be giving a PowerPoint presentation that has been prepared for delivery at the December 5, 2006 Public Forum event. [see: Attachment 'B'] He referred the TAC to the distributed hardcopy handouts of the presentation slides.

He used the first 15 slides to describe:

- Key elements of the Terms of Reference for the EA, including the Study Area, the Objectives of the EA and the Methodology that will be used for conducting the EA;
- Step 1: Developing the initial Long List of Alternative Methods that will undergo a technical screening (in Step 2) based on their ability to reasonably meet the goal and objectives for flood protection and naturalization.

This included information on:

- a summary of the various steps that will be undertaken to determine the preferred alternative;
- the four alternative discharge locations that were identified in the EA ToR;
- the five generic channel/floodplain cross-section types;
- the required water levels that need to be met at the downstream end of the CN Railway bridge in order to meet the flood protection objective;
- the potential impacts of lake water levels on flood conveyance for the various cross-sections and discharge points.
Synopsis of Questions/Comments (and Responses):
(*) Comment/Question; (r): Responses from project team; (c): Responses/comment from TAC.

- John Kelly: What is the water depth in cross-sections based on the "River Channel" form at normal levels?
  - The depth in the "Lacustrine" cross-section was about 1/2 metre, in the "River Channel" variants, it was in the order of several metres.
  - The cross-sections shown in the presentation today are generic representations drawn from the EA ToR. For the Public Forum, diagrams are being prepared that show the water depth, water elevation and cross-section widths.

Dale Leadbeater used the next 13 slides to further develop the initial long list of Alternative Methods in Step 1 and to walk through the process and results of the technical screening that was used to refine the long list of Alternative Methods into a more manageable list of Alternative Methods. This discussion included:

- The habitat types and variations being considered;
- The characteristics of each habitat type (vegetation types, permissible/required water depth, "roughness", flooding frequency) that determine their biological viability in, and their suitability for use within, flood protection channels;
- The nature of, and rationales for, the screening criteria used to determine which of the habitat types could be used in conjunction with each of the identified discharge points/pathways and channel cross-section combinations;
- The pros and cons of each habitat type, the pros and cons of each discharge point/cross-section configuration on habitat viability, the need for areas of quiescent flow in order to allow settling-out of fine, suspended particulate matter.
- General guidelines for choosing vegetation and habitat types to ensure viability and enhance biodiversity, including the need to choose vegetation that survives in "urban" conditions.
- The considerations and trade-offs employed in a preliminary fashion to determine the potential for habitat viability (especially as regards to water levels and fluctuation) versus water transport capabilities through the various cross-sections in order to address the fundamental flood protection requirement.
- The 14 Alternatives that resulted from the initial technical screening to determine the combinations of habitat type, channel cross-section and discharge point that would potentially be biologically viable, maximize opportunities for biodiversity and meet the flood protection objective.

Synopsis of Questions/Comments (and Responses):
(*) Comment/Question; (r): Responses from project team; (c): Responses/comment from TAC.

- Dan Francey: Did using one or another of the various cross-sections alter the frequency and/or severity of the flooding events?
  - Don Haley: The lacustrine option would have a channel width which included the entire 300 m width as opposed to the remaining options which would be in the 60-80 m width for the low flow with higher flows out to the entire 300 m width of the new floodplain. The only option with a slightly larger permanently wetter low flow would be the options which included a lacustrine component.
  - Marc Rose: We are going to be doing more hydraulic modelling in the next step in order to determine flooding frequency. The analyses to date have been aimed mostly at determining whether a particular combination of discharge point and cross-section would be able to meet the flood protection objective.
Paul Murray: Also keep in mind the impact of "lake effect." Lake level fluctuations of up to 1 metre are not uncommon on an annual basis.
- Don Haley: Two different hydraulic regimes must be considered when evaluating possible habitat types and channel cross-sections – the river and the lake.
- (Unknown) Have assumptions regarding dredging activity been incorporated at this point?
  - Don Haley: The assumption is that whatever ‘solution’ is examined, sediment transport has to be dealt with. Effectively there are two basic options: conveying sediment into the Inner Harbour and dealing with it there, or sediment deposition within the river and dealing with it at that chosen location.
  - Marc Rose: It is being assumed that there will have to be some sort of "sediment trap" near the CN bridge so that sediment is not dumped into the naturalized portions of the Don Mouth.
  - Don Haley: Sediment transport modelling is very expensive. Given that every option that could be considered will have to incorporate sediment transport considerations, it is not necessary or advisable to use that as a primary screening criterion. Our aim is to reduce the number of options being evaluated to relatively few before conducting that modelling.
  - Don Haley: The sediment load that must be handled is the same no matter what option is being considered. What differs between them is where that sediment is dealt with. Further to Marc’s comment: The initial review by the sediment modelling team is that it will drop out sooner rather than later when there is a low gradient. So, there may be, or need to be, an option where the sediment handling is done up in the system rather than at the harbour. However, the actual details of that will be examined later.
- (Unknown) Are sediment-related issues going to be illustrated or addressed at the Public Forum?
  - Dale Leadbeater: The preliminary advice we are receiving is to trap and manage the sediment early in the system in order to maximize biological viability and functionality of the plant and animal habitat areas being created. Detailed modelling of this has not been done to date.
  - Ken Dion: In terms of ecological impact considerations, trapping sediment earlier only collects the heavier materials. We will still have turbidity and silt going beyond that area, and we will still have to worry about a lot of sand to deal with further on.
- Adele Freeman: What is the (primary) channel width in Discharge Point configurations 4W and 4S?
  - Paul Murray: 300 metres.
  - Dale Leadbeater: The "overflow" channel in these configurations is intended to accommodate the flows in storms of greater than the 10- to 50-year event severity. It is assumed there will not be regular water flows or wetlands in those channels unless we choose to design for that.
- (Unknown): Is that to say that it doesn’t then matter if there are trees in the "overflow" channel or spillway, since it is not the primary path for water during flooding events?
  - Dale Leadbeater: According to the modelling performed to date, yes.
  - Chair: Keep in mind that we are talking, at this early conceptual level, of a 300-metre width in both the primary channel and the overflow/spillway. Also keep in mind that a 300-metre size (for the spillway area) is not present in the City's Secondary Plan for this area (“Commissioner's Park”). This is, though, addressed in the ToR: the conceived sizes of the two channels and the requirement to consider and address any structures or other impediments that may be in the spillway location.
  - Paul Murray: We are basically splitting the flow between two channels with options 4W and 4S, so we can tolerate a bit higher "roughness" coefficient and still have the water pass through. We
will have to do modelling refinement as we get to the next steps to deal with any structures or obstacles that may be in these pathways.

- **Don Haley**: Basically, we modelled the configurations at this stage in the EA using the highest "roughness" coefficient for an upland forest. That way, we are assured that, barring more restrictive infrastructure obstacles, we are reasonably assured of being able to get water past almost any kind of habitat into this (spillway) area.

- **(Unknown)**: I understand we are referring at this point to a 'conceptual' width of 300 metres for both channels/corridors. As the design is refined, are we going to see width variations – 100 and 460, for instance – or is the aim to have two similar widths?

- **Paul Murray**: We made general assumptions at this point in terms of Study Area size to deal with the primary channels. Further refinement, and 'horse-trading' of available land areas, is required as the project moves forward.

- **Dale Leadbeater**: Keep in mind too that the channels won't necessarily look like "300 and 300" because there will be all kinds of design opportunities that arise as the concept and requirements are further refined.

**Paul Murray** used the remaining slides in the presentation to outline:

- The remaining steps in the process to identify and evaluate "Alternative Methods" (Steps 3 through 5) in order to determine a "Preferred Alternative";
- The overall issues and requirements against which the alternatives emerging from Step 2 must now be evaluated.
- The proposed process for screening the alternatives identified in Step 2 in order to derive a short list of approximately five alternatives to carry forward for in-depth analysis;
- A proposed set of evaluation criteria to use for that screening; and,
- The current time-lines for the balance of this EA Study;

A printed handout of the proposed Step 4 Evaluation Criteria was circulated.

**TAC members** were asked to review the document and provide comments to Marc Rose within three weeks regarding any errors or omissions, suggestions or other comments.

**Synopsis of Questions/Comments (and Responses):**

- **(Unknown)**: Water quality is not included in the objectives. Is it just assumed that would be an inherent benefit of naturalization?

  - **Paul Murray**: That is a very good question. The issue of water quality was addressed in the EA ToR. Essentially, the mouth of the river is not the appropriate location to deal with that problem; it must be addressed further up in the watershed. Among other things, the area available at and around the mouth of the Don River simply is not large enough to create an effective wetland for addressing water quality.
  
  A number of programmes and Master Plans have been created to try to improve the quality of the water in the river. In this EA, we need to recognize that potential for change in quality of the water we receive and need to be able to deal with.

  - **(Unknown)**: Has some thought been directed to consider whether an "emergent wetland" was more beneficial as opposed to an "upland forest", and so on.

  - **Paul Murray**: Bill Snodgrass has calculated that a marsh roughly the size of the Inner Harbour would be required to get any actual improvement in water quality. This is not practical in terms of
this project. That is why you only see us addressing/accommodating changes in the water quality of the flows coming down to the river mouth.

- **Stephen Kaufman**: What are the “man-made” sources of the water coming out of the mouth of the river?
  - **Paul Albanese**: The sources are varied. Material washed into the storm sewers gets into the Don River (including materials on the surface of roads, oil, dog feces, etc.). There are also some CSOs along the Don River that have the potential to discharge into the river during peak storm events and heavy snow-melt periods.
  - **The Chair**: CSOs, such as those in the Leaside area, can discharge raw, untreated domestic sewage into the river during high rainfall events.
  - **Paul Albanese**: You also get people dumping motor oil and paint into a catch-basin on their street. That goes into the storm sewer, and then into the river. The City has a Sewer Use By-law that regulates what can, and cannot, go into a sanitary sewer or into a storm sewer, and also monitors discharges from industry into dedicated sanitary sewers. However, if there is an “overflow”, there can be a flow into the Don River.
  - **Chair**: At their meeting in September, Council gave staff direction to go ahead with a major EA dealing with outfalls and overflows into Taylor Massey Creek (that watercourse runs into the Don River) and for CSOs from there to the mouth of the Don, and then east and west across the waterfront. That is a major step forward, and a wonderful adjunct to what we are doing.
  - **(Unknown)**: It would be such a pity to do such a wonderful job here with this EA then find out the work is being ruined by stuff coming down the river.
  - **Chair**: If you add that work plus the Wet Weather Management Flow Master Plan [WWFMMP] and improved treatment at the North Toronto Treatment Plant, there is a whole collection of projects. They really say, “let’s go ahead and do this EA!”. These projects are moving ahead; in fact, addressing the CSO problem within the WWFMMP has been moved forward about five years, to my understanding. It is going to take a while to put all these things in place, but I think the direction is set.
  - **Notetaker**: offered comment that a finding in the WWFMMP was that water quality in the Don River is already a problem when it enters the municipal area of Toronto. Quality impairment occurs farther up in the watershed, outside of the municipal boundaries, and jurisdictional area of the City. Thus, the problem is not entirely contamination introduced into the river within the City. There are, it was reported by the WWFMMP study team, limits to what can be done to improve water quality in the Don River until such time as the municipalities in the upper area of the watershed also act to do so.
  - **Chair**: An integrated watershed management plan for the Don River is due to start imminently. It includes those upstream municipalities. So, there are a whole series of things being done to improve the water quality at the mouth of the Don River. That said, it must be remembered that we have to deal with the fact that the Don watershed is about 85% “urbanized”.

- **John Kelly**: [ref: slide “Step 3 – Describe the Alternatives”] It is going to be a big job to try to determine the impact of infrastructure on the Study Area, especially when it is not known what at least some of the infrastructure will look like in the future. For example, the Waterfront East Bayfront Transit Environmental Assessment is ongoing; the TWRC is supposed to have the Don River Mouth Area Road Infrastructure EA underway; we have no idea what, if anything, may or may not happen to the Gardiner Expressway; etc.
  - **Obviously**, roads, road bridges and transit bridges in that area are going to have an impact on the ability to move water through it. The suggested criteria do not appear to mention two railway spur lines that run through the Study Area (Kingston rail line). This is a concern since railways are harder to move and take long to move than roadways.
The elevations of the industrial rail spurs in that area cannot be changed quickly, and they must match to the elevations of the rail yards on the east side of the Don Roadway.

- **Chair: They may have to be re-designed and re-built.**
  - John Kelly: It appears the criteria suggest they may have to be designed for being submerged periodically. I imagine that could present an enormous problem with respect to debris.
- **Chair: I agree, that could be a major problem, and there may be others. Maybe there is an Alternative that could address them. What we need to do as we go through this process is identify problems such as these rail spurs, identify the impacts, gather data and facts regarding that, and determine if there is a resolution. It is also fair to say that the project team is not making all the decisions. Raising these issues in the Public Forums will also bring input and insight into defining and resolving the problems.

- John Kelly: The current Keating Channel width at Cherry Street is 25 metres. A “river” channel of 60-80 metres would require a significantly larger bridge structure, especially if a 'lift' bridge is contemplated (to permit transit of barges for removal of sediment). That is a big challenge and could be very expensive.
- **Paul Murray:** The reality is that the 80 metres width is for the “low flow” channel; the whole floodplain is about 300 metres. You can thus imagine what span might be required for passing a “regional” flood underneath it.
  
Some of the things we are going to be examining include structures currently in place that may have to be replaced, structures that might be there in the future, and the span required to pass the flood water under them.

Also consider that we don’t necessarily see this project being implemented “all in one shot.” So, there may be opportunities to deal with some elements while having to accommodate land uses or infrastructure uses that may change over time. For example, the rail spur might have to be there “as is” for ten years, but we might be able to re-locate it in the longer term as some of the other planning for the Port Lands gets resolved.

4.0 **International Design Competition – Don Mouth Area**

Adele Freeman advised that Chris Glaisek, the scheduled presenter for this agenda item, was unable to attend today's meeting so TAC members would have to hold their questions for another time when he was available, and then commented:

Setting aside for the moment the words “international” and “competition”, the key motif here is that the project area, along with the East Bay Front and the road structures spanning the Don River, is at the center of the gateway into the Port Lands. This is very critical to recognize.

This high level of importance of the site requires expanding our mindset beyond simply thinking of recreation space into a consideration of public realm. Soon it will be time in this EA to move beyond technical work and consideration of screening matrices, and start showing the people just what designs for the area could look like.

We need to get some of the underlying technical work done and some of the related issues settled over the next few months so that the foundations, the information bases are in place. Then the people working on the other EAs and on transit infrastructure and Precinct Planning will have better information available concerning this project. And then we can bring in designers to get working on this project. Discussions can begin in a meaningful way on such things as the “trade-offs” mentioned earlier – 125 versus 300 versus 450 metre channel widths, for instance. That way, design concepts can be created, based on those technical fundamentals and the flood protection requirements, which actually, visually show what the different forms in the public realm could look like.
Chris Glaisek is working on this as a high priority task, meeting with City staff and others as we speak, and that is why he is unable to attend this TAC meeting. He is also working on developing a “RFQ” process for bringing other folks on-board towards developing the design. He will possibly be coming to the CLC meeting.

I can accept questions, comments and advice you might wish to offer and pass them along to Chris, but am unable to myself provide answers to those matters here at this meeting.

No questions or comments were offered.

5.0 **Public Meeting (December 5, 2006) Arrangements**

Ken Dion advised the TAC as follows:

Per past practice in this EA and the previous EA (LDRW), the presentations, materials and so forth for Public Forum events are brought beforehand to the TAC and CLC for review and comment to ensure key issues are being covered and the language is clear and understandable. That is a key reason for this TAC meeting.

We are proposing that the upcoming Public Forum be conducted a bit differently than those held to date.

There is a concern that the public is getting “talked-to to death” with all the projects currently going on. Another full, rather long presentation such as that made to the TAC earlier in this meeting seems unadvisable. As an alternative, the December 5th Forum will be conducted as an “extensive ‘open house’ event”. A number of rooms will be used, with information kiosks in each – almost like a ‘science fair’ – that are related to various individual aspects of the project. Project team members will staff the kiosks to explain the material and answer questions from the public in a one-on-one fashion. After a time period for members of the public to visit the information stations, they will be assembled for a general, somewhat formal presentation – albeit much shorter than the one earlier in today’s meeting (30-40 minutes or less) – followed by a Q&A session. After that, the public can then go back to revisit the information kiosks.

We are striving for this Forum to be an educational, one-on-one, feedback gathering process.

The Chair invited TAC members to bring or suggest materials for information kiosks or display stations at the Forum. She suggested that a display regarding the City’s Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan should be included at the Forum since questions from the public on that topic and programme frequently arise. She added that a display related to transportation issues as they relate to the Study Area would also be good to have.

6.0 **Closing Remarks and Adjournment**

The Chair reminded TAC members to review the chart “Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Step 4” and provide comments within three weeks (December 15th). Further to a suggestion by a TAC member, the Chair requested that Michelle Vanderwel circulate the chart to TAC members in electronic format.

TAC members are to send any comment regarding the presentation delivered at this meeting to Marc Rose as soon as possible.

At the request of the Chair, Don Haley offered some information and remarks regarding the rainstorm that occurred last week:
The actual peak flow occurred at 8:00 a.m. Only a very small portion of Bayview Avenue was flooded. However, the press went into a "feeding frenzy" and somehow got it into their mind that major portions of Bayview and the DVP were going to be under water.

The TRCA was constantly in contact with the police and transportation authorities during this time. The press apparently called those agencies and was repeatedly told there was no problem, but chose to ignore that information.

The storm was less than a "1-year event" in severity.

The storm on August 19, 2005, was greater than a 100-year event in severity, but since it did not occur over the entire Don River watershed, the flow at the river mouth was at or below that expected for a "5-year event."

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

---------------------------------------------------------------------

NEXT MEETING of the Lower Don EAs TAC

Date/Time: T.B.A.

Location: T.B.A.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS


2. TAC members to review the document "Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Step 4" and provide comment/feedback/suggestions within three weeks.

3. TAC members to bring, or suggest, materials for information kiosks or display stations at the December 5 Public Forum event. (Materials and/or a display related to the City's Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan is particularly sought)
--- ATTACHMENTS ---

A. – Agenda – TAC DMNP Meeting #9  (21 November 2006)

B. –  “Outcomes of Steps 1 & 2
and Next Steps of the
Environmental Assessment ”
Public Forum
December 5 2006
(TRCA, Gartner Lee; PowerPoint presentation)

[** NOTE: Due to inherent limitations in transferring PowerPoint slides]  
[ into a format for inclusion in the Summary Notes, and in printing  
[ hardcopy of the Notes, fine/small details on slides may not be  
[ easily readable. Every effort is made to minimize the impact  
[ of this effect. Reference should always be made to the original  
[ slides or printed handout where inspection of those fine detail  
[ items is required.  
]
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands
Flood Protection Project EA
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #9

Chair: Adele Freeman

Tuesday November 21, 2006
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Toronto Metro Hall - Room 302
55 John Street

AGENDA

(Refreshments - Coffee, Tea, Juice, Water – 1:30 p.m.)

1. Welcome and Introductions (Adele Freeman) 1:30 p.m.

2. EA ToR Status and Site Walk #2 – October 14, 2006 (Ken Dion) 1:35 p.m. – 1:40 p.m.

3. Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Update (Gartner Lee Staff) 1:40 p.m. – 2:40 p.m.
   - Brief Review of Purpose and Objectives of EA
   - Overview Step 1 (Developing Long-List of Alternatives)
   - Overview Step 2 (Refinement of Long-List of Alternatives – Technical Screening)
   - Next Steps and Timelines

4. TAC Questions and Comments Regarding DMNP EA Discussion 2:40 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

   Break and Informal Discussion (10 minutes)

5. International Design Competition – Don Mouth Area (Chris Glaisek, TWRC) 3:10 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

6. TAC Questions and Comments Regarding International Design Competition and Integration with Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA 3:30 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.

7. Public Meeting December 5, 2006 Arrangements (Ken Dion) 3:45 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.

8. Closing Remarks and Meeting Adjournment (Adele Freeman) 3:50 p.m.
Outcomes of Steps 1 & 2 and Next Steps of the Environmental Assessment

Public Forum
December 5, 2006

Presentation Overview
1. Background from Terms of Reference
2. Outcomes of Step 1 (Develop long list of alternatives)
3. Outcomes of Step 2 (Identification of short list)
4. Process for Steps 3 (Describe short list) and 4 (Reduce short list)

Study Area

Methodology

Background from Terms of Reference
- Terms of Reference (ToR) provides framework for Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Approved in August 2006
- Defines various elements to be addressed during EA
Step 1
Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Lacustrine Environment
(L)

Natural River Channel
(R)

Step 1
Cross-sections for Primary Channel

Created Wetland
(CW)

L + CW =
Lacustrine / Created Wetland
(LCW)

Step 1
New Cross-sections

L + R =
Lacustrine / Natural River
(LR)

Step 1
Habitats (vegetation communities)
Step 1

**Habitat Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Depth (m)</th>
<th>Roughness</th>
<th>Flooding Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 to 50</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 0</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>severe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 to 20</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 45</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>&gt;0.5</td>
<td>intermittent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2

**What are screening criteria?**

- Thresholds to eliminate conceptual designs that are not technically feasible
  
  1. Flood Protection
     - Do cross-section convey regulatory flood volumes associated with regulatory flood?
  
  2. Naturalization
     - Do cross-section meet requirements for plant growth?

Step 3

**Flood Protection**

- Cross-section conveys regulatory flood
- Vegetation communities do not impede water flow

Step 2

**Naturalization (plant growth)**

- Water depth under average conditions is shallow enough to promote plant growth
- vegetation communities are not susceptible to silting

Step 2

**Screening**

- Too deep to support vegetation communities
- Floods too infrequently to support most wet vegetation communities

**Screening Summary**

- Does not meet flood protection criteria
- Does not meet plant growth criteria
- Does not meet wet vegetation community criteria
Step 2
Screening - Primary Channel

- Too deep to support vegetation communities except submerged marsh
- Will not survive in lacustrine environment because of too much silt

Step 2
Summary - Primary Channel

Step 2
Description of Overflow Landform
- 300 m wide landform designed to convey floods equal to or greater than 50-year storm
- Split channel not possible due to habitat and river operation requirements
- May include a variety of upland habitat types and other compatible uses

Next Steps

Step 4
Reducing the Short List of Alternatives
- Determine how well alternatives achieve objectives based on evaluation criteria
- Describe issues and trade-offs with alternatives
- Identify approximately 5 refined short list alternatives

Step 4
Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Buildings</td>
<td>Quality and geometry of old and new structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Erosion</td>
<td>Structure-shoreline interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigability</td>
<td>Habitat diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Value</td>
<td>Scenic and cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Ecological integrity and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>attractiveness and potential use of forested areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Protection</td>
<td>Flood protection functions and/or capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Quality</td>
<td>Surface water quality and treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Initial and ongoing costs and potential savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion</td>
<td>Cost and benefits of erosion management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Cost and benefits of public and private construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information appears to be from a report or presentation related to a project, possibly involving environmental or ecological considerations.
### Step 4 Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact of change</td>
<td>Enhance facility endurance of sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve existing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve existing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 4 Sample Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact of change</td>
<td>Enhance facility endurance of sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve existing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve existing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain or improve with new investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions?

- What are the key objectives for this project?
- How will the project ensure sustainability over time?
- What are the expected outcomes for each year?

---

*Note: The tables and diagrams are placeholders for the actual content.*
December 6, 2006

Michelle Vanderwel
Don Watershed Administrative Clerk
Toronto and Region Conservation
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4

Dear Ms Vanderwel;

Re: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection
TAC Members

Thank you for your letter memorandum dated November 29, 2006 providing us with the Criteria Evaluation Tables for the above noted project and requesting the TAC members to review and comment.

CNR does not wish to be on the Technical Advisory Committee for this project and requests to be removed from the TAC mailing list. CNR does however request to be advised if there will be any potential impacts to the CN railway within the study area.

Sincerely,

Daryllann Perry for
John F. MacTaggart, P.Eng.
Senior Engineering Services Officer
To: Ken Dion (TRCA)

Cc: Tom Golem, Alex Lafrance (EC TWRI Secretariat), Laurie Bruce, Linda Beaulieu (Transport Canada), Lau Matos (Fisheries and Oceans Canada), Sheryl Lusk (Environment Canada-Burlington), Kitty Ma (Health), Suzanne Laperriere (PWGSC), EA Coordination (INAC), Angus Armstrong (Toronto Port Authority), Paul Lacoste (CTA), Sandra Martindale (NEB),

From: Jim Chan, CEA Agency Ontario Region (sent via email)

Date: April 2nd, 2008

Subject: COMPILATION OF FEDERAL COORDINATION RESPONSES: Don Mouth Naturalization Project Environmental Assessment

In my role as the Federal EA Coordinator, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency circulated the Project Description (March 3, 2008) to the various federal authorities in order to determine which ones have an interest and involvement in your above named project. Based on the information provided, below is the summary of the federal coordination responses to date:

**Responsible Authority (RA):** will have a decision making role in respect to your project.

- Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) will require an environmental assessment of the project under Section 5 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (the Act). The indicated potential trigger is the Fisheries Act Section 35(2). (See below)

**Potential RAs:** will have a potential decision making role (tbd pending more information from the proponent).

- EC TWRI Secretariat is prepared to participate early as a potential RA until their RA status has been determined. The indicated potential trigger is financial assistance under Section 5 of the Act.

- Transport Canada (TC) needs additional information to make a determination and is prepared to participate early as a potential RA until their RA status has been determined. Potential trigger is NWPA Section 5(1)(a). Other potential NWPA approvals but which are not triggers may include Section 5(2) and 10. For example, additional information requests include design drawings of proposed bridge works (for new and existing bridges), waterway alignments and dock wall
works. Note: TC’s application form and guide to the NWPA was forwarded via email to your attention on March 18, 2008 and is attached again below.

Needs additional information:

National Energy Board (NEB) needs additional information to make a determination. Potential trigger is NEB Act Section 58. The project description refers to potential pipeline relocations. An application to the Board will be required if the facilities are regulated by the NEB, and will likely trigger the CEA Act. Upon receipt of an application pursuant to the NEB Act by a regulated company, the Board is better able to determine its interest and any CEAA responsibilities. Information requirements for applications under the NEB Act are described in the Board’s Filing Manual, which is available on its web site at http://www.neb-one.gc.ca/. The Board would normally only become involved with this type of project should it receive an application from an NEB regulated company.

Expert FAs: will have the role of informing and providing technical advice.

- Environment Canada (EC Burlington office) is in possession of specialist or expert information and has an interest in the project.
- Health Canada (HC) has determined that it is not a Responsible Authority (RA) but under subsection 12(3) of the Act, Health Canada would be pleased to provide expertise as an expert Federal Authority upon written request by the Responsible Authority.

Waiting response:

- Canadian Transportation Agency (CTA)
- Toronto Port Authority (TPA)

Is not likely to require an environmental assessment of the project under Section 5 of the Act.

- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)
- Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) has a potential interest in the project and would like to be kept informed throughout the environmental assessment process. (See below)

Coordination Meeting:

Please give me a call if you wish to scheduled a conference call "start-up meeting" that would include the proponent/consultant and the federal review team to provide clarification of information needs. Shortly afterwards, the federal review team will formally determine the start of the EA by posting a Notice of Commencement on the CEAA’s Registry website and commence discussions on scoping.

If you have any questions related to the federal EA process or federal roles and responsibilities please don’t hesitate to contact me. In a separate email, I will forward the federal review team contacts.

Yours,

Jim Chan
Appendix:

Attached are letters from PWGSC, DFO and Transport Canada’s NWPA form and guide.
March 18, 2008

Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
55 St. Clair Avenue East, Suite 907
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M4T 1M2

Attention: Jim Chan

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization project EA: Federal Coordination Response

Jim,

Thank you for circulating the Project Description for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project to Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).

PWGSC has determined that this Department does not own any land or facilities within the limits of the project study area as presented in Figure 2-1 of the project description. As such, PWGSC does not (nor anticipate in the future) have a responsibility under section 5 of CEAA to assess the environmental effects of the project. In addition, PWGSC has determined that we have no specialist or expert information or knowledge with respect to an environmental assessment of the proposed project pursuant to section 12(3) of CEAA.

That said, our Geomatics Branch review revealed that PWGSC is the custodian of a number of properties within the larger Impact Assessment Study Area depicted in Figure 2-2. For this reason, PWGSC requests to be included in the circulation of environmental assessment material in order to ascertain if any of PWGSC properties will be affected either directly, indirectly or cumulatively by construction and operation of project components as greater details become available.

Additionally, for your information, the geomatics review revealed that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is the custodian for a parking area on Commissioner Road in the middle of the project study area.

If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me at 416-590-8301 or suzanne.laperriere@pwgsc.gc.ca

Sincerely,

[Signed]

Suzanne LaPerrière
Senior Environmental Officer

EDRMS # 256611
March 26, 2008

WATERFRONT
Toronto
C/O Ms. Brenda Webster
20 Bay Street, Suite 1310
Toronto ON M5J 2N8

Dear Ms. Webster:

Subject: Authorization required under subsection 35(2) of the Fisheries Act

Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) received your project description on March 11, 2008 from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency concerning the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project in the Toronto Inner Harbour. To expedite future correspondence or inquiries, please refer to your referral title and file numbers when you contact us.

Habitat File No.: BU-03-2942
Referral Title: Naturalization and Flood Protection, Lower Don River, Toronto

It is our understanding that your proposal consists of:

- The realignment and naturalization of the mouth of the Don River

as outlined in the following plans:


Based on the information provided, we have concluded that your proposal will result in the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat. The harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat is prohibited unless authorized by DFO pursuant to subsection 35(2) of the Fisheries Act. In reviewing your proposal, we will consider the Department's Policy for the Management of Fish Habitat, which provides that no authorizations be issued unless acceptable measures for any habitat loss are developed and implemented by the proponent. Attached is an Application for Authorization form to be completed and returned to us.

Please be advised that subsection 35(2) of the Fisheries Act has been included in the list of laws that trigger the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA). This means that DFO is required to conduct an environmental assessment of your project, as prescribed by CEAA, before
deciding to issue an authorization. If, as a result of this review, we are satisfied that the project, after taking into account the implementation of any mitigation measures, is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects, an authorization under the *Fisheries Act* may be issued.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Information provided by you related to the Environmental Assessment for this project will be part of the Canadian Environment Assessment Registry and will be made available to members of the public, if requested. A package with additional information about these requirements is attached. Please ensure that you review and understand these requirements. Please be aware that release of documents to the public may be part of the CEAA process. Should you provide any documents that contain confidential or sensitive information that you believe could be protected from release to the public, please contact the undersigned to obtain an Exclusion Form. This Form can be used to identify the information to be considered for exclusion from the Canadian Environment Assessment Registry and the rationale for the exclusion.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact me directly by telephone at (905) 639-9620 or by fax at (905) 639-3549.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Laud Matos  
Fish Habitat Biologist  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Ontario – Great Lakes Area  
Southern District

**Attachment(s):**
- Application for Authorization for Works or Undertakings Affecting Fish Habitat
- Important Note: CEAA Public Registry Requirements
- Section 55 of CEAA

**c.c.:** Ken Dion, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority  
Jim Chan, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency  
Tom Golem, Environment Canada  
Laurie Bruce, Planning Solutions  
Paul Murray, Gartner Lee Limited  
Anneliese Grieve, SENES Consultants Limited  
Thelma Gee, Anna Palamarchuck, Lisa Prime, WATERFRONT Toronto
To: Ken Dion (TRCA)

Cc: Tom Golem, Alex Lafrance (EC TWRI Secretariat), Laurie Bruce, Rebecca Earl (Transport Canada), Laud Matos (Fisheries and Oceans Canada), Steve Woolfenden (Fisheries and Oceans), Sheryl Lusk (Environment Canada-Burlington), Kitty Ma (Health), Suzanne Lapierre (PWGSC), EA Coordination (INAC), Angus Armstrong (Toronto Port Authority), Ken Lundy (Toronto Port Authority), John Woodward (CTA), Sandra Martindale (NEB)

From: Jim Chan, CEA Agency Ontario Region (sent via email)

Date: August 7, 2008

Subject: REVISED FEDERAL COORDINATION RESPONSES: Don Mouth Naturalization Project Environmental Assessment

In my role as the Federal EA Coordinator, an initial federal coordination response was sent on April 2, 2008. Below is a revised summary of the federal coordination responses:

**Responsible Authority (RA):** will have a decision making role in respect to your project.

- Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) will require an environmental assessment of the project under Section 5 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (the Act). The indicated potential trigger is the *Fisheries Act* Section 35(2).

- Transport Canada (TC) will require an environmental assessment of the project under Section 5 of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. Transport Canada may issue an approval under paragraph 5(1)(a) of the *Navigable Waters Protection Act*.

**Needs additional information:**

National Energy Board (NEB) needs additional information to make a determination. Potential trigger is *NEB Act* Section 58. The project description refers to potential pipeline relocations. An application to the Board will be required if the facilities are regulated by the NEB, and will likely trigger the *CEA Act*. Upon receipt of an application pursuant to the *NEB Act* by a regulated company, the Board is better able to determine its interest and any CEEA responsibilities. Information requirements for applications under the *NEB Act* are described in the Board’s Filing Manual, which is available on its web site at http://www.neb-one.gc.ca/. The Board would normally
only become involved with this type of project should it receive an application from an NEB regulated company.

**Expert FAs:** will have the role of informing and providing technical advice.

- Environment Canada (EC Burlington office) is in possession of specialist or expert information and has an interest in the project.

- Health Canada (HC) has determined that it is not a Responsible Authority (RA) but under subsection 12(3) of the Act, Health Canada would be pleased to provide expertise as an expert Federal Authority upon written request by the Responsible Authority.

**Is not likely** to require an environmental assessment of the project under Section 5 of the Act.

- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)

- Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) has a potential interest in the project and would like to be kept informed throughout the environmental assessment process.

- Toronto Port Authority (TPA) will continue to be involved for areas of interest to their operations.

- Canadian Transportation Agency (CTA)

- On July 31, 2008, Environment Canada, through the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Initiative (TWRI) Secretariat determined that they are not a federal authority for the purposes of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Projection project.

Yours,

Jim Chan
Hi Ken,

Sorry for the tardiness of this reply. We have a few people from the office that have been involved with the review of this project and wanted to make sure we are all on the same page with the project.

It appears that there is no Crown land component to the proposed project. The Inner Harbour is a combination of Federal, City, and Toronto Port Authority land. Additionally, there is no Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act (LRIA) approval required as MNR got out of the channelization business several years ago where the projects are within the jurisdiction of a conservation authority with a Regulation. As there is no Crown land component there is no need for a MNR Class EA.

For your convenience I have attached a checklist that we use for MNR Class EA's that outlines considerations when undertaking a MNR Class EA. This may help in your Individual EA when evaluating possible impacts and mitigation measures.

If you have any other questions or concerns please let me know.

Regards,

Chris Hislop
Lands and Waters Technical Specialist
Ministry of Natural Resources
Aurora District
50 Bloomington Road
Aurora ON L4G 0L8
Tel: 905 713-7386 (NEW)
Fax: 905 713-73
Email: chris.hislop@ontario.ca

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken Dion [mailto:KDion@tcar.on.ca]
Sent: December 9, 2009 8:30 PM
To: Hislop, Chris (MNR)
Subject: Fw: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Hello Chris

Just following up with our earlier correspondence. Hope to hear from
you
soon.

Regards
Ken

-----Forwarded by Ken Dion/MTRCA on 12/09/2009 08:36PM -----

To: chris.hislop@ontario.ca
From: Ken Dion/MTRCA
Date: 12/02/2009 02:16PM
Subject: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
EA

Hello Chris

A Mr. Steve Strong recommended that I talk to you about the DMNP EA we are leading on behalf of Waterfront Toronto in Toronto.

It was raised to our awareness by MOE recently that we may need to incorporate in our Individual EA, key elements of MNR's Class EA for lakefill projects. In particular, the areas underlying the proposed Fromontories located within the INner Harbour, and the areas within the Keating Channel, as shown within the enclosed map - to get a clear sense of where the lakefill will occur, please ensure you start the presentation and scroll through.

I was wondering if you could take a moment to review the enclosed and to confirm:
1) Whether the MNR Class EA does come into effect with regards to these proposed works?; and
2) If so, what specific conditions do we need to ensure are incorporated within our Individual EA to cover the requirements of the MNR Class EA process?

Your assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*"
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.

Thank you."

(See attached file: MNR Class EA - Lakefill - Don Mouth Naturalization EA.ppt)"

*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system. Thank you."

Class EA RSFD Screening Criteria.doc
Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278

Dear Mr. Dion:

With regards to the Environment Assessment for the “Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project” that the Toronto Region and Conservation Authority is undertaking on behalf of Waterfront Toronto, please find below the concerns of the Toronto Port Authority.

1) Removal of the Hydraulic Function of the Keating Channel

The Keating Channel was purposely designed and built in the early 1900’s for the capture of suspended particulate matter and floating debris. The design of the Keating Channel means that the majority of the dredging required for the harbour of the Toronto is done in the Keating Channel with no “delta” formation into the inner harbour. The dredge is then transported by barge to the Leslie Street Consigned Disposal Facility for approved disposal. There are more than 400 metric tonnes of floating debris that are annually removed from the Keating Channel and which are currently, easily managed, then dried on the adjacent working dockwall and finally removed. “Clamshell dredging” using the current equipment will not be possible with the construction of permanent bridges along the proposed new path of the lower Don River.

The proposed redesign of the lower Don River will need to address the issues of particulate control / removal, and floating debris management.

2) Introduction of the Don River to the Ship Channel

The Ship Channel is generally a closed system allowing for the safe and unimpeded movement of ship traffic. The addition of a “storm” overflow into the Ship Channel will potentially introduce several safety concerns.

The proposed redesign of the lower Don River will need to address the issues of particulate control / removal, floating debris management, and ship operational control with the introduction of a cross-current in the narrow channel.
3) Navigation within the Inner Harbour

With the introduction of new shoreline contours at the mouth of the Don River, commercial and recreational vessels will need to pay particular attention while in this area. The formation of a shallow "delta" area is probable and will require the addition of navigation aids, the updating of charts, and the education of boaters. Ships berthing at Berths 282-283 and 291-294 will need to exercise caution due to the new shoreline contours.

The proposed redesign of the lower Don River will need to address the issues of particulate control / removal, and safety / navigation of commercial and recreation boat traffic.

4) Introduction of Toxic Substances into the Harbour of Toronto

The new path of the lower Don River will disturb areas that were heavily used and polluted by the petro-chemical industry for decades. This could lead to the leaching of toxins in the harbour of Toronto.

The proposed redesign of the lower Don River will need to address the issues of the leaching of toxins into the harbour of Toronto.

5) Relocation of the Works Yard

The Keating Channel serves as the headquarters for the Toronto Port Authority's Works and Marine Services Department. All of the vessels that the Toronto Port Authority utilize for dredging, harbour debris management, the placement of navigational aids, and other tasks are berthed in the Keating Channel.

The proposed redesign of the lower Don River will need to address the issue of re-location of the Toronto Port Authority's Works and Marine Services Department and equipment.

6) Financial Impact on the Toronto Port Authority

The re-alignment of the lower Don River will also cease commercial shipping and cargo operations at Berths 351-358 and 361-368, and could negatively impact on operations around Berths 282-283, 291-294, 311, 412-416, 421, 455-456 and 461-465.

7) Ownership of Water Lots

The water lots within the Keating Channel and in the areas proposed for lakefilling and creation of new shoreline are under the ownership of the Toronto Port Authority. As such, it will be necessary to address the issue of interest in these waterlots.
8) Environmental Assessment Obligations by the Toronto Port Authority

The Toronto Port Authority is subject to the specific requirements of the Canada Port Authority Environmental Assessment Regulations with respect to federal environmental assessments. Under the present federal act and regulations, the proposed project is not likely to trigger the requirement of an assessment under the Canada Port Authority regulations. However, there are other regulations, authorizations and licences from the Toronto Port Authority which this project may be subject.

Authorization will be required by the Toronto Port Authority, under Port Authorities Operations Regulations to the Canada Marine Act, to divert the flow of a river or stream, cause or affect currents, cause silting or the accumulation of material or otherwise reduce the depth of the waters of the port. This authorization would require due diligent considerations of the proposed work and the Toronto Port Authority would require a proponent for such work to undertake an environmental impact study to address the Port Authority’s concerns.

From the cursory description of the proposed project, it appears that it will also be subject to authorization by the Toronto Port Authority for construction works over, or in, the water. This authorization will review several aspects of this project under our jurisdiction during the construction phase and deal with issues such as navigation; environmental protection of the waters of the port and harbour of Toronto; and, marine security and safety.

In summary, although the Toronto Port Authority is not a Responsible Authority as defined in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, it is in possession of specialist or expert information and knowledge that is necessary to conduct the environmental assessment of the project. It has an interest in the project and would like to be kept informed throughout the environmental assessment process and in order to properly assess authorization application.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours very truly,

Toronto Port Authority
per:

[Signature]

Angus Armstrong
Harbour Master

cc: Mr. K. A. Lundy, P.Eng.; Toronto Port Authority
February 24, 2010

Mr. Angus Armstrong

Re: Letter of Response to Toronto Port Authority Concerns Pertaining to the Project Description for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Dear Mr. Armstrong

We are in receipt of your letter that was sent in response to our CEAA Project Description for the Environmental Assessment for the “Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project”. This letter is to respond to the eight areas of concern about the proposed project.

1) Removal of Hydraulic Function of the Keating Channel

TRCA acknowledges that the function of the Keating Channel as it relates to the management of sediment and debris will no longer be necessary given the proposed new configuration of the Don River. The design for the new river mouth includes widening of the river channel south of the CN Rail embankment in order to pass flood flows under Lake Shore Boulevard. By widening the channel in this location, flow velocities under normal and elevated flow conditions will reduce thereby concentrating sediment deposition in the area north of Lake Shore Boulevard and the Keating Channel.

The design will further encourage sediment deposition in this area north of Lake Shore Boulevard by excavating the channel deeper by several metres, and maintaining these increased depths using a floating hydraulic dredge system connected to a hydrocyclone, which will separate slurry water from the sediments. Dredged sediments are anticipated to be sorted by grain-size, allowing for the coarser sands to be reused for development and/or habitat purposes, while the silts will continue to be deposited in Containment Cell 3 at Tommy Thompson Park. This active separation of grain sizes will also effectively increase the life expectancy of the Cell 3 Containment Cell.

A new sediment and debris management facility will be constructed on the west bank of the Don River, adjacent to the sediment trap, to allow for efficient management of the river. Currently a hydrocyclone is being contemplated for the end of Reach 3a in the
Ship Channel to dewater the dredge slurry. A slurry pipe connecting the dredging facility and the dewatering facility is contemplated along the Don Roadway and future Basin Street extension. Alternative locations for the hydrocyclone (in Reach 1 and 2a) are also being contemplated.

Debris booms will also be installed in this area spanning the channel to allow for the collection and efficient removal of floating wood and garbage coming downstream from the Don River. The sediment management facility will allow for dockside removal of the material. This debris can be removed via truck or barge with larger materials being reused for habitat purposes.

2) Introduction of the Don River to the Ship Channel

TRCA acknowledges that the proposed configuration of the new Don River will potentially increase storm flow into the Ship Channel, as compared to the current conditions. The design includes the following elements to minimize the impacts of sediment, floating debris and implications of cross-currents on navigation in a narrow channel:

- Flood flows from the Don River are not anticipated to access the Ship Channel until over the 25 to 50 year flood event. Operable weirs north of the Keating Channel will provide additional flexibility in regulating when flows entering the Ship Channel. To remove sediment that has deposited in the Ship Channel following very large flood events, the floating hydraulic dredge will be mobile and will be able to remove sediment deposits in the Ship Channel as required. This is anticipated to be required perhaps a couple of times a century.
- To remove woody debris from the Ship Channel following very large flood events, floating debris booms can be used to sweep debris together which can then be removed using the floating hydraulic dredge which is anticipated to include a loader arm.
- To avoid navigation issues related to cross-currents, river flows will not occur from the Ship Channel wetland during most flow conditions. The only time that cross-currents would be an issue would be during hurricane-like conditions, when ships would already be anchored in the Inner Harbour. TRCA has added the Port Authority to the flood monitoring program.

3) Navigation with the Inner Harbour

TRCA acknowledges that the new mouth of the Don River significantly changes the existing shoreline alignment of the Inner Harbour. As part of the EA process, a navigation impact assessment was conducted by Baird and Associates to assess whether the proposed lakefill activities would impair navigation.

The assessment concluded that ships would continue to be able to access the berths along the Central Waterfront. The assessment also identified that the proponent would need to work with the Port Authority to ensure all appropriate navigation aids are installed to shore the limits of the new shore, and to ensure that the appropriate changes to official
navigation charts are made in a timely manner. Specific recommendations for ensuring safe navigation and thereby, protecting against collisions during the construction period, were also provided.

Continued sediment management activities further upstream will inhibit the formation of a delta at the mouth of the Don River. However, in the event that a shallow delta does form, the mobile capabilities of the floating hydraulic barge will allow for periodic maintenance to occur, as required.

4) Introduction of Toxic Substances into the Harbour of Toronto

TRCA acknowledges that the new river alignment will be constructed through soils contaminated by past industrial activities. The proposed construction phasing approach is designed to isolate the construction area from the Don River and Lake Ontario up to around the 50 to 100 year flood event. It is also anticipated that there will be a significant layer of clean material separating the lake and river from any remaining contaminated soils underlying the naturalized system once completed. Once complete, it is anticipated that the risk of toxic substances entering the Harbour of Toronto will be no greater than current conditions.

5) Relocation of the Works Yard

The proposed concept addresses these concerns by relocating the sediment and debris management operations to a new facility located on the west bank of the Don River, immediately upstream from Lake Shore Boulevard. For the remaining Works Yard operations, Waterfront Toronto has identified dock space located along the western Turning Basin to accommodate the machine shop, navigation aid storage, and other works currently undertaken along the Keating Channel.

6) Financial Impact on the Toronto Port Authority (TPA)

The proposed river alignment may potentially impact commercial shipping and cargo operations at a number of berths within the northwestern Port Lands. Waterfront Toronto and TRCA commit to continue meeting with the Port Authority throughout the EA planning, design and construction process as required to track this impact.

7) Ownership of Water Lots

TRCA and Waterfront Toronto are aware that water lots under Port Authority ownership in the Keating Channel and Inner Harbour may potentially be impacted. Waterfront Toronto and TRCA commit to meeting with the Port Authority throughout the EA planning, design and construction process as required to track this concern.

8) Environmental Assessment Obligations by the Toronto Port Authority
Waterfront Toronto and TRCA acknowledges that the Toronto Port Authority has a regulatory interest pertaining to the proposed changes to the diversion of the Don River and its impacts on navigation within the Port, and an interest related to how construction works will proceed within the water. TRCA is undertaking a CEAA Screening report and is aware that the Toronto Port Authority will provide advice to Transport Canada as it relates to this project. Waterfront Toronto and TRCA commit to meeting with the Port Authority throughout the EA planning, design and construction process as required.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager

Cc.: Kevin Bechard, Waterfront Toronto
     Adele Freeman, TRCA
     Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
     Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative – Phase 2

Toronto Port Authority Meeting

MINUTES

April 3, 2013 @ 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: Toronto Port Authority

Angus Armstrong, Toronto Port Authority
Ken Lundy, Toronto Port Authority
Chris Dunn, Waterfront Secretariat
Gwen McIntosh, Waterfront Secretariat
Adele Freeman, TRCA
Ken Dion, TRCA
Chris Glaisek, Waterfront Toronto
David Kusturin, Waterfront Toronto
Shalin Yeboah, Waterfront Toronto
Kyle Knoeck, City Planning
Jamie McEwan, City Planning
Cassidy Ritz, City Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Notes / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overview                 | - City staff provided an overview of work being undertaken for Port Lands Planning Framework  
                            - City staff are preparing a profile document which will identify existing conditions/background information. This will include information on the port function of the Port Lands. City staff are looking for information from TPA on shipping activity.  
                            - Staff also wanted a better understanding of TPAs view of the long-term function of the port. |
| Definition of the Port   | - WT staff asked what it defined as the Port. Is it the 55 acres at Cherry and Unwin or is it all of the industrial operations that make use of the Port? |
| Passenger Cargo/Tour Boats | - TPA requires a cruise terminal for passenger function  
                                 o Short-term tours  
                                 o Larger St. Lawrence cruises – TPA staff noted there is world cruise interest for great lakes  
                                 o Requirements for loading/off-loading and buses  
                                 - TPA noted that other locations for day cruises are going to disappear as they are reliant on parking areas |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Notes / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bulk Storage/Project cargo**         | The port provides road salt storage for all of the GTA  
- The salt arrives by ship. The salt is shipped by truck to municipalities.  
- Municipalities buy on demand and typically per snow storm.  
- If the salt storage did not occur in the Port then all municipalities would be required to enlarge storage areas  
- Pipe/Building materials imported from Europe  
- Rail for TTC  
- Project Steel from Korea/Vietnam  
- Equivalent to 600 truck loads.  
- One ship of project cargo = 500 trucks or 20,000 tons |
| **RedPath**                            | 30-40 ships a year  
- Most from Mexico/Costa Rica  
- Store sugar on dockwalls over-winter (including at Essroc Quay) and primarily sell to Americans |
| **Growth in Refrigerated Units**       | Ships are 400?ft long  
- Fruits and veggies from Latin America  
- The Port ships, stores and trucks product directly to the customer, rather than at the food terminal |
| **Minor Assemblages**                  | Best Buy and Home Depot ship products in bulk and then rebundle on site. Staff asked about frequency of this type of activity. |
| **Rail**                               | Still valuable from TPAs perspective  
- European union – wood pellets  
- City of Toronto uses rail to bring chlorine gas. They utilize Lakeshore to bring the chlorine to Ashbridges Bay.  
- Project cargo – specialized bulk goods manufactured in Ontario comes by rail and is then loaded onto ships.  
- Cargo leaving the port is shipped by truck.  
- TTR manages rail and rail is owned by TPLC  
- CN/CP don't like doing short hauls |
| **Ship Channel**                       | Used by salt and concrete ships  
- 45 ships per year go through the lift bridge.  
- All ships need to turn at the turning basin. |
| **Shipping Trends**                    | Shipping is up to where it was prior to the recession. There was a 5-10% ship traffic increase last year. Traffic is still recovering from sharp decline in 2008.  
- An increasing amount of business is storage, as warehousing declines in the face of "just in time" delivery. Space is an advantage in the Port because it makes it easier to handle. Ability to store goods over the longer term also provides an advantage.  
- TPA provides 2 terminals and charge higher rates for storing inside  
- WT staff asked whether there was a need to increase the amount of space. TPA noted that 2-3 customers and then they are full.  
- International traffic – RedPath and Project Cargo, but the majority of traffic is Great Lakes.  
- TPA will provide stats for Great Lakes shipping activity to the City  
- International ships still use tug boats. |
| **Toronto Port in Comparison to Other Ports** | TPA measures their size as tonnage and compares against other Canadian ports.  
- Toronto sits middle of the pack. Hamilton is larger and imports steel. Other competing ports are Thunder Bay, Oshawa and Windsor. Goderich is a private port. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Notes / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Bridge Requirements**       | - Lift bridges must be designed to provincial standards  
- Ability to handle 62 tonnes  
- Don Roadway was seen as best connection for new crossing of Ship Channel. TPA recommended a new lift bridge for Don Roadway |
| **Other Concerns**            | - Trucking through residential areas could be an issue. Would need to be addressed through traffic study for Ship Channel bridge  
- A traffic study was completed by TPA for the Ship Channel bridge – activity on bridge |
| **Don Mouth EA**              | - TRCA staff provided an overview of the major changes that occurred through the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative to address concerns:  
  o Promontories pulled back  
  o Naturalized mouth with the ability to accommodate Lafarge  
  o Phased implementation of the Don River  
- TPA reconfirmed the continued need for the railway spur over the Don River at Lake Shore to allow train access to the Port via Lake Shore to Leslie then Unwin.  
- TRCA asked TPA to provide river flow velocity limits for docking and mooring of the Lafarge ship in Polson Slip (an issue in Phase 3). TPA indicated that a conversation with Lafarge should be held to address this. TPA did know that the ship visited other ports on the Great Lakes located within the mouths of rivers. The ship also has bow thrusters to increase maneuverability. Once ship is docked, flow velocities should not be an issue.  
- Construction of the spillway is proposed to take 5-10 years.  
- During original DMNP EA, TPA agreed a flood frequency into the Ship Channel through the Greenway Wetland of 25-50 years was acceptable. Question, is there concerns if this flood frequency were to increase to 5-10 years during the interim phasing condition? TPA reiterated that the 25-50 year flood frequency is the minimum frequency of flooding they’d accept due to issue of maintaining seaway depth and avoiding debris in the Ship Channel.  
- TPA confirmed that their preferred form of bridge for future Don Roadway crossing over Ship Channel is a lift bridge. Has implications on future Basin Street crossing and grading for Valley Wall Feature along Don Roadway.  
- TRCA noted that there was a sediment trap proposed.  
- The Lower Don Lands must allow trucks to access the Don Valley Parkway from Toronto Port. Cherry Street alignment is the most appropriate in the absence of Don Roadway crossing of the Ship Channel. Phasing of bridge and roadway crossings critical when removing/replacing Cherry Street Bridges in Phase 1 |
| **Public Access to Dock Walls** | - ISPS Code  
- Ships that load/unload are treated as a work area and public access would create safety issues  
- Guardrail would be required along the Ship Channel for public access and this would impede emergency operations unless guardrail was setback somewhat to allow dockworkers room to operate along the walls.  
- Docked/moored ships require electrical power |

Minutes prepared by: Cassidy Ritz
phase 1 PLAI – key findings

- costs can be reduced and development phased by modifying flood protection alternative 4ws
- modified plan (4ws realigned) includes generous public spaces and preserves the water’s edge for public use
- phasing enables earlier development, generating funds for reinvestment and linking costs to revenues
- initial infrastructure investment is reduced and development expedited through phasing
- existing infrastructure can be used to support some preliminary development
phase 1 PLAI – key findings

• the business case, financial tools and private sector interest exist to minimize public sector investment and increase private sector funding

• upfront investment of $150 to $300 million is required (dependent on precinct)

• the Port Lands are a major long-term employment and residential growth area for downtown

• the Port Lands is a working port with uses that are essential for the operation of the City

• phased development can be achieved while still accommodating current uses and maintaining the working port
• revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 “4WS Re-aligned” option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval;

• revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction;

• protect the proposed valley and stream corridors from encroachment by development;

• complete a high-level framework plan for the entire Port Lands;

• confirm precinct boundaries and initiate precinct planning, inclusive of business and implementation planning, for the Cousins Quay and Film Studio Precincts;
summary of City Council decision

- establish a landowners’ group, comprising property owners and long-term lease holders, to work toward infrastructure cost sharing and front-ending or similar infrastructure funding agreements;
- initiate the development of recreational and ecological opportunities in Lake Ontario Park; and
- further review the use of Development Charges (DCs) or other mechanisms for funding flood protection and infrastructure and incorporate Port Lands infrastructure costs in current City Development Charge Background Study.
Phase 2 PLAI structure

Port Lands Project Structure – Phase 2

TRCA Board

City Council

Waterfront Toronto Board

Executive Steering Committee

Communication & Consultation Committee

Agency Coordinating Committee

Land Owner’s Group(s)
Agency Lead: City

Port Lands-Wide Planning Framework & Infrastructure Masterplan
Agency Leads: City & WT

Cousins Quay Precinct Plan
Agency Lead: WT

DMNP EA
Agency Lead: TRCA

Infrastructure Financing
Agency Lead: City

Transit Commission
Agency Lead: City
(Part of Infrastructure Master Plan)

Film Studio District Precinct Plan
Agency Lead: City

Municipal Class EA Update
Agency Lead: WT

Lake Ontario & Tommy Thompson Parks
Agency Lead: WT & TRCA

Last Updated: March 15, 2013
Don mouth naturalization and port lands flood protection project environmental assessment

to modify the original preferred alternative for the DMNP EA to reflect the outcomes of the PLAI Phase 1 in order to expedite planning efforts while ensuring flood protection and naturalization.
lower don lands class environmental assessment

to amend the Lower Don Lands Class EA Master Plan and complete an Environmental Study Report to reflect the revisions to the flood protection design concept identified through the PLAI
port lands planning framework

prepare a high-level framework plan that:

• is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
• articulates a long-term vision for the Port Lands and establishes the structure for precinct planning to occur
• guides short and long-term growth in the Port Lands
• provides lateral connections to the South of Eastern Strategic Direction
• satisfies the Class EA Master Plan process for:
  – South of Eastern
  – Port Lands east of the Don Roadway and north of the Ship Channel
  – Lands south of the Ship Channel
south of eastern strategic direction

• provide strategic direction for South of Eastern to set a clear policy context for future investment and development
• address January 2012 direction from Planning and Growth Management Committee to consider a planning framework for South of Eastern
• reinforce the direction of the Municipal Comprehensive Review
• ensure consistent planning for site-specific proposals
• satisfy phases 1 & 2 of the EA requirements for transportation and servicing infrastructure
• determine an approach to address the flood protection issues in South of Eastern
precinct plan – Cousins Quay

• develop a precinct plan in accordance with the policies of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan that promotes comprehensive and orderly development in Cousins Quay Precinct
precinct plan – Film Studio

- develop a precinct plan in accordance with the policies of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan requirements to provide for the comprehensive and orderly development of the Film Studio Precinct
landowner coordination and infrastructure financing

- coordinate the establishment of a landowner’s group(s) for the Port Lands and areas within the flood zone
- report to City Council on the outcomes of the landowner’s group
future consultation and engagement

• complete DMNP EA and LDL Class EA
  – Community Liaison Committee meetings April 2013 & June 2013
  – Public Consultation meeting June 2013
• planning framework and precinct planning consultations
  – To begin Fall 2013
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting  Thursday May 2, 2013  Start Time  10:00 am  Project Number  60228858

Project Name  Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location  Lafarge Cement Terminal

Regarding  Tour of terminal to understand effects of Don Mouth and Lower Don Lands development

Attendees  Marc Rose (AECOM)
Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)
Adrian Litavski (Johnston Litavski)
Wayne Huska, Regan Watts, Chris McGuckin (Lafarge)
Adele Freeman, Ken Dion, Don Haley (TRCA)
Brenda Webster, Lisa Prime, David Kusturin, Shalin Yeboah (Waterfront Toronto)

Distribution  Attendees

Minutes Prepared By  Marc Rose

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Tour of the Cement Terminal

- Cement Terminal has been in operation in the Portlands since 1929
- Facility handles 2,500 to 3,000 tonnes of cement (powder) per day, for a total of 400,000 tonnes over a 9 month operating period – takes 40,000 trucks per year off the roads
- All material is shipped from Bath, Ontario via Lafarge’s boat, the English River
- Railway spur has been decommissioned and tracks removed since early 2000s.
- Shipping typically starts last week in March (or when ice leaves canal) and continues until the end of the year or when canal freezes over; after shipping season ends, dockwall is used to dock the ship.
- The silos (20,000 short tonnes) and boat (8,000 short tonnes – US measure) on the dock provide cement powder storage and supplies from the yard during the winter months
- Facility is typically open at 5 am and closed at 6 pm; however, the facility opens and offloads whenever the boats arrive regardless of time of day; Noise generated during operations (unloading/loading) is significant. The facility is dust free.
- Boats typically arrive a couple of times a week (trip from Bath to Toronto is approximately 15-18 hours) and it takes 12 hours to unload the boat
- During unloading, Lafarge is responsible for security along dockwall, including section of neighbouring dockwall to the west of terminal that is not owned / leased by Lafarge
- Trucks leaving facility deliver cement across the GTA as far as Barrie and Chatham, and also travel to facility on Commissioners Street; significant amount of trucks go down Commissioners to the batching plant at Concrete Campus. Routes to DVP, Gardiner and Commissioners need to be maintained.
- Cement supplies east of Toronto (i.e., Oshawa) are supplied either directly from Bath or from Toronto, depending on traffic and other factors.
- Delays for berthing and unload cost $8,000/hr.
- The ship manoeuvres in the harbour and backs into the slip.
- Current ship (constructed in 1961) is getting a new engine and will increase operating life span by an additional 15 years.
- Lafarge has installed a LEED Gold cement laboratory on site which explores and tests innovative concrete products.

### Concerns regarding proposed river mouth

- There is no water current present within the Polson Slip so docking is straightforward however, there are cross-currents from the Keating Channel under existing conditions, even under low flows, which add complexity to ship maneuverability; during storm events, the future Don Mouth could make it challenging to dock the boat.
- The dockwalls within the Slip are in poor shape (have not been maintained in 25 years) and would need to be rehabilitated to deal with river generated scour and different docking procedures required for flowing water (i.e., The ship would dock stern first with stern along the dock and the bow further in the current so flows of river are streamlined as the ship moves against current). Currently, the ship enters stern first and remains approximately 5-10 feet from dockwall, not placing any stresses on the docks. Upgrades to the dockwall to a "slide dock" would assist in docking the ship when the river is complete.
- Under larger flood events, the ship captain needs to be informed prior to docking in order to arrange for tugs if needed.
- Need to ensure that there is no debris within the river mouth
- Ship captain informed that the Preferred Alternative involves 3 river outlets to reduce flow velocities at the docks over a wide range of frequent flood events, with debris management proposed north of Lake Shore Boulevard East. This was viewed positively for reducing potential docking issues.

### Concerns regarding proposed Lower Don Lands development

- Design of road network for future Lower Don Lands needs to account for and accommodate trucking volumes associated with terminal and with the other facility on Commissioners Street
- Typically have 70 to 80 trucks (or 160 trips) entering and leaving the terminal during a 12 to 16 hour period
- Lafarge is interested in knowing how a future Cherry Street bridge over proposed river mouth will be designed to accommodate trucks
- Noise generated by the silo operations is very significant during operations. Ship berthing and unloading can occur anytime during the night. Planning for adjacent land uses needs to address the noise generated from these operations.

### Next Steps

- Co-proponents to present revised design and results of effects assessment to Lafarge once they are complete
- Ensure wording included within EA to allow for specific technical and operational input by Lafarge to the design of any outlet flow management systems designed to facilitate docking needs
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### Amendments to the DMNP EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The DMNP EA has been amended since December 2010 EA submission to address concerns raised during the EA review and in response to concerns raised by the City of Toronto regarding cost and schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The preferred alternative has been amended to allow for Phased construction of the Don River with progressive elimination of flood risk to the Port Lands and South Riverdale community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The concept has also received a minor realignment, and now allows Lafarge to remain on the south side of Polson slip until they no longer wish to operate there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition, the large promontories proposed in the original preferred alternative have been removed to address Toronto Port Authority concerns in the Inner Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project still includes a sediment and debris management facility north of Lake Shore Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flood protection of the Don Mouth has been designed and will be implemented in phases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Work to be Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Planning to submit final EA report in the fall of 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AHT can help to update the section on fish in the harbour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Meeting Notes

**Date of Meeting:** Thursday June 10, 2013  
**Start Time:** 3:00 pm  
**Project Number:** 60228858

**Project Name:** Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project  
**Location:** Toronto City Hall  
**Regarding:** City of Toronto Parks feedback

Ken Dion, Don Haley (TRCA)  
Marc Rose (AECOM)  
Cassidy Ritz, Jamie McEwan, Leslie Coates, Heather Richards, Jennifer Thorpe (City of Toronto)  
Brenda Webster (WT)

**Attendees**

**Distribution**

Attendees

---

**Minutes Prepared By:** Jake Murray

---

### Purpose of Meeting

- Provide The City of Toronto – Parks with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

### Project Overview

- KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Specific changes to the EA since the pause in 2011 from the PLAI;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - DMNP EA and LDL EA study area;
  - Updated Port Lands phasing – Detailed description of changes to each phase;
  - A description of the flood protection measures;
  - A description of the Revised Preferred Alternative;
  - Schedule for the DMNP and LDL EAs

### Concerns regarding design

- How do you create a transition between the re-graded quays and the adjacent lands?  
  - Would need to grade down to the adjacent lands
- Can any uses be put on top of the FPL? First Gulf considering employment hub for site, which would tie in with the potentially proposed GO Train station.  
  - Parking could potentially be put on top.
- Are there any restrictions within 10 m setback of the FPL?  
  - Structures are not permitted, but lighting would be allowed.
- Could you remove the east-west street east of Cherry St. and north of the Ship Channel to compensate for the loss of 50 m of spillway?  
  - Street pattern is notional at this point
Has thought been given to how truck traffic will navigate the site to avoid residential areas?
- Precinct planning will determine details related to land uses and street pattern
- What was the increase in developable land before and after PLAI?
  - 4 hectares increase between 4WS and 4WS Amended

### Concerns regarding parks
- Looking for regional park space as well as local parks, due to the demand for active recreation
- Don’t want to specify that Upland Forest will be within 10 m setbacks from top of bank. Should read – “The area outside of the floodplain of the DMNP will consist of a range of recreational uses within the 10 metre setback from the top of the banks for the new valley system.”
- Cassidy to confirm percentage of parkland dedication for purpose of public meeting
- Whatever is done here will satisfy Parklands dedication by-law
- How would tree irrigation work?
  - Same system as for green roofs – storage is on the roofs and would be piped to silvicell

### Concerns regarding timing and costs
- What is the approximate timeframe for Phase 1?
  - No timing specified yet as there is no funding yet
  - DC charge by-law will include funding for Phases 1 and 2 for next 10 years
  - Landowner group set up to front-end fees

### Next Steps
- None identified
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Start Time: 1:00 pm
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Toronto City Hall

Regarding: City of Toronto Transportation feedback

Attendees:
Ken Dion, Don Haley (TRCA)
Brenda Webster (Waterfront Toronto)
Marc Rose (AECOM)
Cassidy Ritz, Jamie McEwan, Andre Filippetti, Jeff Dea (City of Toronto)

Distribution: Attendees

Minutes Prepared By: Jake Murray

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide City Transportation with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Specific changes to the EA since the pause in 2011 from the PLAI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ DMNP EA and LDL EA study area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Updated Port Lands phasing – Detailed description of changes to each phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A description of the flood protection measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A description of the Revised Preferred Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Schedule for the DMNP and LDL EAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns regarding design</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit conflict at west end of Commissioners with regards to ramp and associated grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider weight restrictions and clearance for bridges</td>
<td>CoT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed worst-case scenario for modelling bridges in terms of number of piers and hydraulic capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy to provide road cross-sections from Class EA – forwarded from Brenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What infrastructure went through all four phases of Class EA?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating Channel precinct went through all four phases, although only area to west of Cherry was endorsed by Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding emergency services</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has space been allocated for fire hall?</td>
<td>CoT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Will be addressed through Port Lands Planning Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emergency Services to check on number of access points based on population of approximately 10,000 – Cassidy to provide population numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility to build Basin St. as emergency access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns regarding timing and costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the timing of the submission to the Ministry?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of Meeting

- Provide City Water with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview

- KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Specific changes to the EA since the pause in 2011 from the PLAI
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - DMNP EA and LDL EA study area;
  - Updated Port Lands phasing – Detailed description of changes to each phase
  - A description of the flood protection measures
  - A description of the Revised Preferred Alternative
  - Schedule for the DMNP and LDL EAs

Concerns regarding design

- Were there any private land issues with the original design?
  - Yes, with regard to the encroachment of promontories, associated loss of dockwall for the Toronto Port Authority, and the Lafarge shipping dock
- How are parks being accommodated in updated plan?
  - Parks are not being approved as part of EA but will be addressed through the Framework Plan for Port Lands
- How does Don Roadway integrate into the existing Don Valley Parkway?
  - Existing grade of Lake Shore Boulevard at the bridge will not change, so taking the current elevation of that bridge and extending south along Don Roadway
- Are there any issues arising from rail lines?
  - Rail lines on the south side have been decommissioned; the only rail we need to worry about is spur that goes to Ashbridges Bay
**Action**

- What happens with the southern edge of the Ship Channel in terms of previous plans for a road?
  - Basin St. was moved north and will be addressed in LDL EA Master Plan update
- What happens with southern Cherry St. bridge across Ship Channel?
  - Not being addressed as part of this EA but will be included in Port Lands EA Master Plan
- How will infrastructure within each block be addressed?
  - This will be addressed through the precinct plan

### Concerns regarding flood protection

- What return period of flooding is reflected in the flood mapping?
  - Regulatory flood
- Would phased implementation of flood protection involve the upgrading of storm sewer works and where does that fit in the phasing?
  - Stormwater upgrading is part of the LDL EA Master Plan update update
  - Once filling begins, stormwater runoff will be affected. Grading will need to ensure that stormwater is directed to the Keating Channel and Ship Channel to the extent possible
  - LDL EA Master Plan update looking at changes to Keating Channel drainage (LDL Class EA showed drainage to the east but currently looking at drainage to the west); no longer considering pumping all stormwater from south of Keating Channel to ballasted flocculation facility to the north
- What happens with water levels at CN Rail? Is it a constraint?
  - CN Rail is the most upstream constraint in conveying the flood
- Is the Eastern Avenue flyover still OK?
  - The Eastern Avenue flyover does not flood. However, there are minor flooding issues with the Eastern Avenue underpass. TRCA is proposing grade modifications to the area southeast of Eastern Avenue in the vicinity of the CN Rail line to eliminate flooding to the east. In addition, 4-5 metres of dredging in the river bed is required to allow sand/silt to backfill.
- What other flood protection features are required?
  - South of Lake Shore, will need to construct Valley Wall Feature (rather than Flood Protection Landform)

### Concerns regarding timing and costs

- When will Phase 2 work take place, as there are considerable infrastructure relocation requirements, and what is duration of construction?
  - Timing depends on when landowners come up with the money to implement the EA Plan;
  - The Development Charges by-law is also being implemented to help raise funds for implementation
- Is there intent to refine the costs of implementing the EA based on servicing and other infrastructure?
  - The costing was completed during PLAI
- If Polson Quay is built in Phase 1, how do residents in Polson Quay travel in and out while the southern Cherry St. bridge (at Polson slip) is constructed during Phase 3?
  - The existing road would be left in place while the southern Cherry St. bridge is constructed in the ‘dry’ (prior to river mouth being constructed)
### Concerns regarding Gardiner EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Does the Master Plan go through Phase 2 or through to Phase 4?  
  - All four phases were completed for Keating Channel Precinct, and Phase 2 for the remainder of the study area as part of existing EA Master Plan  
  - The City only endorsed Keating Channel Precinct west of Cherry St. and not east of Cherry St. due to Gardiner EA  
  - Currently amending and going to Phase 4 for the entire Lower Don Lands  
  - Once Council endorses Gardiner EA, does Council need to endorse east of Cherry St.?  
  - Will likely need to amend Keating Channel Precinct to reflect outcomes of Gardiner EA |

### Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public meeting scheduled in July to present the infrastructure master plan updates to the City  
  - Any development within this area needs geotechnical report before approval |
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- 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
- 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
- 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
• 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
• 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
• 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
• 2012 PLAI Recommended 4WS Realigned
• Revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 4WS Realigned option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval

• Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction

PLAI Study Area
INTRODUCTION - Relationship between DMNP EA and LDL EA MP

DMNP EA establishes:
• River channel and spillway configurations for flood conveyance
• Naturalization
• Adaptive management strategy
• Proposed Regulatory Flood Zone
• Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
• Flood protection features
INTRODUCTION - Relationship between DMNP EA and LDL EA MP

LDL EA MP establishes:

• Location and basic dimensions of relocated municipal infrastructure
• Right of ways to protect in future precinct planning
• Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
• Coordinated stormwater management strategy
Amendment Assumptions for DMNP EA
Revised Preferred Alternative (4WS Realigned)
Phased Implementation of Flood Protection (PLAI Outcome)
Flood Protection: Extent of Existing Flooding
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct New Cherry St. Bridge
B. Remove Old Cherry St. Bridge and Abutments
C. Continued Dredging in Keating Channel
D. Raise grade in Cousins Quay, Polson Quay, and 309 Cherry St.
E. Construct Promontory Park at Cousins Quay (May or May Not Proceed in Phase 1)
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Interim Spillway with Naturalized Wetland at Ship Channel
B. Construct New Commissioners Street Crossing
C. Lengthen Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge and Keating Rail Bridge
D. Construct Sediment and Debris Management Area
E. Relocate Utilities including Hydro Duct Bridge and Gas Line
F. Construct Valley Wall Feature on Don Roadway
G. Modifications to Eastern Avenue Underpass
H. Construct Flood Protection Feature on Former Unilever Site (FPL or VWF)
I. Raise Grade in Remaining Areas Surrounding 309 Cherry Street
DMNP EA Flood Protection Landform (FPL) Typology for First Gulf Site

* Note, Image Is Not to Scale *

- Flood Protection Landform (No Development on Landform)
- Existing or Future Development
- Wet Side 5-15% Slope
- Low Flow Channel
- Existing Don Roadway
- Core
- Existing Ground
- 3-5m Crest
- Dry Side 1.5-3.5% Slope
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DMNP EA Valley Wall Feature (VWF)
Typology for Film District

* Note, Image Is Not to Scale *

Valley Wall Feature

Wet Side
5-15 % Slope

10m Setback

Dry Side
1-1.5 % Slope

New Development

Low Flow Channel/Spillway

Don Roadway

Existing Ground

Existing Ground
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Valley System, including the Low Flow Channel and Flood Control Weirs
B. Construct New Cherry Street South Bridge
C. Construct Basin Street Crossing
D. Raise Grades in Remaining Areas of the Lower Don Lands
Flood Protection Work:
A. Naturalize Polson Quay Dockwall
Flood Protection and Naturalization Iterative Analysis (Finalization Underway)
Lower Don Lands EA MP Planning Framework

Keating Channel Precinct Plan & Municipal Class EA (Phases 1-2) & Future Municipal Class EA (Phases 3-4) and precinct Plan(s)

Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection EA

Waterfront Sanitary Master Servicing Plan

Don River & Central Waterfront Class EA

Gardiner Expressway Individual EA

West Don Lands Municipal Class EA

Cherry Street Transit EA

Queens Quay Boulevard Transit EA

East Bayfront
Addendum to the approved LDL EA MP to reflect to the changes emanating from the PLAI and infrastructure updates to support:

- Realigned flood protection plan
- Revised phasing plan
Scope for LDL EA MP:

- Water
- Sanitary
- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit
- Stormwater
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Sanitary

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved In 2010 LDL EA MP

Approved In City Waterfront Sanitary Servicing MP

Proposed or Relocated In this Addendum

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA | HONI Meeting
13 June 2013 | Slide 28
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Bridges

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

- Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP
- Seeking Full Approval of Phase 1-2 in 2010 LDL EA MP
- Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Stormwater

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum
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Lower Don Lands EA MP - Stormwater

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
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• DMNP EA - Conduct Effects Assessment          Spring, 2013
• CLC/SAC Meeting #2 (DMNP & LDL)               July, 2013
• Public Meeting (DMNP & LDL)                   July, 2013
• Review/Incorporate Public Feedback DMNP       July/Aug, 2013
• Complete Draft DMNP EA Report                 Fall, 2013
    (Circulated for Agency & Public Review)
• Submit LDL Class EA for Review                Fall, 2013
• Submit Final DMNP EA Report                   Fall, 2013
1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Barge Dock
6. Service Road
7. Don Valley Trail
8. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance
   - Potential Connections
9. Adjustable Upstream Weir
10. Sideflow Weir
11. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance
    - Potential Pipe
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Thursday June 13, 2013
Start Time: 1:05 pm
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Toronto City Hall

Regarding:
Ken Dion, Don Haley (TRCA)
Brenda Webster (Waterfront Toronto)
Paul Murray, Michelle Wong Ken (AECOM)
Cassidy Ritz, Kyle Knoeck, Christopher Dunn (City of Toronto)
Faroq Quredly, Steve Haddock, Brian McCormick (Hydro One Network Inc. (HONI))

Attendees:

Distribution:
Attendees

Minutes Prepared By: Michelle Wong Ken

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting

- Provide HONI with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview

- KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - Background and rationale of the DMNP;
  - What has changed since the April 2011
  - Project phasing opportunities (including potential impacts to HONI infrastructure during Phase 2)
  - A description of the flood protection landform and valley wall feature
  - A description of the grading plan
  - Components of the LDL EA Addendum
  - Project schedule for the DMNP EA and LDL EA

Concerns regarding funding and timing

- There is no funding at the moment to start Phase 1 but a development charges by-law will help move the project forward within the next 10 years once the EA is approved. East of the Don Roadway there is an impetus to proceed as landowners groups are willing to help with funding. A financing plan will be put in place and different groups may contribute percentages of the total capital. The project is still at a concept level.
## Concerns regarding design input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Work on the West Don Lands showed that engineering input from HONI early on would be beneficial. However, as the project is in the EA stage, detailed input is not yet required. Rather, an understanding of the engineering cost from HONI would be helpful now. Information from TPUCC is also available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HONI infrastructure, including underground, will be shown on the plans, as an overall strategy, including utilities that will be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Concerns regarding existing infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There are currently four cables that run through the area and there is the need for more. Power is both going in and out from the switchyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project team has a grading plan for Commissioners Street and Don Roadway where there are HONI towers and by the next meeting the plans will be more detailed. The plan is to raise the grade by about 1.5 metres. The project team will provide HONI with a copy of the grading plan. An experienced person from HONI should review the plans and provide comments and a rough cost estimate for potential options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At the West Don Lands, the hydro towers were impacted due to sinking fill and it is likely that the same thing could happen here based on what is known about the soils. More detailed engineering is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ If the hydro towers are left as they are, loading around the towers will impact the soils underneath. In the West Don Lands the towers began to lean because of this, resulting in the need for micro-piles. The question is if it is easier to raise the tower up or bury the base of the towers (requiring special paints). There are also concerns about access to the tower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Temperature is perhaps the key issue with raising the grades. Excessive burial and compaction may result in the existing underground lines to become overheated. Engineering studies are required to explore effects of the proposed change in grades due to heat dissipation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is desire from developers to bury the existing towers because the lines bisect the developable areas. HONI indicated that this option is very expensive. HONI indicated that costs would be approximately $35M/km to bury the overhead cables. This will be a cost of 100’s of Millions. HONI would also seek additional funding for the increased maintenance and replacement costs in the future for burying the cables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The costs to relocate Don Street Junction are too extensive to consider relocation. The Don Street Junction is also above the anticipated Regulatory Flood Event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HONI is concerned about the circuits on the utility bridge as they are critical feeds which can be complicated to relocate. As was considered during the original DMNP EA submission in 2010, the project team assumes that the HONI bridge will have to be moved. This is required to ensure adequate conveyance (increased channel width) through this portion of the Don River, immediately south of the CN railway tracks. At detailed design, we could contemplate raising and extending the bridge including the construction of new abutments as part of the design if it is more cost effective than removing the existing bridge and relocating the infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The bridge requires consideration from a hydraulic dredging access point of view as well and a vulnerability perspective of having critical electrical infrastructure for the City of Toronto at risk to damage during a large flood event due to debris impacts from upstream.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes of Meeting  

Date: June 13, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns regarding contaminated soils</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The soils in the area are heavily contaminated and HONI is concerned about their mineral-oil filled cables and if they will be blamed for contamination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A risk management plan will be developed to manage contaminated soils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on work at the West Don Lands with HONI, the project team is aware of depth restrictions with underground circuits as well as the cleanliness of the soils and conductive capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns regarding future planning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing HONI switchyard was built in the 1950s and the plan is to build a new one just east of the existing switchyard. The switchyard is critical for city supply. At least six new cables will be required that will run over the Keating Channel over the next 50-60 years, in addition to the four overhead and four underground cables that currently exist. HONI is concerned that the DMNP may block off their connection.</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another option for HONI is to move the switchyard out of the Port Lands which would be much more expensive. HONI suggested the potential for a land swap north of the CN railway bridge for a new switchyard.</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI suggests rearranging the bridges, leaving HONI cables as they are as it would be more expensive for them to relocate. HONI will not be able to pay for the relocation and if it comes to it, the people benefitting from the project should pay. It would be best for HONI if only minor modifications are required.</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI did not intend to leave the Port Lands but now will reconsider relocating. The city is stressed for supply and a permanent solution is required. HONI does not want to put in new infrastructure that will have to be changed or relocated in the future.</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI will provide the project team with drawings of their plans for the new switchyard.</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential of flooding in the area and the approval by Council for the revitalization of the area means that the status quo cannot be maintained. Therefore, HONI must consider its options for the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns regarding costs of modifications</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The cost of raising the hydro towers, burying the cables, and relocating the switchyard need to be further assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI wants to ensure that costs associated with modifications to their infrastructure will be paid by the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DMNP will not cover the costs of undergrounding overhead lines. The EA is only looking at the potential impacts in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of raising a hydro tower at the West Don Lands was about $100,000. There is no idea of how much it would cost to remove the towers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRCA/WT to provide HONI with the grading plans</td>
<td>TRCA/WT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI to provide comments of the grading plan by August</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONI to provide drawings of plans for their switchyard</td>
<td>HONI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION - Summary of City Council Decision from Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI)

- Revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 4WS Realigned option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval
- Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction

PLAI Study Area
DMNP EA establishes:

- River channel and spillway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization
- Adaptive management strategy
- Proposed Regulatory Flood Zone
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Flood protection features
INTRODUCTION - Relationship between DMNP EA and LDL EA MP

LDL EA MP establishes:

• Location and basic dimensions of relocated municipal infrastructure

• Right of ways to protect in future precinct planning

• Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA

• Coordinated stormwater management strategy
Revised Preferred Alternative (4WS Realigned)

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum
Phased Implementation of Flood Protection (PLAI Outcome)
**Flood Protection Work:**

A. Construct New Cherry St. Bridge

B. Remove Old Cherry St. Bridge and Abutments

C. Continued Dredging in Keating Channel

D. Raise grade in Cousins Quay, Polson Quay, and 309 Cherry St.

E. Construct Promontory Park at Cousins Quay (May or May Not Proceed in Phase 1)
**Flood Protection Work:**

A. Construct Interim Spillway with Naturalized Wetland at Ship Channel
B. Construct New Commissioners Street Crossing
C. Lengthen Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge and Keating Rail Bridge
D. Construct Sediment and Debris Management Area
E. Relocate Utilities including Hydro Duct Bridge and Gas Line
F. Construct Valley Wall Feature on Don Roadway
G. Modifications to Eastern Avenue Underpass
H. Construct Flood Protection Feature on Former Unilever Site (FPL or VWF)
I. Raise Grade in Remaining Areas Surrounding 309 Cherry Street
**Flood Protection Work:**

A. Construct Valley System, including the Low Flow Channel and Flood Control Weirs

B. Construct New Cherry Street South Bridge

C. Construct Basin Street Crossing

D. Raise Grades in Remaining Areas of the Lower Don Lands
**Flood Protection Work:**
A. Naturalize Polson Quay Dockwall
Addendum to the approved LDL EA MP to reflect to the changes emanating from the PLAI and infrastructure updates to support:

- Realigned flood protection plan
- Revised phasing plan
Scope for LDL EA MP:

- Water
- Sanitary
- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit
- Stormwater
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Water

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
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Lower Don Lands EA MP - Roads

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved In 2010 LDL EA MP
Seeking Full Approval of Phase 1 & 2 in 2010 LDL EA MP
Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
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Combined Project Schedules

- DMNP EA - Conduct Effects Assessment  
  Spring, 2013
- CLC/SAC Meeting #2 (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Public Meeting (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Review/Incorporate Public Feedback DMNP  
  July/Aug, 2013
- Complete Draft DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013 (Circulated for Agency & Public Review)
- Submit LDL Class EA for Review  
  Fall, 2013
- Submit Final DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
# Meeting Notes

**Date of Meeting:** Friday June 14, 2013  
**Start Time:** 11:05 am  
**Project Number:** 60228858

**Project Name:** Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project  
**Location:** Redpath Sugar Office  
**Regarding:** DMNP EA Amendments

**Attendees:**
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman (TRCA)  
- Brenda Webster, Shalin Yaboah (Waterfront Toronto)  
- Paul Murray, Michelle Wong Ken (AECOM)  
- Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)  
- Andrew Judge, David McLaren, Phil Guglielmi (Redpath Sugar)

**Distribution:** Attendees  
**Minutes Prepared By:** Michelle Wong Ken

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

## Purpose of Meeting

- Provide Redpath Sugar with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

## Project Overview

- KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;  
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;  
  - Background and rationale of the DMNP;  
  - What has changed since the April 2011;  
  - Project phasing opportunities;  
  - A description of the flood protection landform and valley wall feature;  
  - A description of the grading plan;  
  - Components of the LDL EA Addendum; and,  
  - Project schedule for the DMNP EA and LDL EA.

## Current Redpath Sugar Operations

- Approximately 115,000 to 150,000 tonnes of sugar are trucked to the port and then taken to Pier 51 during the winter. The process starts in July and is timed with the vessels coming in from Brazil.  
- If Pier 51 is not available for storage, other options should be close to the facility. The area where the Corus building is located was used in the past.  
- The sugar is offloaded from the vessels at the port and transported via trucks. Nothing goes back on the vessels from Redpath.  
- Approximately 100 trucks per day travel along Cherry Street from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. for several months during the winter  
- It typically takes three days to unload vessels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding Cherry Street closure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cherry Street will be moving west. In 2010 it was approved to be realigned north of the Keating Channel and the proposed alignment will provide a better route. Old Cherry Street will remain in operation while the new Cherry Street is being built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding mooring ships and truck access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath Sugar requires the flexibility to moor ships. Redpath uses up to four 750 ft lake vessels, some of which can be put in the Ship Channel. They are usually moored along the west wall. The Port Authority determines the space Redpath uses. Redpath wants to maintain the ability to moor four to six ships during the winter and access for trucks to unload the ships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With modifications to the dock walls proposed through the DMNP, Redpath will still be able to use the Polson and Lafarge dock walls. The southern wall will remain intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The issue with navigation posed by the DMNP previously has been eliminated as the promontories will no longer be constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath usually brings in ships using tugs even though all of them have bow thrusters. The Port Authority decides how ships move through the port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Once moored, only need access for people to the ships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath requires that trucks maintain access to Pier 51 and 52. This issue has been identified by the project team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath has no concerns regarding the proposed Park on Cousins Quay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding timing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City has put together a development charges by-law to collect funding for this project over the next 10 years. It is recommended that the by-law should go to council on July 3. If Phases 1 and 2 go ahead, a business plan would be developed but there is no funding yet. The landowners need to agree on how to pay for the front end of the project. The project is closer to achieving funding now than it was three years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding other EAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All of the other EAs that are taking place in the area do not have to be completed before the DMNP can move forward. These EAs are taking into consideration the components of the Preferred Alternative for the DMNP EA. For example, the Gardiner Expressway EA would ensure that the selection of their Preferred Alternative will not impede the ability of the DMNP EA to function. The DMNP EA will also contain an amending procedure to address minor modifications to the Preferred in the event of additional details arising from parallel planning processes after EA approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding future land use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future land use is proposed to be mixed use (i.e., residential, commercial, and industrial); however, the precinct planning will solidify the land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns regarding water quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath is concerned with the potential increase in sediment load to the Inner Harbour. Water is brought into the factory for cooling the plant and suspended material would be an issue. There is also the potential to treat water at the facility but this depends on the water quality. Currently, water intake occurs on the south dock wall of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action

- Sediment management operations will continue in the Keating Channel until Phase 2. In Phase 2, channel widening north of Lake Shore will require sediment management to occur in that area. With the installation of weirs at the east end of the Keating Channel in Phase 3, the majority of flows will occur through the new river mouth between Polson and Cousins Quays. This would be less direct inputs than currently occurs from the Keating Channel. Further, with the location of the Ship Channel wetland (Greenway), flows would be further diverted away from Redpath intakes during flood events. Overall, with the expanded multi-channel river mouth, sediment loads to the Inner Harbour will be lower than currently experienced at the Redpath intakes.

- Further improvements due to the implementation of the City’s Wet Weather Flow Study for the Don and Central Waterfront will further improve water quality to the Inner Harbour over time.

### Next Steps

- N/A
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INTRODUCTION - Planning Framework

- 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
- 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
- 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
- 2012 PLALI Recommended 4WS Realigned
• Revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 4WS Realigned option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval

• Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction
DMNP EA establishes:

- River channel and spillway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization
- Adaptive management strategy
- Proposed Regulatory Flood Zone
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Flood protection features
INTRODUCTION - Relationship between DMNP EA and LDL EA MP

LDL EA MP establishes:

- Location and basic dimensions of relocated municipal infrastructure
- Right of ways to protect in future precinct planning
- Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
- Coordinated stormwater management strategy
Amendment Assumptions for DMNP EA
Flood Protection: Extent of Existing Flooding
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct New Cherry St. Bridge
B. Remove Old Cherry St. Bridge and Abutments
C. Continued Dredging in Keating Channel
D. Raise grade in Cousins Quay, Polson Quay, and 309 Cherry St.
E. Construct Promontory Park at Cousins Quay (May or May Not Proceed in Phase 1)
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Interim Spillway with Naturalized Wetland at Ship Channel
B. Construct New Commissioners Street Crossing
C. Lengthen Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge and Keating Rail Bridge
D. Construct Sediment and Debris Management Area
E. Relocate Utilities including Hydro Duct Bridge and Gas Line
F. Construct Valley Wall Feature on Don Roadway
G. Modifications to Eastern Avenue Underpass
H. Construct Flood Protection Feature on Former Unilever Site (FPL or VWF)
I. Raise Grade in Remaining Areas Surrounding 309 Cherry Street
DMNP EA Flood Protection Landform (FPL)
Typology for First Gulf Site

* Note, Image Is Not to Scale *

- Flood Protection Landform (No Development on Landform)
- Existing or Future Development
- Wet Side 5-15% Slope
- Dry Side 1.5-3.5% Slope
- 3-5m Crest
- Low Flow Channel
- Existing Don Roadway
- Core
- Existing Ground
DMNP EA Valley Wall Feature (VWF) Typology for Film District

* Note, Image Is Not to Scale *

Valley Wall Feature

- Wet Side: 5-15% slope
  - 10m Setback
  - Low Flow Channel/Spillway

- Don Roadway
  - Existing Ground

- Dry Side: 1-1.5% slope

- New Development
  - Existing Ground
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct Valley System, including the Low Flow Channel and Flood Control Weirs
B. Construct New Cherry Street South Bridge
C. Construct Basin Street Crossing
D. Raise Grades in Remaining Areas of the Lower Don Lands
Flood Protection Work:
A. Naturalize Polson Quay Dockwall
Flood Protection and Naturalization Iterative Analysis (Finalization Underway)
Amendment Assumptions for Lower Don Lands EA MP
Addendum to the approved LDL EA MP to reflect to the changes emanating from the PLAI and infrastructure updates to support:

- Realigned flood protection plan
- Revised phasing plan
Scope for LDL EA MP:

- Water
- Sanitary
- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit
- Stormwater
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Stormwater

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA | First Gulf Meeting
13 June 2013 | Slide 36
Combined Project Schedules

- DMNP EA - Conduct Effects Assessment  
  Spring, 2013
- CLC/SAC Meeting #2 (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Public Meeting (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Review/Incorporate Public Feedback DMNP  
  July/Aug, 2013
- Complete Draft DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
  (Circulated for Agency & Public Review)
- Submit LDL Class EA for Review  
  Fall, 2013
- Submit Final DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Barge Dock
6. Service Road
7. Don Valley Trail
8. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Connections
9. Adjustable Upstream Weir
10. Sideflow Weir
11. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Pipe
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Tuesday June 18, 2013  
Start Time: 8:00 am  
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Location: Toronto City Hall, 18E Board Room

Regarding: Amendments to the DMNP EA

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman, Steve Heuchert (TRCA)
- Shalin Yeboah (Waterfront Toronto)
- Kyle Knoeck, Jamie McEwan (City of Toronto)
- Matthew Coleridge (Burnside)
- Don Manlapaz (First Gulf)
- Timothy Arnott (BA Group)
- David McKay (MHBC)
- Dan Miller

Distribution: Attendees

Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting

- Provide an update on the amendments to the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan (LDL EAMP) and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview

- KD provided a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EAMP;
  - Background and rationale of the DMNP;
  - What has changed since the April 2011;
  - Project phasing opportunities (including potential impacts to HONI infrastructure during Phase 2);
  - A description of the flood protection landform and valley wall feature;
  - A description of the grading plan;
  - Components of the LDL EAMP Addendum; and,
  - Project schedule for the DMNP EA and LDL EAMP.

First Gulf Plans

- Design competition for a Master Plan process (massing and transportation) undertaken for the First Gulf site.
- Master Plan seeks access to Lake Shore and west to downtown over the Don River.
- Own 30 acres of the site, propose an OPA that includes 50 acres of land in the area bounded by Booth Street in the east to Don Roadway in the west, and from CN embankment north to Keating Yard in the south.
- Working with City and Waterfront Toronto on Gardiner EA process to consider additional connections to the potential realignments of the Gardiner and Lake Shore.

### Specific questions raised regarding the DMNP EA

- Please confirm configuration of the proposed flood structure on the First Gulf site
  - Flood Protection Landform (FPL) – is the same type of structure constructed in the West Don Lands.
    - It is a very large earthen structure designed to “permanently” eliminate the risk of flooding by removing the risks of catastrophic failure due to scour, piping or seepage over and through the structure.
    - Its dimensions have been identified as having up to 5-15% grades on the wet (west) side of the structure (10% typical), a 3-5m wide crest, and then 1.5-3.5% grades on the dry (east) side of the structure.
    - The structure will be highest (widest) towards the north on the First Gulf site with the toe near or at the west side of the former Unilever building. The FPL is much lower and narrower as it approaches Lake Shore in the south, which is at a height of land above the Regulatory Flood elevation.
    - No structures or deep plantings are permitted on or through the structure. Inserting such structures reduces the effective width of the structure, and offers potential routes for flood waters to be piped through the structure, which would undermine the definition established for “permanent” flood risk removal.
    - Without this permanent removal of flood risk, high use development is not permitted.
    - The primary benefit of the FPL in the First Gulf site is that it can be constructed without the removal of the existing building at 21 Don Roadway. It would be anticipated that the FPL would be a public dedication of space for the site application – Park and flood protection infrastructure dedication, much like the WDLs.
  - A Valley Wall Feature (VWF) – is proposed for the area south of Lake Shore to the Ship Channel.
    - The VWF is an even wider structure than the proposed FPL. The structure possesses the same conditions on the west (wet) side of the structure and on the crest as indicated for and FPL. The dry (east) side of the structure possesses slopes shallower than 1.5%.
    - The benefit of this structure is that it’s wider than the minimum definition required for “permanent” flood risk removal and as such, we can treat such a structure as a normal valley and table land system, thus infrastructure can go on and through the structure (with certain caveats such as sanitary vents which cannot be located within the flood plain). Thus a 10m development setback would be established from the crest of the VWF, before buildings could be constructed.
    - The added benefits of this structure in the Port Lands is that it can be used to address impacted soils and to provide a land base for upgraded municipal servicing.
    - It is also possible south of Lake Shore since there are no buildings in the footprint of the structure that would need to be removed.
Can a VWF be placed on the First Gulf Site with the existing building in place?
   • No. We would not be able to undertake the necessary compaction around the structure. If the building were to be removed, then this would definitely be a consideration for the site.

The First Gulf site should be connected with higher order transit (i.e. LRT along Broadview from the north of the CN embankment). Can this be accommodated?
   • The biggest challenge is that under a Regulatory event, water will pond along the north side of the CN Embankment. Modelling indicates that some of those flood waters are currently routed east through the Eastern Avenue underpass into South Riverdale. Opening another hole into the embankment for LRT at Broadview would provide an additional way for flood waters to circumvent the flood protection works on the First Gulf site.
   • However, as we are contemplating in the DMNP EA for Eastern Avenue, there may be opportunities to provide grading on the south side of the CN embankment for any future LRT link on Broadview that would prevent water from flowing out of or past the CN embankment grade-separation area.

How much of the Phase 2 cost will First Gulf be expected to cover?
   • City is undertaking development of City-wide and Area-specific Development Charge bylaws. These will reflect those costs more specifically.

TRCA – under current zoning, the types of uses and extent of development is constrained due to the level of flood risk in the area.

First Gulf possesses concepts for a new bridge crossing over the Don River from the First Gulf site, north of Lake Shore. They are aware of the need for sediment and debris management in this area for the DMNP EA. Requested information on the Sediment Management area to help with their planning.
   • ACTION – TRCA to provide refined Sediment and Debris Management Area image and details of operations.
   • ACTION – First Gulf to provide proposed plans for their crossings.

Next Steps

TRCA – Sediment Management Area drawings (in digital format)
First Gulf – To provide proposed crossing diagrams
TRCA – To assist City and First Gulf with options for the proposed LRT grade-separation for Broadview
Environmental Assessment Consultation

Toronto Port Authority

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

& Lower Don Lands Master Plan EA

Monday June 24
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INTRODUCTION - Planning Framework

- 2003 Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
- 2007 MVVA Team Competition Plan
- 2010 DMNP EA Preferred Alternative 4WS
- 2012 PLAI Recommended 4WS Realigned
INTRODUCTION - Summary of City Council Decision from Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI)

- Revise the DMNP EA based on the 2012 4WS Realigned option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval

- Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction

PLAI Study Area
DMNP EA establishes:

- River channel and spillway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization
- Adaptive management strategy
- Proposed Regulatory Flood Zone
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Flood protection features

DMNP EA Study Area
INTRODUCTION - Relationship between DMNP EA and LDL EA MP

LDL EA MP establishes:

• Location and basic dimensions of relocated municipal infrastructure
• Right of ways to protect in future precinct planning
• Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
• Coordinated stormwater management strategy
Amendment Assumptions for DMNP EA
Phased Implementation of Flood Protection (PLAI Outcome)
Flood Protection: Extent of Existing Flooding
Flood Protection Work:
A. Construct New Cherry St. Bridge
B. Remove Old Cherry St. Bridge and Abutments
C. Continued Dredging in Keating Channel
D. Raise grade in Cousins Quay, Polson Quay, and 309 Cherry St.
E. Construct Promontory Park at Cousins Quay (May or May Not Proceed in Phase 1)
Flood Protection Work:

A. Construct Interim Spillway with Naturalized Wetland at Ship Channel
B. Construct New Commissioners Street Crossing
C. Lengthen Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge and Keating Rail Bridge
D. Construct Sediment and Debris Management Area
E. Relocate Utilities including Hydro Duct Bridge and Gas Line
F. Construct Valley Wall Feature on Don Roadway
G. Modifications to Eastern Avenue Underpass
H. Construct Flood Protection Feature on Former Unilever Site (FPL or VWF)
I. Raise Grade in Remaining Areas Surrounding 309 Cherry Street
**Flood Protection Work:**

A. Construct Valley System, including the Low Flow Channel and Flood Control Weirs
B. Construct New Cherry Street South Bridge
C. Construct Basin Street Crossing
D. Raise Grades in Remaining Areas of the Lower Don Lands

Flood Protection for Phase 3 Development (2013)
Flood Protection Work:
A. Naturalize Polson Quay Dockwall
Amendment Assumptions for Lower Don Lands EA MP
Addendum to the approved LDL EA MP to reflect the changes emanating from the PLAI and infrastructure updates to support:

- Realigned flood protection plan
- Revised phasing plan
Scope for LDL EA MP:

- Water
- Sanitary
- Roads
- Bridges
- Transit
- Stormwater
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Sanitary

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA | TPA Meeting
24 June 2013 | Slide 27
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Roads

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Roads

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP

Seeking Full Approval of Phase 1+2 in 2010 LDL EA MP

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Lower Don Lands EA MP - Bridges

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum

- Approved in 2010 LDL EA MP
- Seeking Full Approval of Phase 1+2 in 2010 LDL EA MP
- Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
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Lower Don Lands EA MP - Stormwater

Approved EA Master Plan

2013 Preliminary EA Master Plan Addendum
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Combined Project Schedules

- DMNP EA - Conduct Effects Assessment  
  Spring, 2013
- CLC/SAC Meeting #2 (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Public Meeting (DMNP & LDL)  
  July, 2013
- Review/Incorporate Public Feedback DMNP  
  July/Aug, 2013
- Complete Draft DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
  (Circulated for Agency & Public Review)
- Submit LDL Class EA for Review  
  Fall, 2013
- Submit Final DMNP EA Report  
  Fall, 2013
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Monday June 24, 2013
Start Time: 2:00 pm
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Toronto Port Authority
Regarding: Update on Don Mouth EA and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Don Haley, Adele Freeman (TRCA)
- Brenda Webster, Tristan Simpson, Lisa Prime (Waterfront Toronto)
- Marc Rose, Jake Murray (AECOM)
- Cassidy Ritz, Christopher Dunn (City of Toronto)
- Ken Lundy, Angus Armstrong (TPA)

Distribution: Attendees
Minutes Prepared By: Jake Murray

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

### Purpose of Meeting

• Provide Toronto Port Authority (TPA) with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

### Project Overview

• KD and BW gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Specific changes to the EA since the pause in 2011 from the PLAI;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - DMNP EA and LDL EA study area;
  - Updated Port Lands phasing – Detailed description of changes to each phase;
  - A description of the flood protection measures;
  - A description of the Revised Preferred Alternative;
  - Schedule for the DMNP and LDL EAs;

### Concerns regarding Sediment and Debris

• TPA asked for the co-proponents to confirm velocities at the river mouth and at the Ship Channel during flood events.
• In addition, TPA is looking for confirmation of sediment and debris deposition in Polson Slip (particularly by the Lafarge location causing issues with depth). KD and DH indicated that sediment trap north of Lake Shore is expected to capture majority of sand and silt while fines will likely be transported to the Inner Harbour.
• TPA is also concerned about debris in the Inner Harbour following a storm event. The last major storm event (May 2013) created 70,000 tonnes of debris. Operations and Maintenance will require management in Polson Slip. KD responded that the design identifies the use of debris booms just north of Lake Shore and in the Keating Channel. The wetlands in the floodplain will also aid in collecting sediment and debris.
### Concerns regarding future infrastructure

- TPA expressed concern about access / traffic flow to development south of the river due to frequency of repairs to Cherry St. Ship Channel Bridge. East Ship Channel Bridge would need to be constructed first.
- KD and AF acknowledged the need to look at future of TPA works yard and asked that TPA provide feedback on future needs for the yard.
- AA suggested that low-slung tugs could be considered for transporting sediment once fixed Keating Channel bridge is installed.

### Concerns regarding future climate

- TPA asked whether the design accounts for climate change and the decreasing water levels in the lake. DH responded that TRCA designed the new valley system to account for climate change by including 0.5 m freeboard.
- TRCA to provide note on frequency of May storm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work is underway to revise the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the 2012 Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI). The PLAI Land Owner and User Advisory Committee (LUAC) are being consulted on the changes to the DMNP EA and LDL EA prior to their submission to the Ministry of Environment in the fall of 2013. A total of 18 LUAC members attended the July 4th meeting (see attached participant list).

The purpose of the meeting was:
- To provide LUAC members with an update on the proposed changes to the two EAs, and
- To seek feedback from LUAC members on what they like, don’t like, and any suggested refinements to the updated plans (see attached agenda).

The summary below organizes feedback from LUAC members into key advice for the Project Team to consider. This summary was subject to participant review prior to being finalized.

OVERALL FEEDBACK AND ADVICE

- Overall, LUAC members were supportive of the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs. They felt that the phasing seemed more rational and that the simplified infrastructure design seemed cost-effective.

- There was some concern about how access would be maintained for existing businesses during bridge and road reconstruction, including access for businesses south of the ship channel and access for businesses around Polson Quay.

- There was also some concern about the number of new bridges shown going over the ship channel, and to what extent they would impact ship access to the turning basin. Even if these are lift bridges, there may still be impacts as it is currently difficult to coordinate the lift of the single existing bridge.

- Visual refinements to the presentation included: using phase 3 of flood protection as the base for all LDL infrastructure maps; and explicitly showing that sanitary infrastructure north of the Keating Channel is not a part of the LDL EA, but rather a part of the West Don Lands EA.

- Additional key pieces of information that could be incorporated into the presentation included: rough timing of when Phase 1 and 2 of flood protection will commence, how long they will take to complete, and how much they will each cost; and, the relationship between the Gardiner EA and the LDL EA, particularly which EA would take precedence if they contained conflicting recommendations.
QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION

The following are the questions of clarification that were asked during the CLC/SAC meeting. They have been grouped into seven categories: Flood Protection; Parks and Open Space; Phasing; Transportation; Land Use; Heritage; and, Environmental Management. Responses that were provided to these questions of clarification at the meeting are noted in italics.

**FLOOD PROTECTION**

How much does the grade of Polson and Cousin’s Quays have to be raised?
1-2m. Where lands aren’t being raised (e.g. Lafarge lands) we will work to make sure that there is proper drainage and transition.

Has the dimension of the spillway changed from what was presented during the PLAI?
Yes. Instead of building it 100m wide, then 200m, then 150m over time as flood protection is phased (which is costly, intrusive and not very usable until complete), it will now be built to its final configuration in Phase 2, 200m wide north of Basin Street and 150m south of Basin Street.

Is every flood protection item included in Phase 2 necessary for removing the lands indicated from the flood zone?
Yes.

How will the grade be raised on property that is privately held?
It will be the responsibility of individual landowners to raise land.

What is the southwest border of the area that is taken out of the flood zone in Phase 1? Is it now Munitions Street instead of Cherry Street?
The border used to be just west of Cherry. The border now includes 309 Cherry Street and everything south of Villiers and east of 309 Cherry is in the floodplain.

**FUNDING**

What types of works related to Port Lands flood protection and infrastructure were included in the Development Charges report that recently went to Council?
It included works that can be completed in the next 10 years i.e. all of Phase 1 and some of 2. Only portions of Phase 2 are in the proposed city-wide Development Charge By-Law, and other works are in proposed area-specific development charges.

If there is no resolution on the front-ending agreement, how will the timing of redevelopment be impacted?
The City feels that landowners need to take some leadership and pay a portion of the costs. If that doesn’t happen, the City may be less willing to provide funds promptly.

Have you started to engage the Federal and Provincial governments to discuss funding?
We started discussing this with them approximately 4 months ago.

**LAND USE**

The infrastructure requirements contemplated in the LDL EA rests on certain land use assumptions; what are the assumptions that were used?
The LDL EA doesn’t make assumptions on particular land uses, those will be figured out as part of precinct planning.
There is currently freight rail lines in the area; is there an expectation that they will all be removed?
Yes. *We do not expect that rail traffic will continue in the area.*

**NEXT STEPS**

The meeting wrapped up with representatives from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto thanking LUAC members for their feedback. The project team will use this feedback to refine the presentation materials in preparation for the July 24th public meeting. Following the public meeting, draft final versions of the DMNP and LDL EA amendments will be prepared, with the final version to be submitted to the Ministry of Environment in late fall 2013.
LUAC Meeting Attendance

Build Toronto  
Canadian Salt  
Castlepoint  
Chai Poultry  
Cherry Beach Sound  
Cimco Refrigeration  
Fasken Martineau  
First Gulf  
Holcim Canada Inc.  
Infrastructure Ontario  
Johnston Litavski Ltd  
LaFarge Canada Inc  
National Rubber Technologies  
RJ Burnside  
Telesat  
Toronto Hydro  
Toronto Terminals Railway  
Tribal Partners

LUAC Meeting Agenda

Don Mouth Naturalization EA & Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA

Land Owner and User Advisory Committee
Thursday, July 4, 2013
8:30 – 10:00 a.m.
Waterfront Toronto
20 Bay Street, Suite 1310

AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Welcome / Agenda Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>Updates / Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Questions of Clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you like about the updated plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What don’t you like about the updated plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you have any suggested refinements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Meeting Wed, July 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit Draft Amended DMNP EA (Fall 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit LDL Class EA Addendum (Fall 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting | Thursday July 11 2013  
Start Time | 2:00 pm  
Project Number | 60228858

Project Name | Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location | Waterfront Toronto

Regarding | Update on Don Mouth EA and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan for Lafarge

Attendees | Ken Dion, Don Haley, Adele Freeman (TRCA)  
| Brenda Webster, Tristan Simpson, (Waterfront Toronto)  
| Marc Rose, Jake Murray (AECOM)  
| Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)

Concerns regarding Keating Channel bridge

**Lafarge** – Why is development occurring in Phase 1 before Phase 2 is complete?
- Need to jump start the development process to help pay for flood protection infrastructure and elevation adjustments
- These changes to the phasing make more economic sense than the phasing in the original EA

**Lafarge** - To clarify, by raising elevations and re-constructing the Keating Channel bridge in Phase 1, you are adding flood protection to the rest of the areas in the Lower Don Lands?
- No, the only flood protection being provided in Phase 1 involves the development area identified on both Polsons (minus the Lafarge site) and Cousins Quays, and the area around 309 Cherry Street (immediately east of Cherry Street, north of Commissioners).
### Action

- Phase 1 flood mitigation works will include the construction of a new Keating Channel bridge to the west of the existing bridge, followed by the deconstruction of the existing Keating Channel bridge and removal of the abutments from the old bridge to widen Keating Channel
- This will allow elevations to be raised in the Phase 1 area without increasing flood risk elsewhere within the Lower Don Lands

**Lafarge** - What is the design of the new Keating Channel bridge

- **DH** - Fixed-link bridge not a lift bridge – raised to whatever heights are required for navigation and flood conveyance
- **BW** emphasized that the design/movement of the Keating Channel bridge has not changed since the original EA

### Questions and concerns regarding elevations and protection of Lafarge lands

- **Lafarge** - As part of EA did you look at raising the elevations throughout the Lower Don Lands in addition to cut/valley
- **Lafarge** – Can you simply raise the grades in the Lower Don Lands or do you need a valley system?
  - Simply raising the grades will result in increased flood levels and risk to the north or to other areas. Thus a combination of cutting and filling is required.
- **Lafarge** – What is the difference in elevation between the future Polson Quay Precinct and the Lafarge site
  - **DH** – phase one would increase 1.5 to 2 metres
  - A detailed grading plan will need to be established through the Precinct Planning phase for Polson Quay to ensure that trucks are able to drive onto and off the Lafarge site, and to ensure appropriate drainage is established to ensure that the elevated Polson Precinct does not drain onto the Lafarge site.
  - **BW** – The Precinct Planning process will look at the detail of ensuring that mixed used development can occur adjacent to the industrial operations at Lafarge as it relates to detailed grading of the area.
- **Lafarge** – Need to lay down policies when the EA comes through to protect this property
  - A motion in council was passed to reflect Lafarge’s right to continue operating in the Port Lands – details of this will be fleshed out through the Polson Quay Precinct Planning process
  - Intent is that the City and Waterfront Toronto will work with Lafarge and other land owners on how and when development occurs.
  - **CR** – Preventative measures will be implemented through development applications
- **Lafarge** – Land owners will be permitted to raise their own land (according to the Precinct Plan) when they decide to redevelop the area, not compel them beforehand?
  - Correct
- **Lafarge** – did the lands in phase 2 flood during Monday’s storm
  - No – only along parts of Bayview, the Go tracks and DVP.
**Concerns regarding future policy and designation of lands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – how critical is the Lafarge lands for completing the flood protection works?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>KD</strong> – it’s not a critical element of the flood protection solution. It is for providing the final public connection along the dockwalls in this area. Raising the grades on the site to the same level as the surrounding Polson Quay Precinct will remove the site from flood risk, allowing development to occur here as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>BW</strong> – It is more about the completion of a project and city building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – Will we be able to develop the Lafarge lands in the future rather than naturalize it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>CR</strong> - It is designated as a “regeneration area” – meaning there are various different use available once you decide to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>CR</strong> - There is no notion to change the area from a designated regeneration area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – We’d like to see black on grey for their site on the Phase 4 image to denote future development potential on that site while accommodating the heritage features of their silos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – is there a legend for the colours on the phasing maps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We do not want to identify each area that specifically because development areas outside of the valley are only notional at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concerns regarding site access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> - Location of the bridge to the east and access to our property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>CR</strong> – should be looked at in the EA because it’s about reducing impacts, however the details will be looked at in precinct plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> - How can we be able to turn right onto Cherry St?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team will look at it, possibly in the EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – We see it as a major congested area and difficult for our truck traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lafarge to send further comments/drawings on what they would like the South End of Cherry Bridge intersection to look like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team will look at other examples of industry working in urban areas with successful logistic practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>CR</strong> – How much can we look at this in the EA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team will chat with transportation group before public meeting in a few weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafarge</strong> – Are the bridges over the river fixed? And what do they look like, lanes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fixed-link bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Showed the cross sections of Commissioners, Cherry St, Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion around leaving the option open for future transit (i.e. LRT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion around PLAI financing and timing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progression of the DMNP EA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show the milestones of the EA from beginning in 2004 to now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going to public on the 24th of this month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summarized Goal and Objectives effects assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identified Changes to the LDL MP from 2010 for roads, bridges, water, sanitary, stormwater and transit.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- PLAI Financing Strategy
  - City included a development charges – currently before City Council
  - Some landowners in the area have met to discuss the option of front-ending infrastructure
  - **Lafarge** - Will the public push back to increase the amount of naturalized land?
    - **BW** – Doubtful as they also want this to move forward
    - **AF** – those members of the public that have been engaged throughout will likely be supportive. Those new to the process or have intermittent involvement may be more likely to raise concerns

**Next Steps**
- N/A
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Thursday July 25, 2013
Start Time: 10:30 am
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Toronto City Hall, Committee Room 3
Regarding: Amendments to the DMNP EA

Attendees:
- Ken Dion (TRCA)
- Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)
- Eric Arm (City of Toronto)
- Robert Hatton (City of Toronto)
- David Kusturin (Waterfront Toronto)
- Landowners: Adam Kerbel, Daniel Berholz, Elsa Fancelllo, Joanne Barnet, Karen Soupcoff, Lance Trumble, Rob Cameron, Alfredo Romano, Mathew Fishman, Ornella Richichi, Paul Chronis, Don Manlapaz, Paul Sytsma, Jeannette Gillezeau, Lyn Townsend

Distribution: Attendees
Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting
- Provide an update on the amendments to the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan (LDL EAMP) and obtain feedback to be considered.

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment & Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study
- Presentation by David Kusturin, Chief Operating Officer of Waterfront Toronto
  - Overview of DMNP EA and LDL EAMP
  - Description of revised flood protection phasing
    - Greenway can now be deferred to Phase 2, which reduces up-front costs
    - 309 Cherry St. now protected in Phase 1

Planning Initiatives
- Presentation by Cassidy Ritz, Senior Planner, Community Planning, City of Toronto
  - Description of overall project organization
  - Port Lands planning framework
  - South of Eastern Strategic Direction
  - Precinct Plans
    - Cousins Quay
    - Film Studio Precinct
  - Public Engagement

Action
### 2013 Development Charges By-law Review
- Presentation by Robert Hatton, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Intergovernmental Finance
  - Overview of Development Charges
  - Summary of Background Study for City-Wide Development Charge By-Law
  - Preliminary description of Area-Specific Development Charge
  - Role of development charges in overall funding plan for Port Lands revitalization

### Q&A and Landowner Feedback
- Concerns expressed by Lyn Townsend and others over the need for an area-specific development charge and the extent of the area over which it will apply
  - Rob Hatton responded with rationale for ASDC
- Questions regarding the methodology for determining the payment amount for the area-specific charge (i.e. based on land area or unit type and count)
  - Rob Hatton indicated that City currently only has capacity to apply ASDC based on land area
- Questions regarding the funding responsibility for the elevation changes that will be required to protect private lands against flooding
  - Staff responded that grade adjustments on private land will have to be paid for by landowners

### Follow-up
- September 20th, 2013 letter from Townsend and Associates to the City's Executive Committee
  - Letter expresses the position being taken by a group of Port Lands land owners and leaseholders
    - Recommends that the cost of all Port Lands flood protection works be applied to the City-Wide Development Charge and that no Area-Specific Development Charge be applied in the Port Lands
    - States that the group is not currently in a position to discuss potential financial contributions towards the cost of Port Lands infrastructure
  - Precinct plans, DMNP EA and LDL MP EA, zoning by-laws must be completed before group will enter into financial negotiations with the City

### Next Steps
- None Identified
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Tuesday July 30, 2013
Start Time: 1:00 pm
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Toronto Port Lands Company (TPLC)

Regarding: Update on Don Mouth EA and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan for TPLC

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman (TRCA)
- David Kusturin (Waterfront Toronto)
- Marc Rose, Jake Murray (AECOM)
- Cassidy Ritz, Fiona Chapman, Jamie McEwan (City of Toronto)
- Jerry Prypasniak, Tina Panagoula, Don Forbes, Alan Kearsey (Toronto Port Lands Company)

Distribution: Attendees

Minutes Prepared By: Jake Murray

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting
- Provide Toronto Port Lands Company (TPLC) with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview
- DK/KD/CR gave a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Specific changes to the EA since the pause in 2011 from the PLAI;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - DMNP EA and LDL EA study area;
  - Updated Port Lands phasing – Detailed description of changes to each phase;
  - A description of the flood protection measures;
  - A description of the Revised Preferred Alternative; and,
  - Schedule for the DMNP and LDL EAs.

Concerns with Elevations/Flood Protection Measures
- TPLC – Will elevations ever be raised by less than 1 metre?
- TPLC - 1.5m to 2m is preferred for contaminated sites.
  - KD – Elevations are currently determined based on the need for flood protection. Infill requirements for contaminated sites and servicing needs have not yet been considered. Those details would follow during the RA/RM after EA approvals.
  - DK – The team also needs to be mindful of raising grades around the Lafarge property without increasing flood risk for Lafarge.
**Notes of Meeting**

**Tuesday July 30, 2013**

---

### TPLC - Describe a valley wall feature. How does it differ from a Flood Protection Landform (FPL)?

- **DK** – Earthen structure similar to an FPL but wider, the FPL is a structure with wet side slopes of 5-15% with a median slope of 10%. The crest is defined as being 3-5m wide. The dry side slope ranges between 1.5 and 3.5%. The FPL is deemed the minimum width required to be deemed to provide Permanent Flood Protection. In this configuration, it is deemed that the risks due to catastrophic failure (scour due to overtopping; piping and boils) are negligible. However, as this is deemed the minimum acceptable level of protection for Permanent Flood Protection, activities that further reduce the effective width of the structure (such as installing underground servicing and buildings into the FPL) would thereby provide conduits for increase risk of catastrophic failure. Thus, such structures and infrastructure are not permitted onto the FPL.

- The VWF instead, possesses the same wet side and crest conditions, but possesses a dry side slope of 1.5% or less. Under such a scenario, the width of such a structure is deemed to be such that there is effectively no risk due to catastrophic failure, and as such, we can treat the structure as an extension of the valley and tableland system. As such, TRCA’s valley and stream corridor policies come into play, allowing structures and development to occur in the structure, with a 10m development setback from the crest of the valley as long as any proposed infrastructure does not allow piping to occur from the valley to the adjacent tablelands (i.e. Such as a sanitary vent).

### Question from team regarding re-zoning of leased TPLC properties

- **CR** – What are the stipulations for someone leasing a TPLC property on Polson Quay who is interested in rezoning? Are they able to rezone under TPLC lease agreements.

  - **JP (TPLC)** – Land use permissions under a lease agreement differ for each property in this area. For example. The Castan lease agreement incorporates much broader land use restrictions. No matter what the lease agreement says, they must stay within the existing permitted uses if they are interested in rezoning. If the lessee wants to rezone beyond what the permitted uses, then they need TPLC’s consent.

### Concerns regarding future development process and timelines

- **TPLC** – For a developer to begin new work on the Film Studio site (Rosecorp auction lands?) would they require re-grading?

  - **KD/DK/CR** – Yes… These lands would be located within the existing SPA. As such, there could be opportunities for expanding operations under existing zoning conditions (industrial), subject to site specific flood proofing and confirmation that raising the grades locally does not increase the risk due to flooding in other areas of the Port Lands. In order to intensify land uses and pursue added value to the land, the lands would need to be raised in coordination with the overall Phase 1 and 2 activities outlined in the DMNP EA.

- **TPLC** - When could a developer begin work on lands north of Commissioners Street?

  - **DK** – Only after construction is complete can a developer being work in that area. A proponent would only require a rezoning if they were intensifying.
**Notes of Meeting**

**Tuesday July 30, 2013**

**Action**

- **DK** – Could you get rezoning before flood protection features are implemented?
  - **CR** – We will have to look into this. The province is the authority for removing lands from the special policy area. If there is no funding or program in place for flood protection they would be apprehensive to do any re-zoning. We intend on addressing the special policy area in the Official Plan. We want to do it once or at least in the most efficient manner.
- **TPLC** – We are receiving a lot of inquiries from developers/contractors as to when work can begin.
  - **DK** – To speed up the process, the City may be looking for landowners to front-end the infrastructure required for their own developments. Due to risk, developers are hesitant to do this but are eager to begin construction.
  - **TPLC** – This seems like a complicated waiting/who goes first game

**Concerns regarding EA timeline**

- **TPLC** – When will we receive the latest copy of EA for review?
  - **AF** – October. Is there anything in particular that you would want information on earlier than October?
  - **TPLC** – Not at the moment
- **TPLC** – When is the timeline to get the EA to the Ministry
  - **KD** – There is a draft submission to the Ministry and public in October and a 5 week review period for agencies, public, and stakeholders. Final submission will be followed by a 7 week review period.

**Concerns regarding amendment procedures**

- **TPLC** – What amendment procedures are being included in this new version of the EA? It should propose a process to deal with amendments of a smaller scale.
  - **KD** - The original EA included this and we will use the same process to deal with such amendments
  - **DK** – With the City having Development Charges (DCs) and area specific DCs and the Province having interest in flood protection within this area. The Province looks at it as we haven’t completed the flood protection yet. There is an opportunity to get the Province to recognize their interests in a monetary way. Possibly get the Province and Federal government to provide funding for phase 3 then the project could be accomplished in the preferred timeline and complete all the necessary construction for phase 3 within the appropriate Phase 3 timing. When funding is split between all three government levels it’s close to 30 million/year which seems much more reasonable at the provincial and federal levels

**Concerns regarding phase funding**

- **TPLC** – What were the new costs? You said they have been reduced since the previous design for Phase 1 and 2 whereas phase 3 and 4 costs are the same
  - **DK** – The change in costs is mainly due to the changes with the Greenway. Phase 1 and 2 savings based on the new design Alt 4WS is $175 million
  - **DK** – It’s not a dramatic change as the overall costs will still be between 400 and 450 million

**Next Steps**

- None identified
Good afternoon,

As a member of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA), we wanted to keep you informed regarding project related activities and updates.

Work is underway to amend the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA). These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) in 2012.

A public meeting was held on July 24th, 2013 to provide an update on the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs and to seek feedback on the updated plans. The attached draft summary provides highlights of overall feedback, followed by participants’ questions of clarification and answers provided by project team members at the meeting. Should you have any comments and/or suggested edits to this draft summary, please forward them to Alex Heath (aheath@swerhun.com) no later than Wednesday, September 4th, 2013. Meeting material, including a project backgrounder, agenda, display boards, and presentation, are available for download on the project website at www.trca.on.ca/dmnpea

If you have any questions regarding the status of the DMNP EA, or wish to be removed from the DMNP EA distribution list, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Alexis Wood, BSc, MES
Project Manager, Highland Creek Watershed |
Toronto and Region Conservation |
Head Office - 5 Shoreham Dr. North York, ON M3N 1S4 |
Mailing Address – 70 Canuck Avenue, Toronto, ON M3K 2C5 | email: awood@trca.on.ca | phone: 416 661-6600 ext 5243 | fax: 416-667-6278 | web: www.trca.on.ca

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system. Thank you."
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment & Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study

TPA Meeting
September 17, 2013
Preferred Alternative
Preferred Alternative Reach Delineations
Phase 1
Phase 2
Sediment Management Area

1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved Area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Proposed Secondary Debris Booms
6. Barge Dock
7. Service Road
8. Don Valley Trail
9. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Connections
10. Adjustable Upstream Weir
11. Sideflow Weir
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Phase 3
Phase 4

Legend
- Parkland
- Naturalization Habitat
- Low Flow Channel / Spillway
- Sediment and Debris Management Area
- Flood Area
- Developable Area
- Development from Previous Phases

Date: August, 2013
Changes to Port Operations

- Potential for decreased moorage in Essroc Quay and in the Ship Channel as a result of lakefilling and the creation of the Ship Channel wetland
- The design accommodates continued mooring in the Inner Harbour along the western dockwall of Cousins Quay, within the Polson Slip at Lafarge, the western dockwall of Polsons Quay, and the majority of the Ship Channel; shallow draft vessels would be able to use dockwalls in the Keating Channel
- Permanent loss of dockwall moorage for both the Toronto Port Lands Company (TPLC), Toronto Port Authority (TPA), and other long-term leaseholders in the area associated with the following:
  - Phase 1 removal of approximately 1,341 m of dockwall in Essroc Quay and the Polson Slip
  - Phase 2 removal of approximately 404 m of dockwall in the Keating Channel and Ship Channel for the construction of the Greenway
  - Phase 4 removal of approximately 402 m in Reach 4, upon divestiture of industrial lands by Lafarge
Overview of the Effects to TPA

Changes to TPA works yard operations

- Relocation of the sediment and debris management area north of Lake Shore Boulevard will remove the need for such operations at the works yard.
- Replacement of the Keating Channel bridge with a fixed bridge will allow low profile vessels (3-3.5 m high) to travel underneath the structure.
- New location for the yard will be found in consultation with the TPA prior to demolition of the existing yard, possibly located further to the east within the Ship Channel.
- Use of hydraulic dredge and dewatering technologies provides opportunity to increase life expectancy of CDF Cell #3 by separating cleaner sands from dredgeate for better reuse.
Overview of the Effects to TPA

Changes to Shipping Activities

- Retaining the Keating Channel and providing a naturalized floodplain in the river valley system creates two areas to manage sediment and debris which provides redundancy and improves operational capacity.
- Parkland adjacent to the Inner Harbour will not affect maneuvering for larger vessels within the Inner Harbour.
- New river mouth is not expected to negatively affect maneuvering and loading/unloading of ships within the Inner Harbour.
- Upon completion of the river valley system, velocities within Polson Slip will increase during storm events and thus will require Lafarge to receive notification of anticipated high flow events via the TRCA Storm Advisory System; real-time access to TRCA’s Don River stream gauge information would also be provided.
- The completion of the river mouth requires modifications to Lafarge’s current docking procedures; access to the dockwalls in this area will be maintained.
- The configuration of the Project avoids impacts to Redpath’s existing operations and uses of the dockwalls in the Port Lands.
- The naturalized Don River Mouth is expected to attract more recreational boaters, which could lead to conflicts with larger vessels in the Inner Harbour and Polson Quay.
Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting: September 18, 2013
Time: 1:00 pm
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization Project
Location: Toronto Harbour Authority, 60 Harbour Street, Toronto, Ontario

Regarding: Update on effects assessment for amended Don Mouth EA

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman, Don Haley – Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
- Brenda Webster, Shalin Yeboah – Waterfront Toronto
- Cassidy Ritz – City of Toronto
- Geoffrey Wilson, Michael Riehl, Ken Lundy – Toronto Port Authority
- Marc Rose, Jacob Stemeroff – AECOM

Distribution: Attendees
Minutes Prepared By: Jacob Stemeroff

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting

- Provide Toronto Port Authority (TPA) with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered
- Present Preferred Alternative and Phasing Strategy
- Ensure that concerns of and effects to the Toronto Port Authority are addressed and reflected in EAs

Project Overview

- KD delivered a PowerPoint presentation highlighting:
  - The four phases of construction
  - An overview of possible effects and mitigation measures related to Toronto Port Authority operations and interests
- KD talked about how TRCA, the City, and WT have met with Lafarge and Red Path several times to discuss the proposed changes. The tour with Lafarge included a site tour with the captain of Lafarge’s ship; Lafarge is aware of the proposed new alignment of the river mouth and though they did raise issues pertaining to debris/sediment, and flow velocities, they identified that they have ports in the mouths of rivers elsewhere along the Great Lakes and believed that these changes are all manageable.
- TRCA has committed to providing real time access to flow data in the Don River to Lafarge regarding storm events

Concerns About Replacing the Keating Channel Bridge (at Cherry Street)

- KL indicated that the existing Keating Channel bridge requires repairs as it is not lifting properly, despite the City’s upgrades to the bridge approximately 18 months ago
There is a significant amount of vehicle traffic on bridge; KL asked how the traffic would be accommodated during construction of the new bridge; KD explained that the new bridge would be built before the existing bridge is removed;

There is currently no timeline for repairing the existing bridge; The group discussed whether the need to fix the existing bridge a second time in less than 2 years may provide an impetus to accelerate construction of a new Keating Channel bridge;

The TPA operates the Keating Channel bridge. However the City of Toronto owns the bridge and is responsible for capital repairs; therefore the City must be consulted to determine how to proceed

KL asked about the timing of the new Keating Channel bridge; CR responded that the bridge is expected to be funded through development charges and should be built within the next 3 to 5 years; Phase 3 might take an additional 20 to 30 years to be built out, depending on market conditions, though there remains interest between the parties to build the river our completely at the same time, pending the availability of funding.

GW asked whether DMNP EA deals with replacement of Bailey bridge and realignment of Cherry Street; The EA does not propose to replace the Bailey bridge but Cherry Street is proposed to be realigned as part of the Lower Don Lands Master Plan Class EA

**Dredging in the Keating Channel**

KL explained that the clamshell dredge was lifted out of the channel shortly after the bridge was discovered to be broken; KL confirmed that 50-60% of dredging in Keating Channel required for the year has been completed

DH explained that the amended EA includes a strategy for dredging in the Keating Channel with the existing clamshell dredge before the new sediment trap is built; this strategy, which accommodates movement of the barge underneath the new Keating Channel bridge, may need to be implemented now to allow for dredging while the existing bridge is broken

The City of Toronto had a hydraulic dredge barge (suitable removing sediment from the Keating Channel) on long-term lease for the last 3 years in the Keating Channel. It was recently returned to the contractor and is no longer available.

KL asked how future sediment management will deal with fines; KD responded fines are currently not captured in the Keating Channel. The majority of material captured in the Keating Channel is sand and a smaller fraction of coarser silt. The new configuration will continue to be very effective at capturing the sand north of Lake Shore. During rainfall events, some of the flow will go through the Keating Channel, which will continue to collect some sediments that make it past the sediment area north of Lake Shore. Similarly, during floods, some of the sediment will be deposited in the naturalized channel and wetland areas downstream of Commissioners. It is anticipated that infrequent, periodic dredging will be required in the Keating Channel and possibly in the Ship Channel near the future wetlands. Overall, the new design should reduce the total volume of sediment reaching the Inner Harbour over existing conditions.

KD pointed out that the hydrocyclone required to be used in conjunction with the hydraulic dredge, has the added ability to sort dredgeate by grain size and that a
significant percentage of the dredged materials consisting of sand would likely be able to be reused and/or sold for other purposes. The more impacted remaining silt fraction of the dredgeate would continue to require disposal at the Leslie Street CDFs. By diverting the sand for other better uses, the life expectancy of the Cell 3 CDF should be increased significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Effects on Dockwalls and Mooring**

- GW asked whether there would be any grading at the dockwalls (i.e., would the dockwalls be increased in height?); DH responded that the dockwalls would not be modified in height but would require reinforcement given the proposed increased loadings away from the dockwalls and their current state of disrepair.
- TPA confirmed that removal of dockwalls around Essroc will displace 3 ships.

**Effects on Lafarge**

- KL asked whether Lafarge had raised any concerns regarding land-based access; KD explained that Lafarge had expressed some concern about how the proposed bridge over the new river mouth at Polson Slip along Cherry Street would affect ingress and egress from the terminal – this issue would be more fully addressed through the Precinct Plans to be developed for this area.
- Other concerns raised by Lafarge included compatibility of future development with the noise associated with current operations.
- CR informed the TPA that a Class EA to address Transportation and Servicing for the remainder of the Port Lands has been initiated to look at this and other areas, including the Don Roadway bridge over the Ship Channel.

**Future Actions**

- Marc to send draft of report to TPA (Ken Lundy)
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

&

Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study

HONI Meeting
September 20, 2013
Preferred Alternative
Phase 1 – Flood Protection

- Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
- Construct new Keating Channel bridge
- Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments
Phase 1 – Development

- Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
- Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
- Fill Essroc Quay
Phase 2 – Flood Protection

- Construct Greenway
- Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge
Phase 2 - Sediment Management Area

1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved Area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Proposed Secondary Debris Booms
6. Barge Dock
7. Service Road
8. Don Valley Trail
9. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Connections
10. Adjustable Upstream Weir
11. Sidetflow Weir
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Phase 2 – Flood Protection

Illustrative Cross Section of Don Roadway Flood Protection Landform North of Lake Shore

Illustrative Cross Section of Don Roadway Valley Wall Feature South of Lake Shore
Phase 2 – Development

- Development to Munitions Block
- Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected
Phase 2 – HONI Infrastructure

- FPL
- Underground Cables
- Overhead Towers

VWF
Phase 3 – Flood Protection

- Construct Polson Slip bridge
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs
Phase 3 – Development

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise and fill north and south of river valley
Phase 4 – Naturalization

- Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Overview of the Effects to HONI

Changes to Existing, Planned and Proposed Underground Utilities

- Utility Bridge south of CN/GO crossing of the Don:
  - Removal and relocation of underground cables (all circuits north of Lake Shore impacted); OR
  - Extension of the Bridge westward (circuits remain in place)

- North of Lake Shore:
  - All circuits may be buried by FPL along east side of Don Roadway and short distance along Lake Shore
  - Depths from 1 to 1.5m metres or less
  - Impacts occur over a 200m linear distance
  - Heat dissipation key concern

- South of Lake Shore:
  - Half of circuits go east along Lake Shore (not impacted)
  - Remaining half go west along Lake Shore to near Don Roadway.
    - Veer south to Villiers then east along Villiers to Saulter.
    - Depth of circuits would be up to 2-2.5m in the west, dropping to near zero at Saulter
    - Heat dissipation key issue
    - Length of impact is approximately 300m
Overview of the Effects to HONI

Changes to Existing Above Ground Utilities

- Tower at Sub-station west side of Don River not impacted
- Tower at Don Roadway north of Lake Shore likely minimal impacts. Loadings of FPL will be very shallow in area.
- 2 towers along Don Roadway and along Commissioners near Don Roadway will be in the VWF
  - Remain in place
    - Bury tower foundation
    - Raise towers
  - Bury the circuits (assumes strategic direction for overall Port Lands revitalization)
    - Retain towers for industrial cultural heritage landscape
    - Remove towers
Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting: September 20, 2013  
Time: 2:00 pm  
Project No.: 60228858
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Regarding: Don Mouth Naturalization Project Update and Consultation with Hydro One
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PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting

• Provide Hydro One with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA)
• Discuss possible options for relocating/modifying existing Hydro One network in project area
• Project team wants to ensure they understand Hydro One infrastructure and have a understanding of any Hydro One concerns

Project Overview

• Ken Dion gave Power Point Presentation on the project including:
  ▪ Highlighted the preferred alternative
  ▪ Reviewed the four phases of the project
    - Phases three and four are currently outside of 10 year Development Charge planning horizon
  ▪ Reviewed Hydro One’s existing network in the project area including overhead towers and wires and underground cables

Key Hydro One Infrastructure

North of Lake Shore Boulevard

• Utility bridge north of Lake Shore contains 4 underground circuits. The bridge is currently high enough to convey Regulatory Flows, but is too narrow.
• 4 underground circuits run from bridge to the east side of Don Roadway from halfway between CN Line and Lake Shore down to just before the Keating Spur, before veering east then south under Lake Shore.
• 1 overhead tower west side of Don River at substation
• 1 Tower at Don Roadway and Lake Shore.
South of Lake Shore Boulevard
- 2 of 4 underground circuits veer west along Lake Shore, south near Don Roadway, east on Villiers and south along Sault to Commissioners.
- Remaining 2 of 4 underground circuits go east along Lake Shore
- 2 overhead towers along east side of Don Roadway
- 1 overhead tower along Commissioners near Don Roadway
- 2 overhead towers along Commissioners (one east of Sault, and one west of Bouchette)

Implications of DMNP EA on Hydro One Infrastructure
North of Lake Shore Boulevard
- Utility bridge north of Lake Shore and infrastructure needs:
  - Removal and relocation of the circuits or
  - Lengthening of the bridge.
  - Recommendation – no major cost savings in either approach, while the removal and relocation will likely be simpler from a constructability perspective.
- HONI believes no implications on underground circuits if amount of fill placed is 0.5m deep or less (thermal dissipation issue given old technology).
  - As such, the FPL can likely be shifted a bit east from the mid to southern portion of the alignment to ensure fill loadings are 0.5m or less
- No change proposed to the 1 overhead tower (4 circuits) on west side of Don River at substation as a result of the DMNP EA
- Minor amounts of fill may or may not be required at the base of the Hydro Tower at the Don Roadway and Lake Shore.
  - This may or may not require application of corrosion-resistant paint and possibly additional shoring works to address geotechnical issues of the tower foundation

South of Lake Shore Boulevard
- For the 2 underground circuits that would underlie the Valley Wall Feature.
  - Fill depths would exceed the 0.5m limit to allow required thermal dissipation of the circuits along the Don Roadway and most of Villiers. To address this, it would be possible to relocate the cables east along Lake Shore and then down Sault to avoid Valley Wall Feature.
- For the 2 underground circuits going straight east along Lake Shore, there is no anticipated issues with the DMNP EA
- For the 2 overhead towers along east side of Don Roadway and the 1 on Commissioners near Don Roadway:
  - Fill can be placed around the base of the towers to allow them to remain in place. HONI indicated that there is sufficient clearance available with the overhead circuits to allow this increase in grade (up to 2 to 2.5m at the western end).
  - The towers will require applications of corrosion resistant paint and possibly additional shoring for geotechnical considerations.
- For the 2 overhead towers along Commissioners (east of Sault and west of Bouchette) there are no impacts due to the DMNP EA. HONI did indicate clearance may have been an issue towards Sault if the amount of fill remained around 2m, but should not be an issue as the fill tapers to around at-grade at this point.
## Hydro One Considerations

- **HONI position statement on the state of their infrastructure:**
  - The hydro towers are very cost efficient and easy to maintain. There is no economic incentive for HONI to remove these circuits and bury their infrastructure. These towers can remain in perpetuity.
  - The 4 underground circuits were installed in the 1960s and will be due for replacement in the not too distant future.
  - In 2021 or so, HONI is looking at adding two additional underground circuits through the area using tunneling technologies.

- **HONI suggested two approaches could be taken with regards to their infrastructure:**
  - **Piecemeal Approach** - Mitigate only those direct effects on HONI infrastructure due to DMNP EA:
    - Remove utility bridge and bury circuits under the river
    - Paint and/or shore up to 4 overhead towers
    - Relocate 2 underground circuits over a distance of ~300m to intersection of Saulters and Villiers from Lake Shore; or
  - **Comprehensive Approach** - Tunnel all circuits (4 circuits on Overhead Towers, 4 existing circuits underground and 2 future circuits) in Port Lands as part of a strategic direction for the Revitalization of the Waterfront.

### Piecemeal Approach

- Remove utility bridge and relocate infrastructure
- Moderately shift southern part of FPL footprint in detailed design: No economic impact.
- Relocate 2 circuits of underground cable over a distance of ~300m (600m total)

### Comprehensive Approach

- Removal of overhead towers and 4 circuits will be the responsibility of CoT / WT for costing as it is not in the interests of HONI to remove the towers.
- If towers removed from hydro station on north side of Ship Channel straight line tunneling distance to the sub-station at the Sediment Management Area is ~950m
- If towers removed and the circuits originate at the Portlands Energy Centre on the south side of the Ship Channel, straight line distance to the Sediment Management Area increases to ~1250m.
- Replacing all the underground circuits in the Port Lands may be undertaken as a cost sharing endeavour between the CoT/WT & HONI, given that the existing cables are approaching their end of life and will require replacement and possible upgrading.
- Installing the two new underground circuits would be part of HONI operations.

### Comparison on Piecemeal and Comprehensive Approaches

- Comprehensive approach allows complete freedom to proceed with DMNP EA, and the rest of the Port Lands revitalization by avoiding conflicts with high voltage infrastructure.
  - Based on a similar recent project undertaken nearby by HONI, a budget of $100M was established to tunnel 2 cables a distance of 5.5km or a total length of 11km of tunneling.
  - To bury all the circuits in the Port Lands would involve a similar length of tunneling ~10-11km (ie. more circuits but over a shorter distance for each).
HONI indicated that all costs to bury the 4 overhead circuits would be borne by the City or Waterfront Toronto, as HONI has no incentive to bury these circuits.

- There may be opportunities for cost sharing the deep burial (tunneling) of the existing underground circuits as they are approaching the end of their life-expectancy.

**Effects of the piecemeal approach will result in:**

- Lower overall cost, "back of the envelop ballpark cost" of $20M was discussed during the meeting to include the $12M estimate of the utility bridge, and a ballpark cost to relocated the 2 underground circuits and modifications to the towers (based loosely on recent work in the WDLs);
- Hydro Towers remaining in place which may effect transit/transportation plans for the Port Lands; and
- 100 foot setbacks for development from the overhead towers, thus sterilizing land along the western portion of the Film Studio District. Limiting opportunities in that area to greenspace.

- In either approach, the DMNP EA can proceed without major disruption to the existing HONI network. The majority of costs involved with the piecemeal approach would be associated with relocating the HONI bridge and 2 HONI circuits over a distance of 300m each.
- The revitalization of the Port Lands however, has more significant issues to address if the existing HONI infrastructure is not tunneled as it impacts development area in the Film Studio District and transit/transportation along Commissioners.

### Switching Yard

- Potential to move switching yard
  - Would eliminate some current problems
  - Would need land to build new switching yard
- Current Switching yard is a problem for public access to waterfront

### Working with Hydro One

- Eventually old cables will be replaced
  - This provides an opportunity to work with Hydro One now and develop a long term plan for the area
- Hydro One willing, and wanting, to work with project team to develop alternatives
- EA will include commitment to continue consultation with Hydro One following EA approval to resolve this issue
- To be confirmed:
  - If new circuits are tunneled to replace existing infrastructure, HONI may require an EA to undertake the works.
  - Piece-meal relocation of the infrastructure as outlined in the DMNP EA should not require additional EA works.

### Conclusion

- Need to get “firm” development plans to Hydro One, so Hydro One can design future plans to incorporate project considerations
- Draft EA will be distributed in October
  - Steve Haddock is “point man” from Hydro One and would like a digital copy to distribute
### Action

- **EA needs to note:**
  - Overhead wires will hamper development
  - Need to work with Hydro One to develop alternatives
  - Final decision of how to manage Hydro One’s existing network should be left to steering committee
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Redpath Meeting
September 20, 2013
Phase 1 – Flood Protection

- Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
- Construct new Keating Channel bridge
- Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments
Phase 1 – Development

- Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
- Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
- Fill Essroc Quay
Phase 2 – Flood Protection

- Construct Greenway
- Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge
Phase 2 - Sediment Management Area

1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved Area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Proposed Secondary Debris Booms
6. Barge Dock
7. Service Road
8. Don Valley Trail
9. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Connections
10. Adjustable Upstream Weir
11. Sideflow Weir
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Phase 2 – Development

• Development to Munitions Block
• Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected
Phase 3 – Flood Protection

- Construct Polson Slip bridge
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs
Phase 3 – Development

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise and fill north and south of river valley
Phase 4 – Naturalization

• Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Overview of the Effects to Redpath

Changes to Port Operations

- Decreased moorage
  - Essroc Quay due to lakefilling; and
  - Ship Channel due to creation of Ship Channel wetland
- Design accommodates continued mooring at:
  - Western dockwall of Cousins Quay,
  - Within Polson Slip at Lafarge,
  - Western dockwall of Polson Quay, and
  - Within the Ship Channel

Changes to Shipping Activities

- Removal of the promontories ensure that there are no effects on manoeuvring larger vessels in the Inner Harbour
- New river mouth is not expected to negatively affect manoeuvring and loading/unloading of ships within the Inner Harbour
- Naturalized Don River Mouth is expected to attract more recreational boaters, which could lead to conflicts with larger vessels in the Inner Harbour and Polson Quay
Overview of the Effects to Redpath

Changes to Existing and Planned Roads and Bridges

• Construction of the new Cherry Street Bridge, the realignment of Cherry Street and to a lesser extent, removal of the existing Keating Channel bridge and abutments in Phase 1, will likely produce:
  o Short-term, localized nuisance effects such as traffic disruption
  o Impacts mitigated by retaining existing Cherry Street and Keating Channel Bridge until the new infrastructure is completed

Changes to Water Quality

• Construction activities have the potential to cause localized increases to turbidity within:
  o Keating Channel,
  o Ship Channel, and
  o Inner Harbour
• Implementation of best management practices and spill response plans will mitigate impact on water quality
• Following construction, water quality within the Keating Channel, Ship Channel, and new low flow channel is anticipated to be comparable or marginally better than existing water quality
• Diversion of the Don River’s primary channel through the Polson Slip will be away from the Redpath water intake as compared to existing conditions
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**Date of Meeting**: September 20, 2013  
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### Purpose of Meeting

- Provide Redpath with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA)  
- Highlight effects assessment as it applies to Redpath  
- Obtain feedback from Redpath

### Project Overview

- KD gave Power Point Presentation on the project including:  
  - A description of the preferred alternative  
  - Reviewed the four phases of the project  
    - Phases three and four are currently outside of 10 year Development Charge planning horizon  
  - Presented expected effects to Redpath:  
    - Changes to Port Operations  
    - Changes to Shipping Activities  
    - Changes to existing and planned roads and bridges  
    - Water Quality management

### Concerns Regarding Timing and Financing

- Redpath asked when the project would start and who would pay for it  
  - City-wide Development Charge By-law adopted by the Executive Committee. Area-specific DC bylaw to be developed and will be brought forward to Council in the near future. The area-specific DCs will assist in the funding of DMNP EA flood protection elements.  
  - There is a potential cost savings for undertaking all proposed work at once, as opposed to spreading out work over several phases
- City of Toronto currently investigating this option, and predicts to have answers in the new year; they are looking for funding from:
  - Land owners
  - Provincial government
  - Federal government
- Regarding timing, the project is a long-term project spanning multiple decades
- Once EA is approved, it will be easier to secure financing and move forward with scheduling
- Initial two phases are within City's 10-year capital plan

### Concerns Regarding Water Quality

- Redpath had previously expressed concern about the impacts of dredging and/or construction on water quality. Water quality is important for Redpath as it is used as an input in several of their operations
  - Response – majority of dredging operations will occur north of Lake Shore using a hydraulic dredge and dewatering system. As a result, water quality should be improved as compared to existing dredging conditions, especially after Phase 3 is implemented when the new river mouth discharges through the Polson Slip (further away from the Red Path intakes). Dredging will occur periodically in the Keating Channel, but the frequency and extent of those activities will be less than currently experienced.
  - As for the construction related effects, lakefilling will be limited to the area around Essroc Quay. Typical practices involve the placement of a rubble berm to isolate the work area from the rest of the Lake. Then fill is placed in the isolated area. If turbidity increases beyond a certain level outside of the berm, construction is halted until turbidity decreases.

### Concerns Regarding “De-Industrialization” of Harbour

- During construction, Redpath is concerned about potential impacts to navigation
  - The majority of construction will be located on-land or away from the Inner Harbour. Works in the Inner Harbour will largely be limited to the area around Essroc Quay, and along the north dockwall of the Polson Slip when the area is naturalized.
- Redpath expressed concerns about the degrading state of dockwalls
  - The north dockwalls along the Polson Slip will be modified, and dockwalls along Essroc Quay will be filled in. The Keating Channel dockwalls will be reinforced with rock buttresses. Some of the dockwalls will be cut in the Ship Channel where the proposed wetland will be installed in Phase 2. Remaining dockwalls will need to be upgraded as part of the Precinct Planning process for the Port Lands.
- Redpath noted that the harbour is being “De-Industrialized”
  - It was noted that moored boats will be in plain view and that the co-proponents believe that harbour activity will add excitement and character to the future development.
  - The moorage of ships on the dockwalls of Polson and Cousin Quays may provide “wind-breaks” to adjacent recreational areas, especially during the winter.
- Redpath acknowledged that the increase in recreational boaters should not be an issue considering the existing conditions within the Inner Harbour.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Currently Redpath has no future plans to move from current location on Queens Quay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Redpath feels that their previous issues have been addressed with the amended EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Andrew will be coordinating Redpath’s review of the draft EA; he would like a digital copy of Power Point presentation and a digital copy of draft EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lafarge Meeting
October 15, 2013
Phase 1 – Flood Protection

- Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
- Construct new Keating Channel bridge
- Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments
Phase 1 – Development

- Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
- Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
- Fill Essroc Quay
Phase 2 – Flood Protection

- Construct Greenway
- Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge
1. Sediment Trap
2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
3. Reserved Area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
4. Debris Booms
5. Proposed Secondary Debris Booms
6. Barge Dock
7. Service Road
8. Don Valley Trail
9. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential Connections
10. Adjustable Upstream Weir
11. Sideflow Weir
12. Potential Location for CSO Shafts
Phase 2 – Development

- Development to Munitions Block
- Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected
Phase 3 – Flood Protection

- Construct Polson Slip bridge
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs
Phase 3 – Development

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise and fill north and south of river valley
Phase 4 – Naturalization

- Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Overview of the Effects to Lafarge

Changes to Shipping Activities & River Operations

• Promontories removed: no effects on manoeuvring larger vessels in the Inner Harbour
• Three outlet river mouth: not expected to impact manoeuvring and loading/unloading of ships within the Inner Harbour.
• Polson Slip operations:
  • Lafarge docking procedures will be modified in Phase 3 to dock against baseflow low currents “slide-docking”.
  • If deemed necessary, Phase 3 valley design may be modified to divert flows to north side of Polson Slip
  • With new river mouth, more recreational boaters may be attracted to the area, which could lead to conflicts with larger vessels in the Inner Harbour and Polson Quay.
• Lafarge access to TRCA’s real-time flow monitoring system and flood forecast system will be critical information for Lafarge operations.
• Primary debris management will be relocated north of Lake Shore, with secondary collection in Keating, and naturally collected in the new valley system in Phase 3.
Overview of the Effects to Lafarge

Changes to Port Operations

• Decreased moorage
  o Essroc Quay due to lakefilling; and
  o Ship Channel due to creation of Ship Channel wetland
• Design accommodates continued mooring at:
  o Within Polson Slip at Lafarge,
  o Western dockwall of Cousins Quay,
  o Western dockwall of Polson Quay, and
  o Within the Ship Channel

Changes to Water Quality

• Construction activities have the potential to cause localized increases to turbidity within:
  o Keating Channel,
  o Ship Channel, and
  o Inner Harbour
• Implementation of best management practices and spill response plans will mitigate impact on water quality
• Following construction, water quality within the Keating Channel, Ship Channel, and new low flow channel is anticipated to be comparable or marginally better than existing water quality
Overview of the Effects to Lafarge

Changer to Existing and Planned Roads, Bridges and Land uses

- Construction of the new Cherry Street Bridge, the realignment of Cherry Street and removal of the existing Keating Channel bridge and abutments in Phase 1, will likely produce:
  - Short-term, localized nuisance effects such as traffic disruption
  - Impacts mitigated by retaining existing Cherry Street and Keating Channel Bridge until the new infrastructure is completed
- Grading impacts will be considered at Precinct Plan stage and resolved at Detailed Design to ensure trucks can continue to enter and leave Lafarge site once grades in adjacent Polson Quay are raised in Phase 1
- Intersection at Cherry and Polson Streets must allow for safe truck turning onto the new bridge to be constructed by Phase 3. To be resolved at detailed design stage for the implementation of the Polson and Cousins Precincts.
- Noise generated during Lafarge operations is significant. Precinct Planning for Polson Quay will consider implications of noise when considering land use changes to adjacent lands.
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Project Number: 60228858
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Location: Lafarge – Polson Quay
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PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting
- Provide Lafarge with an update on the final Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview
- KD gave a presentation on the project including:
  - Preferred Alternative
  - Phasing Strategy; and
  - Effects most pertinent to Lafarge operations

Questions
- Lafarge – Will we have access to real-time stream gauge information and weather forecasts so that we will be able to ensure the ship can berth prior to leaving other ports?
  - Yes – TRCA can provide links for that information
  - During detailed design, we can also explore opportunities to install flow deflection structures to the east of the Lafarge docks to divert flows away from the south dockwall
- Lafarge – Can you provide a copy of the ppt presentation?
  - Yes – enclosed with this meeting summary
- Project Team to Lafarge – Are there any concerns or issues between Lafarge and adjacent land owners?
  - No. The primary concern is the safety of the general public that accesses Cherry Street and Polson Street relating to their truck traffic. They see the Lower Don Lands work as potentially increasing the risk to the public with their trucks turning onto Cherry Street.
• **Lafarge** – What sort of land uses are anticipated in Phase 4?
  ▪ It is assumed that Phase 4 would only proceed when operations at the Lafarge plant cease and intensification efforts are desired by the parties.

• **Lafarge** – Some other key issues involve noise and port security. Lafarge is responsible for maintaining security of their dockwall until they decide to change land uses.

• **Lafarge** – What are the DMNP EA timelines?
  ▪ Once submitting in late 2013, the EA approvals will take approximately 9 months in total.

• **Lafarge** – What is the status of the Precinct Planning processes on the Quays?
  ▪ Cousins Quay Precinct Planning and the Port Lands Framework studies are underway. The Class EA in support of the rest of the Port Lands will proceed in October/November.
  ▪ Polson Quay Precinct Plan will proceed at a later date.
  ▪ City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto remain co-leads on the PLAI planning initiatives and amendments to the Secondary Plan.
  ▪ A comprehensive OPA will proceed later in 2014

• **Lafarge** – Other concerns include increased periodic traffic use on Cherry by the TPA, and the significant increase in pedestrians on the road during the Cirque du Soleil in the Port Lands.

### Next Steps

• N/A
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Date of Meeting: October 23, 2013
Start Time: 10:00 am
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Ministry of Natural Resources

Regarding: Update on Don Mouth EA and Lower Don Lands EA Master Plan for MMAH&MNR

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Steve Heuchert, Rob Grech, Don Haley, Sameer Dhalla, Laurie Nelson (TRCA)
- Cassidy Ritz, Kyle Knoeck (City of Toronto)
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Distribution: Attendees
Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

### Purpose of Meeting

- Provide MMAH and MNR with an update on the final Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and obtain feedback to be considered.

### Project Overview

- KD gave a presentation on the project including:
  - Preferred Alternative; and
  - Phasing Strategy.

### Questions

- MMAH – Confirmed that they had no concerns with the Phased approach for the preferred alternative presented in the DMNP EA Amendment

### Next Steps

- Prior to the start of works, ongoing discussions between Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH), City of Toronto, TRCA and Waterfront Toronto will be required to determine the appropriate approach and timing for removal of the SPA designation.
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- Bing Young, Walter Kloostra and Mike Shehan – Hydro One
- David Kusturin, Shalin Yeboah - Waterfront Toronto
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman - TCRA
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### Purpose of Meeting

- Provide Hydro One with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA)
- Discuss possible options for relocating/modifying existing Hydro One network in project area
- Project team wants to ensure they understand Hydro One infrastructure and have a understanding of any Hydro One concerns
- Next Steps

### Project Overview

- Ken Dion went through history of DMNP EA, PLAI and EA Amendment Process.
- Walked through print-off of September 20 Power Point Presentation given to Steve Haddock (HONI) on the project including:
  - Highlighted the preferred alternative
  - Reviewed the four phases of the project
    - Phases three and four are currently outside of 10 year Development Charge planning horizon
- Reviewed Hydro One’s existing network in the project area including overhead towers and wires and underground cables

### Key Hydro One Infrastructure

#### North of Lake Shore Boulevard

- Utility bridge north of Lake Shore contains 4 underground circuits. The bridge is currently high enough to convey Regulatory Flows, but is too narrow.
- 4 underground circuits run from bridge to the east side of Don Roadway from halfway between CN Line and Lake Shore down to just before the Keating Spur, before veering east then south under Lake Shore.
- 1 overhead tower west side of Don River at substation
- 1 Tower at Don Roadway and Lake Shore.
South of Lake Shore Boulevard
- 2 of 4 underground circuits veer west along Lake Shore, south near Don Roadway, east on Villiers and south along Saultier to Commissioners.
- Remaining 2 of 4 underground circuits go east along Lake Shore
- 2 overhead towers along east side of Don Roadway
- 1 overhead tower along Commissioners near Don Roadway
- 2 overhead towers along Commissioners (one east of Saultier, and one west of Bouchette)

Implications of DMNP EA on Hydro One Infrastructure

North of Lake Shore Boulevard
- Utility bridge north of Lake Shore and infrastructure needs:
  - Removal and relocation of the circuits or
  - Lengthening of the bridge.
  - Recommendation (based on Sept 2013 meeting) – no major cost savings in either approach, while the removal and relocation will likely be simpler from a constructability perspective.
- HONI believes no implications on underground circuits if amount of fill placed is 0.5m deep or less (thermal dissipation issue given old technology) – based on Sept 2013 meeting.
  - As such, the FPL can likely be shifted a bit east from the mid to southern portion of the alignment to ensure fill loadings are 0.5m or less
- No change proposed to the 1 overhead tower (4 circuits) on west side of Don River at substation as a result of the DMNP EA
- Minor amounts of fill may or may not be required at the base of the Hydro Tower at the Don Roadway and Lake Shore.
  - This may or may not require application of corrosion-resistant paint and possibly additional shoring works to address geotechnical issues of the tower foundation

South of Lake Shore Boulevard
- For the 2 underground circuits that would underlie the Valley Wall Feature.
  - Fill depths would exceed the 0.5m limit to allow required thermal dissipation of the circuits along the Don Roadway and most of Villiers. To address this, it would be possible to relocate the cables east along Lake Shore and then down Saultier to avoid Valley Wall Feature.
- For the 2 underground circuits going straight east along Lake Shore, there is no anticipated issues with the DMNP EA
- For the 2 overhead towers along east side of Don Roadway and the 1 on Commissioners near Don Roadway:
  - Fill can be placed around the base of the towers to allow them to remain in place. HONI (Sept 2013) indicated that there is likely sufficient clearance available with the overhead circuits to allow this increase in grade (up to 2 to 2.5m at the western end).
  - The towers will require applications of corrosion resistant paint and possibly additional shoring for geotechnical considerations.
- For the 2 overhead towers along Commissioners (east of Saultier and west of Bouchette) there are no impacts due to the DMNP EA. HONI did indicate
clearance may have been an issue towards Saulter if the amount of fill remained around 2m, but should not be an issue as the fill tapers to around at-grade at this point.

**Hydro One Considerations**

- HONI reconfirmed position regarding their infrastructure:
  - The hydro towers are very cost efficient and easy to maintain. There is no economic incentive for HONI to remove these circuits and bury their infrastructure. These towers can remain in perpetuity.
  - The 4 underground circuits were installed in the 1960s and will be due for replacement in the not too distant future.
  - In 2021 or so, HONI is may be looking at adding two additional underground circuits through the area using tunneling technologies but planning has not advanced far.
- Discussion with HONI suggested two approaches could be taken with regards to their infrastructure:
  - Piecemeal Approach - Mitigate only those direct effects on HONI infrastructure due to DMNP EA:
    - Remove utility bridge and bury circuits under the river
    - Paint and/or shore up to 4 overhead towers
    - Relocate 2 underground circuits over a distance of ~300m to intersection of Saulter and Villiers from Lake Shore; or
  - Comprehensive Approach - Tunnel or bury all circuits (4 circuits on Overhead Towers, 4 existing circuits underground and 2 future circuits) in Port Lands as part of a strategic direction for the Revitalization of the Waterfront.
- Tunneling may be problematic concentrating all the circuits in one deep tunnel. If something goes wrong (ie. flooding of tunnel), all the circuits for Toronto will be gone.
- HONI has recently built new Switch Yard. Purchased property from OPG near Hearn. No immediate plans to remove older existing switch yard.

**Scoping – Feasibility Study**

- TRCA, WT and City of Toronto to draft scope of work for HONI to undertake a Feasibility Study. The first scenario:
  - Determine issues, remediation strategy and cost to address immediate impacts of the Preferred Alternative for the DMNP EA.
  - Determine issues, remediation strategy and cost to address a comprehensive relocation of infracture that meets, DMNP EA, LDL MPEA and Port Lands Master Plan needs.
  - Consider a hydrid solution that allows for early start of DMNP EA, but takes opportunities and efficiencies to allow for a more comprehensive approach for the three main Projects.
- HONI would receive proposed Scope of Work, help to refine and undertake Feasibility Studies at cost to the three co-proponents. Work could be done by April 2014 if scope of work provided shortly.
- Scoping efforts to be coordinated through Bing Young.
- Seeking construction start up of DMNP EA Phase 1 and/or 2 between 2016 and 2018.
Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting: Thursday December 12, 2013
Start Time: 2:00 p.m.
Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization Project
Location: 240 Unwin Avenue, Toronto

Regarding: Amendments to the DMNP EA

Attendees:
- Ken Dion (TRCA)
- Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)
- Ms. Kalvena (Windsor Salt)

Distribution: Attendees

Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting:
- Provide Windsor Salt with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

Windsor Salt’s Operations:
- Transport 300,000 to 400,000 tonnes of salt per year, for Canadian salt alone
- Salt is delivered by contracted ship from Windsor Mine. Use Lake Max vessels (largest vessels that can travel seaway)
- Primary clients are City of Toronto and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation. Smaller contracts are involved as well
- Work on an “as-required” basis. Orders must be available within 24 hours or penalties involved
- Past attempts to transport by train were problematic - trains are slow, and have been lost in transit
- Transport by truck is slow, and inefficient. Using Dump Trucks, which have 38 tonne capacity, takes over four hours for one truck to travel from Windsor to Toronto. Thus there is not enough time by law to make a round trip (MTO Hours of Service Rules for drivers allows one round trip per truck per day from Windsor to Toronto vs. up to 5 or 6 round trips per truck per day from the Toronto stockpile with the same truck)
- Some smaller trucks leave the site for smaller salt yards - 25 tonnes capacity (only 38 mt Trucks deliver from Windsor, challenging to access some City yards with large trucks due to space limitations)
- On slow days in winter, 4,000 tonnes a day may be transported. Other days may have over 10,000 tonnes transported (equal to several hundred 38 tonne capacity trucks)
- Vessel shipping season runs from end of March to end of December. All salt supplies need to be on site when the Seaway closes for winter
- Closure of the Cherry Street Bridge at the Ship Channel until Fall 2013 caused major problems in replenishing stockpile on site
- Windsor Salt upgraded the site and spent $1M to resurface
- Need more space for salt storage as would like to expand their operations
- Most effective is for ships to self-unload directly onto stockpile. Double-handling 1/2 of their storage is required as two rows of salt stockpiles are permitted on site. The more dockwall available, the more efficient
- Currently Windsor Salt leases site from TPLC, and are asking for more lands. Can moor three 730-750 foot long vessels
- Restrictions exist on how close a laker can moor in proximity to a bridge
- After unloading, ships move to the Turning Basin to turn around and leave
- Windsor Salt does not own any ships. They must contract and compete against other users of the ship
- Salt is stored in Hamilton and in Bowmanville
- Their competitors are located beside them in the Ship Channel
- Salt storage is not compatible with certain other uses – i.e., steel storage or cement (salt and cement harden together)
- Limited space and dockwalls remain in the Port Lands to be relocated
- Road salt is absolutely necessary for delivery to Toronto Deep Water port for public safety in the winter
- Transport Canada Port Security Rules mandate site is kept absolutely safe, especially during vessel interface. No outsiders are allowed on site during vessel discharge
  - For safety reasons also, public must be kept away at all times, as large machinery is operated on site
- Replacement of existing infrastructure, namely dock wall is very expensive
  - A more economical option is to maintain existing infrastructure
- Dock wall in front of their operations has been maintained. Not necessarily elsewhere along ship channel
- Relocation options for their operations begin to be limited at the Port Lands

### Concerns Regarding the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan

- The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan location of the Greenway on the south side of Ship Channel (middle of their stockpiles)
- The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan location of the Don Roadway bridge crossing (would like to see bridge further to the east, if possible)
  - The plans for the road crossing and greenway have been available in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan since 2003. But through the EA process for the Port Lands will be exploring many alternatives.
  - If necessary, the Study Team could explore alternative locations within the Ship Channel for Windsor Salt operations. Windsor Salt indicated that this is likely okay as long as credits for site upgrades to the existing facility are available at the new location.
  - The proposed works in the Unwin Avenue area are on the 30 to 50 year planning frame horizon, though the Don Roadway bridge may occur prior to that. Such a bridge would be a lift bridge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns Regarding Sedimentation of the Inner Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about sedimentation in Inner Harbour at the new location of the Don River Mouth (where Windsor Salt’s ships maneuver before entering the Ship Channel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sediment and debris management is a key element of the DMNP. A management facility is being proposed north of Lake Shore Boulevard, but additional maintenance opportunities remain in the Keating Channel. Following completion, sediment management will be more comprehensive than what currently exists. Similar concerns raised by Redpath, TPA and Lafarge. These agencies seem satisfied with the approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A commitment of in the DMNP, EA is to conduct periodic monitoring of the Inner Harbour bathymetry to confirm if management is proceeding as anticipated. If so, periodic dredging would be necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative – Phase 2
HONI Feasibility Study

MINUTES

Jan 13, 2014 @ 1:00 AM – 2:00 PM
Location: Hydro One

Mike Sheehan, HONI
Bing Yong, HONI
Walter Kloostra, HONI
Farook K., HONI
Fred Ball, Waterfront Secretariat
Adele Freeman, TRCA
Ken Dion, TRCA
Cassidy Ritz, City Planning
Amanda Santo, Waterfront Toronto
Veronica Bergs, Waterfront Toronto
Paul Bumpstead, Dillon Consulting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Notes / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMNP EA Scope of Work</td>
<td>DMNP implications:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 circuits overhead; 2 circuits underground along Villiers (south of Lake Shore Boulevard), and 4 circuits underground north of Villiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- discussion focused on four circuits on the utility bridge, potential and issues related to converting overhead to underground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 options identified for the utility bridge relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Directional bore 4 circuits under river combined with removing the bridge and abutments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Modify utility bridge (new or extending the existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Convert the 4 circuits into overhead lines from intersection of Lake Shore and Don Roadway to sub-station on west bank of river south of CN crossin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Challenge with extending existing bridge: how to maintain service during work - de-energizing line; can't afford outages given area being served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Can not accommodate 4 underground circuits on current towers - - new towers would be required. Different types of towers can be used than existing to minimize their visual impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Generic consideration for underground is where it comes up --- &quot;potheads&quot; to tower requires more land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Notes / Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Benefit of overhead tower option is that it eliminates underground circuits along Don Roadway and Gardiner Ramps, which may assist with Flood Protection Landform on former Unilever site and implementation of Gardiner EA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other technical challenges to be considered include “Gardiner EA” and Toronto Water Don River and Central Waterfront Master Plan (the CSO tunnels and shafts proposed in the area to address stormwater run-off).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Major issue - Enbridge Gas line north of Lake Shore at Don Roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>ACTION</strong> – North of Lake Shore, HONI to look at bury option; and tower option. Modify existing bridge option will only be explored in the event two other options are not feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>ACTION</strong> – South of Lake Shore, HONI to look at “confirming acceptable level of fill on top of two existing underground circuits south of Lake Shore along Don Roadway and Villiers”, then consider rerouting these two circuits east along Lake Shore Boulevard to avoid the proposed Valley Wall Feature proposed by the DMNP EA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port Lands Scope of Work</th>
<th>Options discussed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain overhead but modify to accommodate transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bury south of Lake Shore to Ship Channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bury south of Lake Shore to Ship Channel and address north of Lake Shore through Unilever site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reroute and/or bury along Carlaw Avenue and modify crossings across the Ship Channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LRT introduction with existing overhead: not impossible, requires considering electrical clearances, grounding, induction and maintenance access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rerouting overhead would require 100ft separate right of way. Would not be practical for revitalization efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impacts/cost of burying system would require understanding of planned infrastructure improvements (above - road, LRT - and below - W/WW/SW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New switching station --- does not mean decommissioning of old switching station at Hearn --- lines come to ground and are sorted/directed into switching yard. They are planned like circuit boards, with everything in its place. This land will not be released and new switching yard does not mean new alignment for hydro circuits. Reconfiguring would require construction of new switching station (~$100M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two options being carried forward into feasibility study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain overhead but modify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bury south of Lake Shore to Ship Channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Port Lands Study and Class EA</th>
<th>First public meeting held November 28, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Existing conditions presented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second consultation meeting targeted for mid-February to present alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CR to provide notice to HONI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Notes / Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Third line" from Niagara into Port Lands | - Should be referred to as a "path" not a line  
- Logical place is into existing switch yard because land and infrastructure in place  
- No definitive plans -- speculation |
| Feasibility Study | - HONI to prepare feasibility scope for Phase 1 (DMNP) and Phase 2 (PL)  
- HONI to identify cost for undertaking Feasibility Study  
- Timing anticipated for reporting on Port Lands Class EA is anticipated to be May 2012  
- Feasibility study would inform evaluation of alternatives  
- City staff would report the Executive Steering Committee on timing for the feasibility study and seek direction on whether to proceed in the event the Feasibility Study is not complete |
| Post Meeting Note | - DMNP EA - REROUTING 2 UNDERGROUND CIRCUITS – HONI should consider scheduling, cost-sharing and other efficiencies associated with rerouting two underground circuits in the context of maintaining/replacing their existing aging underground circuits in the Port Lands. In particular, the apparent stated need that any replacement /rerouting of their existing underground circuits would be associated with an upgrade in circuit technology from existing conditions.  
- IMPLICATIONS OF EXTENDING BOUCHETTE TO THE SHIP CHANNEL. HONI to include adjustments to locations of existing towers within Toronto Hydro Site  
- HONI to advise whether there would be any Implications for a lift bridge in the vicinity of Bouchette over the Ship Channel and implications on overhead wires that cross the Ship Channel. |
From: Van der Woerd, Mark
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 9:24 AM
To: Wong Ken, Michelle
Subject: FW: Hydro One meeting re Port Lands (Jan 13, 2014) Minutes

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mark van der Woerd
AECOM | mark.vanderwoerd@aecom.com
P: 905.390.2003 | C: 289.439.9803

From: Ken Dion [mailto:KDion@trca.on.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2014 3:34 PM
To: Van der Woerd, Mark; Rose, Marc; Adele Freeman
Subject: Fw: Hydro One meeting re Port Lands (Jan 13, 2014) Minutes

Kenneth M. Dion, MSc | Special Projects Manager, Project Management Office |
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority | 5 Shoreham Drive, Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4|
✦ 416.661.6600 ext. 5230 |☎ 416.667.6278 | ✉ kdion@trca.on.ca | www.trca.on.ca

----- Forwarded by Ken Dion/MTRCA on 02/12/2014 03:33 PM -----

From: Bing.Young@HydroOne.com
To: ASanto@waterfrontoronto.ca, mike.sheehan@HydroOne.com, w.d.kloostra@HydroOne.com, Melissa.LACHHMAN@HydroOne.com, Jacquie.Davidson@HydroOne.com, Critz@toronto.ca, VBergs@waterfrontoronto.ca, KDion@trca.on.ca, afreeman<trca.on.ca>, smckenna@toronto.ca, DKusturin@waterfrontoronto.ca, fqureshy@HydroOne.com
Cc: ASanto@waterfrontoronto.ca, VIBergs@waterfrontoronto.ca, KDion@trca.on.ca, afreeman<trca.on.ca>, smckenna@toronto.ca, DKusturin@waterfrontoronto.ca, fqureshy@HydroOne.com
Date: 02/05/2014 02:56 PM
Subject: RE: Hydro One meeting re Port Lands (Jan 13, 2014) Minutes

Amanda,

We are looking to get you a draft scope by the end of next week. Once we have general agreement on the scope, we’ll need to run it by our Conceptual Engineering group to get an estimate on the cost and time they need to do the study work. This may take an additional week or two depending on their workload and whether further clarification discussions are needed.

Bing

From: Amanda Santo [mailto:ASanto@waterfronttoronto.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 2:36 PM
To: SHEEHAN Mike; YOUNG Bing; KLOOSTRA Walter; LACHHMAN Melissa; DAVIDSON Jacquie
Good afternoon, please find attached the minutes from our meeting on January 13, 2014. I have included all those who were in the original invite so please circulate to others in your team as necessary. Note that included in the minutes are some post meeting notes of additional aspects we would like you to explore.

Can you also please advise at your earliest when we can expect to receive the scope, cost and timelines.

Thanks so much
Amanda
Minutes of Meeting

Date of Meeting: February 6, 2014  Time: 10:00 am  Project No.: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization Project  Location: GO Transit Offices, 20 Bay Street 19th Floor, Toronto, Ontario

Regarding: Don Mouth Naturalization Project Update and Consultation with GO Transit

Attendees:
- Cassidy Ritz, Fred Ball – City of Toronto
- Carrie Schaeffer, Wayne Moss – GO Transit
- Amanda Santo - Waterfront Toronto
- Ken Dion, Don Haley – TRCA

Distribution: Attendees & Jason Ryan (GO Transit)

Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Meeting</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide GO Transit with an update on the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Overview:
- Ken Dion went through history of DMNP EA, PLAI and EA Amendment Process.
- The enclosed Power Point Presentation was shown including:
  - History of the DMNP EA
  - The preferred alternative
  - Reviewed the four phases of the project
    - Phases three and four are currently outside of 10 year Development Charge planning horizon
    - Proposed operations
- Identified past correspondence with Dan Francey (GO Transit).
- Identified that little has changed in proximity to GO infrastructure in the amendment of the DMNP EA since 2010.
- Identified key concerns raised by GO regarding original EA, related to proposed urban development in 480 Lake Shore to their GO yard and access road issues between the proposed sediment management area for DMNP EA and their GO Yard at the Don River.
- Identified proposed considerations for sediment management in amended DMNP EA regarding potential for dewatering north of Lake Shore – including possible use of the Spur line to the Port Lands or Wilson Yard for possible transport of dredged sand.
- Identified the possible need for conducting hydraulic dredging under the Kingston Subdivision Bridge in the future to maximize hydraulic conveyance through the bridge.
• Reviewed past consultation efforts with GO Transit regarding the Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project Class EA, which removed the risk of flooding to the west of the Don River. This included a review of options to determine whether opportunities were available to reduce the risk of flooding to GO’s Bala Subdivision in proximity of the West Don Lands. It was determined that the tracks were currently at their maximum allowable elevation for clearance purposes under all of the City Bridge crossings over the tracks/Don River.

Key GO Transit Infrastructure

• GO indicated they now own the whole Kingston Subdivision Crossing over the Don River. CN transferred ownership of all lines in proximity of the Don.
• GO owns the Bala Subdivision along the west side of the Don River.
• GO restated their interest acquiring TPLC’s Wilson Yard located immediately south of the GO Yard along Kingston Subdivision.
• GO expressed interest in acquiring the Keating Yard on the east side of the Don River, which is also under TPLC ownership.
  • GO was aware that Toronto Water completed a Class EA for the collection and treatment of CSO and other stormwater discharges along the Don River and Central Waterfront. This EA was approved in 2012 and identifies a number of large / deep vertical stormwater storage shafts along the length of the Keating Yard. There would also be a tunnel along the west side of the Don River crossing under the Kingston Subdivision and a storage shaft on the west bank of the river, north of Lake Shore, near the proposed sediment management area for the DMNP EA.
    - GO was aware of the City’s EA.
• GO expressed interest in acquiring parts of 480 Lake Shore Boulevard and identified that some of the lands are in provincial ownership (554 Lake Shore).
• GO indicated that they would like to remain advised of progress on the DMNP and other projects within the Port Lands.
• GO indicated operations staff will be advised to discuss the potential for dredging under the Kingston Subdivision.
The Need for Flood Protection

- Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land

Purpose of DMNP EA also establishes:
- River channel and Greenway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization and city building
- Flood protection requirements
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Proposed phasing strategy for removing regulatory flood zone
- Adaptive management strategy

Progression of the DMNP EA

2012 PLAI Phasing

LDL MP EA Study – Purpose

The LDL MP EA Study:
- Servicing infrastructure necessary to support revitalization and refines it to coincide with the optimized river valley.
- Phases 3 and 4 are being completed for Schedule C projects including streets and coordinated stormwater management infrastructure.
- Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
**Preferred Alternative**

- **Phase 1** – Flood Protection
  - Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
  - Construct new Keating Channel bridge
  - Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments

- **Phase 1** – Development
  - Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
  - Relocate and reconstruct Cherry Street
  - Fill Euroc Quay

- **Phase 2** – Flood Protection
  - Construct Greenway
  - Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
  - Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
  - Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
  - Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge

- **Phase 2** – Sediment Management Area
  1. Sediment Trap
  2. Potential Sediment Trap Expansion
  3. Reserved Area for Sediment and Debris Management, Staging and Operations
  4. Debris Booms
  5. Proposed Secondary Debris Booms
  6. Barge Dock
  7. Service Road
  8. Don Valley Trail
  9. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance - Potential connections
  10. Adjustable Upstream Weir
  11. Sidewalk Weir
  12. Potential Location for CSO Siphons

---

**DMNP EA & LDL MP EA Study | February 6, 2014**

**GO Transit Meeting**
**Phase 2 – Development**

- Development to Munitions Block
- Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected

**Phase 3 – Flood Protection**

- Construct Polson Slip bridge
- Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control walls

**Phase 3 – Development**

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise and fill north and south of river valley

**Phase 4 – Naturalization**

- Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Q-5  History of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, Toronto Purchase Specific Claim & Globe Article
THE HISTORY OF
THE MISSISSAUGAS OF
THE NEW CREDIT
FIRST NATION
INTRODUCTION

The intent of this brochure is to outline the general history of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation from the time before contact with Europeans in the early 1600s to the time of settlement in the mid-1800s, onto the present Mississaugas of the New Credit Reserve in southern Ontario. The contents of this brochure provide information on the historical way of life of ancestors of the Mississaugas of the New Credit from the 1600s to the 1800s. The historical account presented in the following pages details the relocation and settlement of ancestors of the Mississaugas of the Credit into southern Ontario, and the nature and extent of use of lands in this time period.

Gathering Wild Rice by Captain Seth Eastman. the Ojibwa harvested this staple crop in late September. In order to gather wild rice in the fall several people went out by canoe together. The individual in the stern paddled while the others collected it and then beat the kernals free into the bottom of the canoe. Courtesy of Schoolcraft, Indian Tribes of the United States. 3 (1853):62
Map 1
The lands of the Anishinabeg and related peoples, about 1800

Map 2
Sacred Feathers's World: Mississauga Place-Names at the Western end of Lake Ontario
THE MISSISSAUGA NATION IN THE EARLY 1600s

The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation is part of the Ojibway (Anishinabe) Nation, one of the largest Aboriginal Nations in North America. Before contact with Europeans and until the late 1600s, the Mississaugas occupied a territory situated inland from the north shore of Lake Huron, just to the west of Manitoulin Island and east of Sault Ste. Marie. The first known written record to identify and locate the Mississaugas is a 1640 account of Aboriginal occupants of the Lake Huron by the French Jesuits. In this document, the Mississaugas are identified as the Oumisagai. The name 'Mississauga' has been given two possible meanings. One interpretation suggests the name refers to the Eagle Clan of the Ojibway Nation. A second interpretation suggests the name refers to the mouth of the Mississagi River, which was an important fishing location for the Mississauga people.

Like other Anishinabe people living along the north shore of Lake Huron, the Mississaugas followed a way of life that involved mobility and recurring shifts in resource harvesting with the different seasons of the year. In winter months, the Mississaugas were spread out over the Nation territory, living in mobile groups of extended families. Family members cooperated in hunting large and small game animals, and supplemented this main source of food with ice fishing. It was customary for families to establish and move their winter hunting camps within certain ranges. However, there were no fixed boundaries to hunting lands used by family groups, and in times of need people could count on neighbouring groups to share food and other resources.

By early spring families moved to maple sugar grounds. At the end of the maple sugar harvest period, all family groups gathered at spring fisheries. These fishing locations were important social and ceremonial centres. The mouth of the Mississagi River was one of the main fishing centres for the Mississauga people. Up to three villages were established in the area totalling about one thousand persons. At this time of the year, people renewed social relationships after the long winter months, and individuals developed marriage ties. Village populations performed communal religious rites. The summer months were also the time in which the Mississaugas renewed and strengthened social, political and economic relations with other Ojibway and Anishinabe Nations in the Lake Huron region. Mississauga leaders and representatives often travelled to the Sault Ste. Marie area, which was one of the main regional gathering centres for Anishinabe in the Upper Great Lakes.

Between late spring and early fall, people followed a much more sedentary lifestyle relative to winter. The rich fisheries of Lake Huron allowed the Mississaugas to live in permanent villages throughout the summer. The main subsistence activity was fishing sturgeon, trout, and whitefish. However, in addition to fishing, the Mississaugas also practised agriculture to some extent, cultivating corn, squash, and other vegetables in family and village gardens. Summer was also the time in which people collected bark from birch trees used to construct canoes and lodges.
With the approach of fall, the Mississaugas harvested their garden produce and collected a number of wild fruits and vegetable products. A portion of collected fruits and vegetables, in particular corn and blueberries, was set aside and preserved for later consumption in winter. By late fall, village populations began to disperse along the shoreline of Lake Huron, hunting beaver and moose. After a last harvest at fall fishing locations, people broke up into extended family groups and removed to inland hunting ranges in preparation for winter.

Paul Kane's painting in 1846 of Menominee Indians spearing fish by torchlight on the Fox River in a present day Wisconsin could easily have been painted half a century earlier - about 1800, during the spring or fall salmon runs on the Credit River. The Mississaugas used the same fishing techniques as their fellow Algonquians on the Upper Great Lakes. Courtesy of the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada.

Paul Kane's painting of an Ojibwa village near Sault Ste. Marie, Upper Canada, in the mid 1840's. It represents very well what Chief Wahbanosey's encampment might have looked like at the head of Lake Ontario during Sacred Feathers's early boyhood. Courtesy of the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada.
MOVEMENT AND SETTLEMENT INTO SOUTHERN ONTARIO

The arrival of Europeans and the establishment and growth of colonies by the early-mid 1600s brought Aboriginal Nations in eastern North America into increasingly complex political, economic and military alliances with the two main competing European Nations - France and England. Anishinabe Nations in the St. Lawrence and Ottawa River valleys and in the Upper Great Lakes, along with the Wendat (Huron) living in the Penetanguishene peninsula and Lake Simcoe area, allied themselves with French fur traders, missionaries, and the French colonial government. Meanwhile, the Five Nations Iroquois Confederacy living south of Lake Ontario, had developed similar alliances with England.

During the first half of the 1600s, Anishinabe and Iroquois had occasionally engaged in military conflicts in attempts to access territories rich in fur bearing animals, and to control important fur trade travel routes. By 1650, these conflicts had grown into full-scale regional warfare. The Iroquois destroyed villages of the Neutral, Huron and Petun Confederacies between 1649 and 1650, forcing survivors to flee to distant refuge areas. After 1650 southern Ontario became a vast hunting territory for the Five Nations Iroquois, who now threatened more distantly established Anishinabe, including the Ojibway of Lake Huron.

By the 1680s, the Anishinabe of the Upper Great Lakes began to mount an organized counter-offensive against the Iroquois. In the early 1690s, the Ojibway, Odawa and Potawatomi, now politically and militarily allied as the Three Fires, initiated a series of offensives that gradually pushed the Iroquois back into their original homeland territory south of Lake Ontario. An oral tradition of these battles was kept by the Mississaugas for over 200 years. In 1904, a narrative account told by Chief Robert Paudash was recorded. This oral tradition was then published in the Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records the next year. The tradition has been validated by modern historians and historical researchers.

The oral tradition indicates that the Mississaugas played a key role in Anishinabe battles with Iroquois. It also describes how the settlement of Mississaugas into southern Ontario dates from the final removal of the Iroquois from the region. According to Chief Robert Paudash, the Mississaugas first defeated a party of Mohawks on an island in Georgian Bay named Pequahkoodebaminis (Skull Island). The Mississaugas then travelled along the Severn River to Lake Simcoe where they divided into two groups. The main group continued east to Balsam Lake, and from there down through the Trent waterway to the Bay of Quinte.

A second group of Mississaugas travelled south from Lake Simcoe along the Holland and Humber Rivers. The southern route followed by the Mississaugas, known as the Toronto Carrying Place, was an ancient and well known Aboriginal overland route linking Lake Ontario to Georgian Bay. Aboriginal peoples had long used it to avoid the long water passage via Lakes Ontario, Erie and Huron. French explorers learned of its existence from Aboriginal people in the mid-1600s. In the 1700s French traders, followed by Northwest Company traders, used this route as it proved a shorter and more efficient link between Lake Ontario and Lake Huron than any alternatives at the time.
Depiction of the Ojibwa defeat of the Iroquois. Around 1900 Mesaquab (Jonathon Yorke), an Ojibwa from the Rama Reserve, Lake Simcoe, made this representation of a rock painting that once stood on Quarry Point, Lake Couchiching. As it was "some years since the rock fell into the water," he relived exclusively on his own memory. The design was made for the lid of a birchbark box. The Ontario Provincial Museum's Archaeological Report for 1904 states: "The design is said to represent two Ojibwa warriors after the last great battle fought with the Iroquois, the central figure being a Mohawk, or Canienga. Mesaquab asserts that the Ojibwas, coming from the north, occupied the territory forsaken by their enemies.

According to Chief Robert Paudash, after the Iroquois retreated to their homeland south of Lake Ontario, the Mississaugas negotiated a peace treaty with the Mohawk Nation. Upon returning from these negotiations, the Mississaugas decided to settle permanently in southern Ontario. Although an exact date cannot be confirmed, historians generally agree that the process of southern Ontario settlement by Mississaugas occurred in about 1695.

One large group established themselves in the valley of the Otonabee or Trent River, along Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence up to Brockville. A second group established themselves to the west, in an area between Toronto and Lake Erie. This latter group are the direct ancestors of the present Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.
THE MISSISSAUGAS OF THE CREDIT:
HISTORICAL TERRITORY, RESOURCE AND LAND USE

The Mississaugas who settled in the area between Toronto and Lake Erie occupied and used a large territory in south-western Ontario throughout the 1700s and into the 1800s. In about 1720, French traders established a fur trade post at the western end of Lake Ontario. From this time onwards, the Mississaugas were regularly involved in the regional fur trade. By 1750, another French trade post had been built in the area of present-day Toronto (Fort Rouille). A practice soon developed by which French, and later English fur traders would extend credit to the Mississaugas at a particular river location. As a result, this river became known as the Credit River. By extension, the Mississaugas established in the region became known to Europeans as the Mississaugas of the Credit.

Over time, the Mississaugas of the Credit came to view the territory they occupied and used in southern Ontario as their traditional territory. In the 1800s, several detailed and consistent geographic descriptions of what was by then considered the traditional territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit were outlined in written documents. One such description was provided to the Governor General by Chiefs Joseph Sawyer and John Jones in 1844:

The extent of country owned and possessed by the River Credit Indians from time immemorial, extended as far down as the river Rouge thence up the said river Rouge to its source, thence Westerly along the dividing ridge between Lake Huron and Ontario to the head waters of the Thames thence southerly to Long Point on Lake Erie, thence down Lake Erie, Niagara River, and Lake Ontario to the place of the beginning.

In 1848 the Reverend Peter Jones, whose Mississauga name was Kah-Ke-Wa-Quo-Na-By, provided a similar description of the traditional territory of his people in the Christian Guardian.
The Reverend Peter Jones was at the time a well-known missionary and advocate not only for his people, the Mississaugas of the Credit, but also for many other Aboriginal Nations and communities in Ontario. By 1855, then as Chief of the New Credit Band, Peter Jones provided a further description of the traditional territory of the Mississaugas of the New Credit in a statement to the Indian Department. This description is quoted in an insert on the map of Credit Mississauga Territory presented in this brochure.

Between about 1695 and the mid-1820s, the Mississaugas of the Credit continued to follow a yearly cycle of movement and resource harvesting in their southern Ontario territory. This yearly seasonal cycle was generally comparable to the way of life followed by the Mississaugas on the north shore of Lake Huron.

In winter months, extended family groups were dispersed throughout the territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit. Hunting provided the major means of subsistence in winter. A number of large and small game, birds and fur bearing animals provided important sources of food and pelts for commercial trade. Deer were abundantly available, and bear were also harvested although to a lesser extent. Beaver and muskrats were important fur bearing animals whose pelts were traded in exchange for European goods. However, these fur bearing animals were also harvested for food, and their meat supplemented dietary needs of families.

In spring, families first moved to sugar bushes to tap maple trees. After the maple harvest, families congregated at the Credit River, the site of an important salmon fishery. Furs and pelts were also brought to trade posts at this time. Fishing was supplemented by hunting small game and fowl, principally ducks, geese and partridges.

Summer provided an abundance of resources for subsistence. Women planted corn and other vegetables, tended to crops and collected a variety of wild foods. Berries, mushrooms, roots, and where available, wild rice in the fall, were important wild foods that could be preserved for winter months. Fishing, supplemented by hunting, were the main economic activities engaged in by men throughout summer months. By fall, people often returned to the Credit River for salmon fishing and for obtaining credit (trade goods) from European traders prior to returning to winter hunting grounds.

Toward the end of the 1700s, growing Euro-Canadian settlement in the Lake Ontario region started to interfere with the seasonal movements and resource harvesting activities of the Mississaugas of the Credit. However, the growing villages and towns also provided some opportunities for the Mississaugas of the Credit to supply this population with food and manufactured goods through barter sales. The diary of Mrs. John Graves Simcoe (wife of the first Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada) details a number examples of receiving supplies of salmon, pike, geese, ducks and maple sugar from barter sales by Mississaugas of the Credit in the 1790s.
Indian Sugar Camp, engraving by J.C. McRae of a watercolour by Seth Eastman. The women usually left for the maple sugar groves during the final muskrat hunt in the spring. The Henry Schoolcraft, Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States, 6 vols.

In the 1820s, the Mississaugas of the Credit established a mission settlement on the Credit River under the direction of the Reverend Peter Jones. The mission settlement quickly developed as a successful agricultural community. Over the following years, the Credit River settlement gained considerable political importance as a regional centre where a number of Ojibway Grand Councils were held.

However, throughout this time period, the Mississaugas of the Credit continued to travel extensively for hunting and fishing. Many community members had developed close family relationships with Ojibway and other Aboriginal peoples from several First Nation communities in southern Ontario, including Muncey, Owen Sound and the Six Nations Iroquois on the Grand River. As Euro-Canadian settlement intensified along the western end of Lake Ontario, Mississaugas of the Credit travelled further inland and to more remote hunting grounds, for example, in the Muskoka area, to harvest renewable resources.
THE RELOCATION TO NEW CREDIT

Between the late 1700s and into the 1800s a number of events would have long lasting impacts on the Mississaugas of the Credit and their land base. These events happened within broader social, political and economic changes that included the development of Euro-Canadian settlement in Mississauga territory, colonial government land grants to the Six Nations Iroquois and land purchases from the Mississaugas.

Throughout the 1700s, the Mississaugas and the Iroquois Confederacy (which after the early 1700s included Six Nations) maintained peaceful relations. In the early-mid 1700s, the Mississaugas were even admitted into the Confederacy. This formal political alliance would not last, in part because of British attempts to undermine a growing pan-Indian alliance movement. However, it is clear that friendly relations between Mississaugas of the Credit and Iroquois were maintained. At the request of the British colonial government in 1784, the Mississaugas agreed to a land grant permitting settlement of the Six Nations along the Grand River.

The land grant to the Six Nations was part of a series of 'land surrenders' (as the British conceived the agreements) involving the Mississaugas first in 1784, and then later between 1787 and 1805. In this time period, according to the English texts of agreements, the British colonial government 'purchased' tracts of land along the Grand River and the entire Niagara Peninsula. In 1787 and 1788 two additional large tracts of lands were purchased. The 'Toronto Purchase' covered much of what is today central metropolitan Toronto. The 'Gunshot Treaty' covered Mississauga lands north of Lake Ontario. Both of these land agreements remain controversial today. The original land purchase documents contained defects by British legal standards at the time. For example, the 1787 Toronto Purchase was not ratified by the British government until 1805, and the Gunshot Treaty was almost immediately considered invalid by colonial authorities.

The validity of these early 'land surrenders' by the Mississaugas of the Credit is also questionable on other grounds. The Mississaugas understood these agreements very differently from the colonial government. The British saw land as a commodity and thought they were purchasing land or rights to land once and for all. The Mississaugas conceived of their relationship to the land in spiritual terms. They did not believe that land could be 'sold', or that their rights to use land and access resources for food and living, could be absolutely and permanently signed away.

After 1800, the growth of Euro-Canadian settlement in the Toronto area put increasing pressure on the ability of the Mississaugas of the Credit to continue to make a living. At first, the Mississaugas of the Credit responded by seeking to protect their ability to make a living on their territory. The Mississaugas petitioned the colonial government to secure for them exclusive rights to key fisheries in 'land surrender' agreements. The text of the 1805 Toronto Purchase defined specific, exclusive rights to fisheries for the Mississaugas in the Twelve Mile Creek, the Sixteen Mile Creek, the Etobicoke River, and the Credit River. In 1829, the Mississaugas of the Credit sought further protection of
their fishing rights in a petition to the Upper Canada government to secure their salmon fishery on the Credit River. Later that year, an Act of Parliament was passed confirming exclusive rights of the River Credit Mississaugas to hunt and fish along that river. The Act was confirmed again in 1835.

Yet by the early 1840s the Mississaugas of the Credit realized that their ability to make a living at their settlement on the River Credit was in jeopardy. It was becoming increasingly clear that the community would have to relocate to an area less directly disturbed by Euro-Canadian settlement. After considering several options, in 1847 the Mississaugas accepted an offer from the Six Nations to establish a new settlement on a tract of land situated in the southwest portion of the Six Nations Reserve.
A number of reasons convinced the leaders and people that this tract presented better possibilities for successful relocation relative to other options. The land was within the traditional territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit, and relatively close to the existing settlement on the River Credit. Also, the land was of superior quality compared to other tracts, and presented greater potential for agricultural development. Finally, over the years, the close ties between the Mississaugas of the Credit and the Six Nations people had resulted in a number of intermarriages. The opportunity to maintain close family ties proved an important attraction.

The relocated community became known as the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation. This tract of land was formally confirmed as the Mississaugas of the New Credit Reserve in 1903, which remains to this day.

A special thanks to Praxis Research Associates, 6352 St. Louis Drive, Ottawa Ontario for researching and writing MNCFN History.
COMMUNITY VISION

The ‘Vision’ of the Mississaugas of the New Credit is that of a united, thriving, self-sufficient and self-determining Anishnabek community, living a joyful celebration of our heritage. Our heritage includes our culture, identity, beliefs and traditions as Anishnabe.
INTRODUCTION

The intent of the documentation contained within the following pages is to inform people of the process involved and the steps taken by the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to secure a fair and just settlement for the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim.

The information will detail the history of a displaced people, providing the reader with a glimpse into who the Mississaugas are and from whence they came.

Following the history of the Mississaugas, will be an account of the steps taken by the First Nation to initiate the claims process and the process itself. The conclusion of which will be the process to reach a settlement between the Federal Government and the Mississaugas of the New Credit for the Toronto Purchase of 1805.

As our community vision states, we are a people striving to achieve a “united, thriving self-sufficient and self-determining Anishnabek community.” Thereby, in pursuing a settlement of the Toronto Purchase, we are in no way trying to displace any persons from the land that is our Traditional Territory. We are a fair people working towards closure for past grievances.
WHO WERE THE CREDIT RIVER INDIANS?

In the 1600's the Iroquois invaded what is now known as Southern Ontario, driving out the Tobacco, the Neutral and the once mighty allies of the French, the Huron. The Iroquois did this in order to secure new trapping grounds. They had depleted most of the beaver population and other fur-bearing animals in their traditional territory, now identified as New York State.

During the Beaver Wars, starting in 1695, the Mississaugas, traditional enemies of the Iroquois, travelled southward from their settlements on the north shore of Lake Huron near the Mississagi River, and drove the Iroquois back to their traditional territory south of Lake Ontario. There were two major groups within the Mississauga Nation. One branch drove the Iroquois down the Trent River system to the Bay of Quinte and then settled in that area.

The other Mississauga branch travelled down the old Aboriginal trail called The Toronto Trail or the Toronto Carrying place, which extended from Georgian Bay, across Lake Simcoe, down the Holland River and the Humber River to Lake Ontario. Here the group defeated the Iroquois at the mouth of the Humber. This western branch of the Mississaugas became the River Credit people. They settled the lands extending from Toronto down through Niagara and into the north shore of Lake Erie, but their principle residence was the mouth of the Credit River at the current site of Port Credit.

The name of the Credit River is derived from the Mississauga people who traded with the French fur traders at the Fort situated along the mouth of the river. The Mississaugas earned a reputation as a trustworthy people who when extended credit would always pay back the fur traders the following spring. By 1705 the Mississaugas were in control of most of what is now identified as southern Ontario.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF AN ERA

By the mid 1700's, as the European powers fought each other for control of North America (with various Indian tribes playing strategic roles as allies) the colonies in New England and New France began to expand. Problems developed over the haphazard and often fraudulent way in which settlers acquired land from the Indians. The situation escalated to a climactic ruin when in the summer of 1763, the Ottawa warrior Pontiac led a series of devastating raids on interior trading posts in which more than two thousand settlers were killed.

Quebec fell in 1759, and the French surrendered to the British at Montreal the following year. The European powers signed the Treaty of Paris in 1763 at the conclusion of the Seven Years War, through which Britain gained control of most of the continent from Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, east of the Mississippi. The British then issued the Royal Proclamation of 1763. That proclamation, dealt with the administration of their new lands also set aside most of the interior of North America, west of the Appellations and east of the Mississippi, as Indian Territory. In addition, the Royal Proclamation established a procedure for the surrender of Indian lands that is still in place today (in a modified form, set out in the Indian Act R.S.C. 1985, C. I-5, sections 37-41). That process was established to prevent the "great frauds and abuses... committed in purchasing Lands of the Indians" by forbidding private persons from purchasing Indian land. Instead, it required the following procedure:

...if at any Time any of the Said Indians should be inclined to dispose of the said Lands, the same shall be Purchased only for Us, in our Name, at some public Meeting or Assembly of the said Indians, to be held for that Purpose by the Governor or Commander in Chief of our Colony respectively within which they shall lie,...

This process effectively placed the Crown between the settlers and the Indians by preventing the sale of Indian lands to anyone other than the Crown. It was, as a result, the beginning of the Crown's fiduciary obligations to the Indians, and the Treaty making process as well. Most Treaties prior to the Royal Proclamation had been "peace and friendship" Treaties, not land surrenders. The majority of the land settled in Canada after 1763, was obtained through numbered Treaties.

The British Crown entered into approximately twenty different Treaties with the various Mississauga groups to secure title to "Upper Canada" for settlers and United Empire Loyalists who left the United States following the American Revolution in 1776. The Mississaugas gave up virtually all of their land between 1783 and 1820; only a few small reserves remained.

How the Mississaugas of the New Credit came to be:

In 1847, landless and greatly reduced in numbers and influence, the River Credit Mississaugas were forced from their village site on the banks of the Credit River (the current site of the Mississauga Golf and Country Club). The Band relocated to reserve land near Brantford purchased from their ancient enemies, the Iroquois, now known as Six Nations. Following the move, the River Credit Mississaugas re-named themselves "the Mississaugas of the New Credit."
THE "SALE" OF TORONTO 1787

Fearing invasion from the new neighbours to the south (which came in 1812), the Crown felt it vital to secure a military communication route from Lake Ontario to Lake Huron that did not utilize the vulnerable routes through Niagara, Lake Erie and past Detroit. In 1785, Lieutenant Governor Hamilton sent out John Collins, the Deputy Surveyor General, to explore the passage from the Bay of Quinte, up the Trent River to Lake Simcoe and then on to Lake Huron and to determine what lands would need to be purchased from the Mississaugas and Chippewas. Collins apparently went ahead and made "Treaties" with both the Mississaugas, for a rite of passage, and with the Chippewas for land from Lake Simcoe to Lake Huron. The passage proved unsatisfactory and the Crown looked for a better route.

In 1787, Sir John Johnson, head of the Indian Department, called a council of the Mississaugas at the Bay of Quinte to distribute "presents" (trade goods such as blankets, kettles and gunpowder) to reward the Mississaugas for their loyalty to the British during the American Revolution. In total £1,700 worth of trade goods was distributed to all of the various Mississauga groups at three different locations across southern Ontario. At that Council, Sir John Johnson discussed a number of potential land sales along the north shore of Lake Ontario and in particular they discussed a potential purchase of the "carrying place" from Toronto to Lake Simcoe.

Although these discussions were later characterized as the "sale" of Toronto, and the £1,700 worth of presents were later characterized wrongly as payment for the Toronto Purchase, in actual fact, nothing was sold at that Council in 1787. The deed to the land that was "found" many years later was blank, with the marks of three Chiefs from the Toronto area on separate scraps of paper wafered onto the blank deed. There was no description of the land "sold" in the deed.

The only record which remains of the lands discussed in 1787 is contained in a letter written by Sir John Johnson twelve years after the fact in 1798:

"ten miles square at Toronto, and two to four Miles, I do not recollect which, on each side of the intended road or carrying place leading to Lake Le Clai (Lake Simcoe), then ten miles square at the Lake and the same square at the end of the water communication emptying into Lake Huron—this Deed was left with Mr. Collins, whose Clerk drew it up to have the courses inserted with survey of these Tracts were completed and was never returned to my office..."

It is important to note that Sir John Johnson considered the purchase to be "ten miles square." He is not certain about the width of the strip up to Lake Simcoe, but he was clear that it was either two or four miles on either side of the Carrying Place. It is also important to note that the boundaries of the land as discussed with Sir John Johnson and the Mississaugas did not include the Toronto Islands. "Ten miles square" at Toronto would not have captured what was then the Toronto peninsula (the Toronto Islands did not become islands until a great storm later in the 1800's).
THE "SURVEY" IN 1788

Johnson's recollection of his agreement with the Mississaugas in 1787 is critical to the position of New Credit with respect to the Toronto Purchase. The boundaries of the land described by Johnson were significantly different than the boundaries the Crown attempted to survey the very next year in 1788. At that time Lord Dorchester and Sir John Johnson met again and discussed the purchase of the carrying place from the Mississaugas. Payments were made that year to Chippewas from Lake Simcoe and Mississaugas from the Rice Lake area, and presumably to the River Credit Mississaugas, though it is not known how much.

Shortly after Lord Dorchester and Sir John Johnson departed, the surveyor, Alexander Aitkin, attempted to survey the lands purchased from the Mississaugas. He immediately encountered difficulties. He had been instructed to make the eastern boundary at the end of Ashbridges Bay, but the River Credit Mississaugas said they had only given up to the Don River. He encountered similar problems in the west, when the Mississaugas said the boundary was the Humber River, not the Etobicoke River. In a letter written on September 15 1788, Aitkin acknowledges that the Indians protested the eastern boundary and his attempt to survey land westward beyond the Toronto River (the Humber River). It was only when the military was called in that the Indians were "prevailed upon to give up to the River Tobicoak (Etobicoke River) but no further."

Over the objections of the Mississaugas, Aitkin did a coast sketch from the eastern end of Ashbridges Bay to the Etobicoke River. He surveyed up the Etobicoke River about three miles, but then abandoned the survey because the Mississaugas were so hostile and his military protection had departed. This is a far cry from Sir John Johnson's "ten miles square at Toronto and two to four miles on each side of the intended road or carrying place."

There was no "meeting of the minds" in 1788 regarding what had been sold. No tract of land was surveyed; only a partial survey of the coast and a small portion of the Etobicoke River was completed. The eastern boundary, the northern boundary and the western boundary all remained undetermined. As the year before, no valid transaction took place in 1788.

The original Council Chambers of the elected body representing the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, located in the core area of the community adjacent to the present Council House.
1805 Toronto Purchase Boundary Map

This map shows the northern boundary line of the Provisional Surrender No. 13a, where it meets the 1805 Toronto Purchase boundary using Fort Toronto as a reference point.
The Toronto Trail also known as the Toronto Carrying Place extended from Georgian Bay, across Lake Simcoe, down the Holland River and the Humber River to Lake Ontario. It was here the Mississaugas destroyed the Iroquois Village at the mouth of the Humber.
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In preparation for the meeting with the Mississaugas, the Crown prepared four different plans - two of the Treaty No. 13a Lands and two of the 1787 Toronto Purchase. Surveyor William Chewett sent the four plans to William Claus, Deputy Superintendent General Dept. Indian Affairs (and the government official who led the 1805 negotiations with the Mississaugas) along with instructions for their use:

Herewith enclosed I send you two small Plans of the Mississaque Tract (the Treaty No. 13a lands with their Descriptions, having made two Descriptions of each as requested and numbered the same 1st and 2nd. Also two descriptions of the Toronto purchase in the year 1787, numbered 1st and 2nd, which ever of these descriptions may be taken for the Toronto purchase, the corresponding number must be taken for the Mississaque Tract...

The first Description is according to the survey made by (unreadable) - the 2nd is that which you were pleased to say the Indians conceived to be the true Boundary.

The western boundary of the 1787 Toronto Purchase would become the eastern boundary of Treaty No. 13a. Claus knowing that the western boundary of the 1787 Toronto Purchase had been hotly contested by the Mississaugas in 1788, went ahead and had Chewett prepare two plans of the 1787 Purchase - likely one with the Etobicoke River as the western boundary, as surveyed by the Crown, and a second plan with the Humber River as the western boundary, as the Mississaugas had maintained at the time. Which plan the Mississaugas would accept for the 1787 Purchase would then dictate which plan of Treaty No. 13a to use, and Chewett numbered them, so that Plan 1 of the 1787 Purchase was to go with Plan 1 of Treaty No. 13a, and Plan 2 was to go with Plan 2 - in other words the western and eastern boundaries would coincide if the Plans were used properly.

Claus met with the Mississaugas on July 31, 1805, armed with the two plans of the 1787 Purchase, but only showed the Mississaugas Plan 1 - which was what Aitkin had attempted to survey in 1788 (over the objection of the Mississauga Chiefs who had negotiated with Sir John Johnson directly). Not wishing to play his hand, Claus requested the Mississaugas state where they thought the boundaries of the 1787 Toronto Purchase had been. Chief Quinipenon replied:

Father - All the Chiefs who sold the Land you speak of are dead and gone. I now speak for all the Chiefs of the Mississagues; We cannot absolutely tell what our old people did before us, except by what we see on the plan now produced & what we remember ourselves and have been told.

Claus replied that the new deed would be made out as soon as possible and that the Mississaugas would be provided with a copy. Regarding any compensation Claus stated:

...he had it not at present in his power but he will report their request to the Governor and hopes from his reputation of their conducts the General may be induced to comply with their request.

The very next day, Claus returned to the River Credit with the fresh deed and it was executed with the Mississaugas. The Crown then gave the River Credit Mississaugas ten shillings for the Toronto Purchase. For "confirming" the boundaries of the 1787 Toronto Purchase, as surveyed incorrectly by the Crown in approximately 1788, and for giving the Crown legal title (which they did not have up to this point) to 250, 880 acres of prime southern Ontario land upon which the capital city sat, the Crown gave its Indian allies, who in only seven years time would prove key in repulsing the American invasion of Canada, the mere sum of ten shillings.
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NEW CREDIT'S POSITION TODAY

As noted in the previous pages, the Crown's fiduciary duty to First Nations can be traced back directly to the Royal Proclamation of 1763. Since the Indians are prohibited from selling their land to anyone other than the Crown, then the Crown has an obligation to deal honourably and fairly with the Indians when purchasing their lands.

In 1984 the Supreme Court of Canada released the following statement with regards to the Crown's obligation to First Nations:

...the nature of Indian title and framework of the statutory scheme established for disposing of Indian land places upon the Crown an equitable obligation, enforceable by the courts, to deal with the land for the benefit of the Indians.

The Crown stood in a fiduciary relationship with New Credit regarding the surrender of the Toronto Purchase lands in 1805. At the very least the Crown had two major duties:

i. To ensure that the River Credit Mississaugas were fully informed as to their rights and the facts regarding any particular transaction.
ii. To ensure that the Crown paid a reasonable price for surrendered land.

The Crown failed to exercise both of the said duties. The Indians were not consulted regarding the invalidity of the earlier purchase and 10 Shillings was a pathetic price for Toronto.

This breach of fiduciary obligation means that the Band is owed damages in the nature of restitution, that is to be placed in the same position as if the breach had never occurred. New Credit is owed the value of the 250, 880 acres in 1805 and lost opportunity to the date of settlement of this claim. If the Crown can prove what amount, if any, was actually paid to the River Credit Mississaugas in 1788, then that amount could be offset against the amount owing.

Compensation will primarily be in the form of money from Canada. In no case will innocent third parties be displaced.

New Credit First Nation Councillor Ward LaForme Jr. delivering welcoming remarks at the Aboriginal Festival in November, 2000. The annual event is held at the Skydome in the city of Toronto - the Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation traditional territory.
• Claim submitted in 1986 by the Mississauga Tribal Claims Council (MTCC).

• Claim rejected by Canada in 1993.

• MTCC requested the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) conduct an inquiry in 1993. However the ICC file was closed due to inaction by MTCC.

• The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation requested an independent inquiry, February 1998.

• A planning conference was held in Ottawa on July 16, 1998. Representatives of New Credit, the Department of Justice and the ICC were present at the conference where Canada agreed to review the claim on the basis of the original rejection.

• A second planning conference was held on October 1, in Toronto with Justice Robert F. Reid of the Indian Claims Commission.

• New Credit requested that the Crawford Treaty and the Gunshot Treaty be held in abeyance.

• Third planning conference was held in Ottawa, November 25, with Justice Reid.

• Canada agreed to proceed with the merits of the claim before beneficiary issue is resolved.

• New Credit submitted a fresh legal opinion March 8, 1999, including position regarding the Toronto Islands.

• New Credit submitted position regarding the Beneficiary Issue September 9, 1999.

• New Credit submitted position regarding the Compensation Issue October 18, 1999.

Land Claims

Band offered $145-million for land lost in 1805

Government to compensate Mississaugas after British paid them 10 shillings for land now occupied by Toronto

BY ANTHONY REINHART

For the modern-day price of a camping hatchet at Canadian Tire, the British sold Toronto out from under the Mississaugas Indians in 1805.

The 1,238 hectares went on to form Canada’s largest city and a good chunk of its suburbs, while the Mississaugas wound up on 2,439 hectares south of Hamilton.

Needless to say, the deal left a bad taste, but a federal government offer of $145-million could soon cleanse the palates of the 1,400 members of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation. If they accept the offer, it will be the largest single land-claim settlement in Canadian history.

“It’s a good start for us and it prepares us for the future,” Chief Bryan Laforme, who leads the First Nation near Hagersville, Ont., told a crowd at a local high school on Monday, where Indian Affairs Minister Chuck Strahl announced the offer.

If accepted by band members in the coming months, the payment will also cover a claim on the much smaller, 1,400-hectare Brant Tract on Burlington Bay, along Lake Ontario between Toronto and Hamilton.

The Mississaugas filed two claims in the late 1980s. Ottawa spurned talks until 2003, when negotiations leading to Monday’s announcement began.

The Toronto Purchase, as it is known, dates to a 1787 meeting at Tyendinaga, near what is now Belleville. In appreciation for the Mississaugas’ military support during the American Revolution, British officials gave them “presents” of weapons, tools and other goods.

At the time, the British were looking for link from Lake Ontario to Lake Huron that avoided the American troops at Detroit. The Mississaugas could have provided it with a route up the Humber River, overland via portage to Lake Simcoe and on to Georgian Bay, but land talks ended in dispute.

Kim Fullerton, lawyer for the Mississaugas, said the British went ahead and settled York (later Toronto), and “it wasn’t until the 1790s that the head of the Upper Canada government pulled out the old deed and said ‘Holy crap’... he said, most likely paraphrasing: ‘There was no description of the land surrendered ... and they really didn’t know what to do.’

An 1805 meeting with new Mississauga chiefs ended in a sketchy transaction whereby the British claimed they had bought twice as much territory as was actually discussed in 1787. Oblivious to the substance of those previous talks, the new chiefs chose to trust them, but asked for a small sum as a confirmation of good faith.

“That’s when the British came back the next day and gave them 10 shillings,” Mr. Fullerton said. “It’s about two bucks ... and two bucks was worth more then than it is now, but it’s still two bucks.”

Or about $27 in current Canadian dollars.

While Ottawa’s offer of $145-million is exponentially less than the billions Greater Toronto would fetch today, the question was “what should the British Crown have paid them in 1805” and “how do you bring that amount forward to today’s dollars?” the lawyer said.

Mr. Strahl’s sum, while lower than hoped, “is a substantial offer and one that merits consideration by the members.”

More broadly, Mr. Fullerton said, “People living in Toronto can presumably hold their heads high now ... and say, ‘We can have a little bit more pride in the foundation of our city.’”

THE TORONTO 18

Bomb plotter not entrapped, Crown argues

The revised Toronto Purchase of 1805, seen here, completed an agreement first drafted in 1797 between British authorities and leaders of the Mississaugas. The area now occupied by Toronto and much of its northern suburbs was transferred to the Crown.

Brampton

A Brampton 18 member found guilty in a plot to bomb Canadian targets was a clear participant in the terror plan and not a bystander used by police to reach one of the group’s leaders, prosecutors argued yesterday.

Crown lawyer Croft Michaelson dismissed defence arguments that Mr. Abdelhaleem was “just a body sitting there” during meetings with ringleader Zakaria Amara and an RCMP agent.

The police, he argued, had “reasonable suspicion that Mr. Abdelhaleem was involved in the bomb plot.”

Mr. Abdelhaleem’s lawyer, William Naylor, has brought a motion to stay the case, arguing his client was entrapped so the police could get information.

Mr. Abdelhaleem was found guilty last week of plotting to bomb financial, intelligence and military targets, but the judge did not enter a conviction pending the outcome of the entrapment motion.

Abdelhaleem and others were arrested and charged with terror offences in 2006 and came to be known as the Toronto 18. The hearing continues today.

“The Canadian Press
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## First Nations Briefing and Information Session

**Wednesday, July 5, 2006**
**9:00 am to 2:00 pm**
**TWRC, 20 Bay Street, Suite 1310, Toronto, Ontario**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am - 11:00 am</td>
<td>Presentation of Waterfront Projects</td>
<td>Chris Glaisek, TWRC Vice President of Planning and Design, will greet attendees. Project Leaders will discuss major area projects including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- West Don Lands - Brad Searchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lower Don River West Remedial Flood Protection Project Class Environmental Assessment – Ken Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flood Protection:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge – Ken Dion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berm – Brad Searchfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Don River Park – Melanie Hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- East Bayfront – Chris Glaisek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- East of Parliament/Lower Don Roadway Environmental Assessment – Chris Glaisek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TTC-TWRC Waterfront Transit Environmental Assessments – Bill Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mouth of the Don Environmental Assessment – Ken Dion/Steve Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Port Lands Implementation Strategy – Melanie Hare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lake Ontario Park – Chris Glaisek/Pina Mallozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Tommy Thompson Park – Nancy Gaffney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Commissioners Park – Karen Pitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transition Sports Fields – Karen Pitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Western Beaches Watercourse Facility – Karen Pitre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Central Waterfront Promenade and Queens Quay Design – Chris Glaisek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am - 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Dialogue Session</td>
<td>Kristin Jenkins will lead discussion to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure on-going communication; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Receive comments and feedback regarding the studies underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon - 12:30 pm</td>
<td>Luncheon at TWRC</td>
<td>Project Leaders will attend luncheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm - 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Tour of West Don Lands, East Bayfront and Port Lands</td>
<td>Bus tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chris Glaisek, Kristin Jenkins, Ken Dion, Steve Willis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slide 1 – Introduction Slide

Slide 2 – Project Description: Reason for Project: Grass-roots initiative to naturalize mouth of Don and Long-standing priority location for TRCA to mitigate flood risk in our jurisdiction.

Slide 3 - Planning Process:
- Preferred alternative for naturalizing Don Mouth to be determined through 3 separate and interrelated processes:
  - Provincial EA process: What is ToR, what is EA? (Stage 1 and 2 – almost completed Stage 1)
  - Federal EA process: what is the screening (Stage 2)
  - Functional design development: what is this (Stage 2)

Slide 4 – Through ToR, developed project goal as follows:

Slide 5 – Through ToR, developed project objectives which will allow us to evaluate level of success in meeting project goal.

Slide 6 – ToR Consultation Activities

Slide 7 – Key Messages during direct consultation with Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation

Slide 8 – Alternative Discharge Points with greatest potential to meet project goal. Defines study area where aspects of the environment that are subject to direct manipulation.

Slide 9 – Impact Assessment Area: Identifies the geographic area where aspects of the environment may be influenced as a result of selecting any particular alternative in the EA. These indirect impacts must be evaluated as well.

Slide 10 – Consultation key for EA
- Public forum, Site Visits, CLC, and TAC meetings will be held at key milestones during the EA to receive input in the development of alternative methods, evaluation criteria, selection of preferred alternative, and refinement of the functional design.
- First Nations are part of CLC and receive TAC correspondence.
- Additional opportunities for consultation with Mississaugas of the New Credit will be available through direct meetings with the Band Council at each key milestone or as deemed necessary by the Band.
- Other First Nations are invited to comment on any materials throughout the process through direct participation with the study team, or through future similar events as being held today.
- Design Work Shop

Slide 11 – Current Status & Milestones
PROJECT DESCRIPTION / OVERVIEW

Reasons for this Project

This is about realizing a vision to naturalize the mouth of the Don first initiated by Task Force to Bring Back the Don in 1991

An opportunity to correct the most significant flood risk hazard in TRCA’s jurisdiction and to naturalize the Don River mouth

Project Goal

To establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

Planning Process

Key components of the Individual EA:
- EA Terms of Reference (Stage 1)
- EA (Stage 2)

Key components of the CEAAscreening (Stage 2):
- Screening Report

Functional Design (Stage 2)

Don Mouth Naturalization & Flood Protection
Environmental Assessment

First Nations Briefing and Information Session

July 5, 2006
Stage 1 Consultation Activities

- Meeting with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
- 2 public forums
- 3 public working sessions
- 4 meetings with the Community Liaison Committee
- Individual meetings
- Site Walk
- 3 meetings with the Technical Advisory Committee

Project Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate the mouth of the Don River utilizing an ecosystem based approach
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Maintain the provision for navigation and existing flood protection through sediment, debris and ice management.
4. Integrate existing infrastructure functions that could not be reasonably moved or removed (including road, rails, utilities, trails, and power)
5. Encourage additional compatible recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and public/handicap accessibility
6. Contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the waterfront and coordinate with and inform other planning and development efforts and associated certain and foreseeable infrastructure
7. Design and implement this project in a manner consistent with TWRC's Sustainability Framework. (e.g. Contaminated Soil/Groundwater Rehabilitation)

Key Components of ToR

Project Study Area

Legend
- Discharge Points
- Start of River Mouth
- Do Nothing Alignment

Key Messages From Consultation with Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation

1. Ensure data is collected regarding unregistered burial sites along the river, plants, and species at risk (fish).
2. Band is to be involved at key decision points throughout EA.
3. Band recommends participation in Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC) projects, including Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project.
4. Band recommends that site visits be organized to allow for more informed discourse regarding their issues, concerns and opportunities involving TWRC projects.
Key Components of EA
Consultation Framework

- Stage 2 Starts
  - Public Forum
  - TAC
  - CLC
  - First Nations

- Short List
  - PF
  - TAC
  - CLC
  - FN

- Select Preferred Alternative
  - PF
  - TAC
  - CLC
  - FN

- Functional Design

- Site Visit

Ongoing activities - project newsletters, flyers, web updates, newspaper ads, workshops, individual meetings as required

CURRENT STATUS & MILESTONES

An individual Provincial EA is completed in 2 Stages:

- **Stage 1** - Terms of Reference
- **Stage 2** - Do the EA (following the Terms of Reference approval)

A Federal EA is completed concurrently in the 2nd Stage.

- 2005
- 2006
- 2007
- 2008

- Government and Agency Review
- Terms of Reference
- Implement EA & CEAA
- Functional Design
July 19, 2006

Margaret Sault
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
2789 Mississauga Road
R. R. #6
Hagersville, ON
N0A 1H0

Dear Ms Sault;

Re: CLC, Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, EA Stage

I would like to thank you and the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation for your involvement on our Community Liaison Committee (CLC) for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection (DMNP) Project. Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) also appreciates the opportunity that you provided us to introduce the DMNP Project to Chief LaForme, your Council, and yourself on February 6, 2006.

With your assistance, we have finalized the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this project and submitted this document to the Minister of Environment. The Minister received mostly supportive feedback on the ToR, and approval of the ToR is expected to be received in late July 2006. We will be certain to inform you when we receive this approval.

Once the ToR is approved, the project enters the next phase, the development of the preferred alternative and the accompanying EA documents. We anticipate that the CLC will again play a critical role in providing advice and insight in support of the planning and public consultation processes. TRCA would like to continue submitting the meeting agendas, minutes and presentations to you for your review as we proceed through the EA process.

Given the success of our initial meeting in February, and further to our discussion following the July 5, 2006 briefing session that was organized by the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC), we would like to suggest that we meet with yourself, Chief LaForme, and your Council (if requested) on a more regular basis to increase the number of opportunities for your involvement throughout the planning process for the DMNP Project.

We would be pleased to provide a venue in Toronto to facilitate these meetings, travel to your offices, or to alternate meeting locations, depending on your availability. We also suggest that the meetings take on a working session style format, though we are open to consider other

...over
meeting formats that you may suggest.

This is an important project, not only with regards to the revitalization of the Toronto waterfront and the need to provide flood protection for a large area of land, but also given its focus on reestablishing some functioning natural habitat to the Toronto waterfront in an area where essentially all natural habitat was destroyed 100 years ago. Important aspects of reestablishing a more natural mouth to the Don River are to ensure that the past uses of the river are celebrated, and that the present day concerns and interests of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation are addressed.

We are in the process of completing our draft work plan and proposed schedule for the EA. I will contact you directly once we have a copy of that work plan and schedule for your review and comment, and to confirm how the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation would like to be engaged as we move forward with the DMNP Project EA. Of course, in addition to the above, you will continue to receive materials for the CLC and to be invited to participate in all CLC and public events.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dion

Senior Project Manager
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

KD/mv
Hi Kenn

I have taken the liberty to invite Kelvin Goodridge to our meeting tomorrow as well. Though he is not part of our projects along the waterfront, he is the coordinator for our volunteerism and diversity program at TRCA. His main focus is to provide applied work experience opportunities in the environmental field for recent immigrants to Canada. However, there may be the opportunity to expand the focus of his program through partnering with Miziwe Biik as well. I would still like to focus most of the meeting on the original agenda, however, we will ensure that you and Kelvin have a good opportunity to discuss whether there are any opportunities for working together if you so wish.

Regards
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
Kenn Ross <kross@miziwebiik.com>

I can get to you for that time; will Map Quest your location. Kenn

Ken Dion wrote:

Welcome back Kenn

It looks like we are both available tomorrow afternoon. Around 1:30 or so?

We are located at 70 Canuck Place at Downsview Park (near intersection of Sheppard and Keele). If that is not convenient for you, we can meet you elsewhere.

Regards
Ken Dion
Hi, I'm back from Nova Scotia. We could meet as early as tomorrow a.m. or p.m. but where? Yes, pls invite Ms. Gaffney. Kenn

Ken Dion wrote:

Kenn

Sounds great. I am available all day Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday afternoon, Thursday morning and all day Friday. If possible, I would also like to invite Nancy Gaffney, the other TRCA project manager that was at last Wednesday's meeting as well. She is leading a number of projects across the Toronto waterfront.

Regards
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Kross Ross <kross@miziwebiik.com>
To: masault@yahoo.com
cc: Michelle Vanderwel/MTRCA@MTRCA, Adele Freeman/MTRCA@MTRCA
Subject: Site Walk and Boat Cruise - Mouth of the Don

Good afternoon Margaret:

I hope that you have had a great summer since we last chatted in July.

As you are aware, we have received MOE approval for our EA Terms of Reference for the Don Mouth Naturalization EA.

We are now progressing forward with the actual EA itself.

We plan to jumpstart the public consultation component of the EA with a Public Site walk on Saturday October 14, 2006 (likely between 1 and 4pm) which will be held outside, at the mouth of the Don. The event will include interpretive walks around the Keating Channel and the Port Lands, and a free interpretative boat cruise between the Ship and Keating Channels.

Essentially, we intend to have a number of different information stations scattered throughout the Port Lands and Keating Channel area with a variety of topics available for discussion that have an impact on the outcome of the Don Mouth Naturalization EA. Members of the public would be broken into a number of smaller groups and would walk from station to station where they would be presented with information at that station. Discussions would be held over a period of 10 to 15 minutes or so.

We would be very pleased to have representatives from the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation attend this event to provide information to the public at one of our information stations. I would like to suggest that there would be a lot of public interest if you could present information regarding the following topics:

a) the history of your People to the area including the activities your People would have conducted at the mouth of the Don River
b) the objectives and status of your Claim to the area (Toronto Purchase), and
c) how you would like to see Nation's past and current interests addressed within the Don Mouth Naturalization EA.

Of course, we would be pleased to hear of any other topics that you may have for such a presentation.

We hope that you and/or some other representatives would be available to attend this event.

Warmest Regards,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
Hi Kenn

I believe that Michelle has tried to contact you about the Site Walk and Boat Cruise for the Don Mouth EA that we are planning, however, I wanted to follow-up on a few specific details.

1) When we had met with you earlier this summer, you had expressed some interest in participating. As such, I wanted to make sure that you were aware of the event so you can mark it in your calendar.

2) You had also mentioned this summer that you might be able to assist us in reaching out to the aboriginal community living within the City of Toronto. Would you happen to have any suggestions how we can encourage the local aboriginal community to come out and enjoy the walk and boat cruise on October 14?

3) We plan to jumpstart the public consultation component of the EA with a Public Site walk on Saturday October 14, 2006 (likely between 1 and 4pm) which will be held outside, at the mouth of the Don. The event will include interpretive walks around the Keating Channel and the Port Lands, and a free interpretative boat cruise between the Ship and Keating Channels.

Essentially, we intend to have a number of different information stations scattered throughout the Port Lands and Keating Channel area with a variety of topics available for discussion that have an impact on the outcome of the Don Mouth Naturalization EA. Members of the public would be broken into a number of smaller groups and would walk from station to station where they would be presented with information at that station. Discussions would be held over a period of 10 to 15 minutes or so.

We have invited the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to provide information at one of the stations and I suggested the following topics that would be of particular interest to the public and would provide an opportunity for the Mississaugas to raise awareness of their own issues as well:

a) Present the history of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation in the area including a summary of past activities that would have been conducted at the mouth of the Don River;
b) Discuss the objectives and status of the Specific Claim, and
c) Express how they would like see their past and current interests addressed within the Don Mouth Naturalization EA.

If you have any other thoughts or ideas regarding the above, please let me know. I hope that you will able to come out and enjoy the afternoon.

Regards
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
Dear Michelle Vanderwel,

Please find our preliminary comments. I will be forwarding to you the final approved letter at a later date including the lands claims status. The letter will be signed by Pam Wheaton, Director, Policy and Relationship Branch.

Dear Michelle Vanderwel:

**RE: Don Mouth Public Forum 3**

Thank you for your email dated November 22, 2006 to Mr. Barry Silver of the Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA) regarding the above noted project.

The mandated responsibilities of the Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs (OSAA) include conducting land claim negotiations and finalizing and implementing land claim settlement agreements on behalf of the Province. In light of this mandate, OSAA has reviewed the materials and notes that it is not aware of any First Nation land claims submitted to the Government of Ontario that will have an impact on this project.

For your information, OSAA notes that the project could impact or be of interest to Aboriginal peoples. OSAA recommends that you contact the following First Nations:

**Mississaugas of Scugog Island**

22521 Island Road

PORT PERRY, Ontario

L9L 1B6

(905) 985-3337

(Fax) 985-8828

msifn@on.aibn.com

In addition, OSAA recommends that you contact the following organizations that represent a number of First Nations to ask whether there are other First Nations who may be interested in the project and wish to provide comments.

**Anishnabek Nation**

(Union of Ontario Indians)

Nipissing First Nation (head office)

P.O. Box 711

NORTH BAY, Ontario

P1B 8J8

PH: 705 497-9127

FX: 705 497-9135

As well, the Government of Canada sometimes receives claims that Ontario does not receive, or with which Ontario does not become involved. The Government of Canada contacts have changed since the last correspondence. For information about possible claims in the area, OSAA recommends the proponent contact the following federal contacts:
OSAA notes that sometimes projects fall within an area subject to litigation. For further information on the nature of possible litigation, its status and the litigation process, OSAA recommends you call or write the following Ministry of the Attorney General contact:

Grant Wedge, Counsel
Crown Law Office
Ministry of the Attorney General
8th floor, 720 Bay St.
Toronto, ON M5G 2K1
Tel: (416) 326-4112

For future E.A. inquiries direct your correspondence to Pam Wheaton. You may contact me at (416) 314-6781 for follow up inquiries.

Yours truly,

Surinder Singh Gill
Policy Advisor,
Policy and Relationships Branch
Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs
720, Bay Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, ON
M5G 2K1
Phone: (416) 314-6781
email: surinder.singh.gill@osaa.gov.on.ca
November 15, 2007

Ms. Nancy Martin
Executive Director
Miziwe Biiik
167 Gerrard St. E.
Toronto, ON
M5A 2E4

RE: Community Liaison Committee Meeting for the Environmental Assessment of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Dear Ms. Martin;

Since May 2007, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) and our consultant team led by Gartner Lee Limited (GLL) has been working closely with the City of Toronto, WaterfrontToronto (WT) and a team led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) to integrate the results of WT’s International Design Competition for the Lower Don Lands into the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP EA).

It is with pleasure that we announce that significant progress has been made over the last few months with regards to the integration of this new river alignment into the DMNP EA. We anticipate that our next Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting will be held in early February 2008, in advance of a public meeting anticipated for late February or early March 2008.

The next CLC Meeting will focus on the results of the integration process, the EA evaluation criteria, and the results of the evaluation of alternatives, which will focus the DMNP EA to one or two remaining alternatives for more detailed consideration. The CLC will of course be asked to
comment on the work completed and to provide advice as to how we could best present the information at the public meeting anticipated towards the end of February 2008.

We acknowledge that the integration process has taken a somewhat longer period of time to complete than is desirable, however we hope that you remain as committed to your critical role on the CLC. As such, I ask that you send an email to Michelle Vanderwel (mvanderwel@trca.on.ca) confirming whether you plan to continue representing your association on the CLC for this exciting and important Revitalization Project at the mouth of the Don.

We want to thank you for your continuing patience as we move forward with this work, and we look forward to seeing you in the new year.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kenneth Dion, MSc.
Senior Project Manager

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
November 15, 2007

Mr. Kenn Ross
Manager, Aboriginal Business Resource Centre
Miziwe Biik
167 Gerrard St. E.
Toronto, ON M5A 2E4

RE: Community Liaison Committee Meeting for the Environmental Assessment of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Dear Mr. Ross,

Since May 2007, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) and our consultant team led by Gartner Lee Limited (GLL) has been working closely with the City of Toronto, WaterfrontToronto (WT) and a team led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) to integrate the results of WT’s International Design Competition for the Lower Don Lands into the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP EA).

It is with pleasure that we announce that significant progress has been made over the last few months with regards to the integration of this new river alignment into the DMNP EA. We anticipate that our next Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting will be held in early February 2008, in advance of a public meeting anticipated for late February or early March 2008.

The next CLC Meeting will focus on the results of the integration process, the EA evaluation criteria, and the results of the evaluation of alternatives, which will focus the DMNP EA to one or two remaining alternatives for more detailed consideration. The CLC will of course be asked to comment on the work completed and to provide advice as to how we could best present the information at the public meeting anticipated towards the end of February 2008.
We acknowledge that the integration process has taken a somewhat longer period of time to complete than is desirable, however we hope that you remain as committed to your critical role on the CLC. As such, I ask that you send an email to Michelle Vanderwel (mvanderwel@trca.on.ca) confirming whether you plan to continue representing your association on the CLC for this exciting and important Revitalization Project at the mouth of the Don.

We want to thank you for your continuing patience as we move forward with this work, and we look forward to seeing you in the new year.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dion, MSc.
Senior Project Manager

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
November 15, 2007

Ms. Margaret Sault
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
2789 Mississauga Road
R. R. #6
Hagersville, ON N0A 1H0

RE: Community Liaison Committee Meeting for the Environmental Assessment of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Dear Ms. Sault;

Since May 2007, Toronto and Region Conservation (TRCA) and our consultant team led by Gartner Lee Limited (GLL) has been working closely with the City of Toronto, WaterfrontToronto (WT) and a team led by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA) to integrate the results of WT’s International Design Competition for the Lower Don Lands into the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP EA).

It is with pleasure that we announce that significant progress has been made over the last few months with regards to the integration of this new river alignment into the DMNP EA. We anticipate that our next Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting will be held in early February 2008, in advance of a public meeting anticipated for late February or early March 2008.

The next CLC Meeting will focus on the results of the integration process, the EA evaluation criteria, and the results of the evaluation of alternatives, which will focus the DMNP EA to one or two remaining alternatives for more detailed consideration. The CLC will of course be asked to comment on the work completed and to provide advice as to how we could best present the information at the public meeting anticipated towards the end of February 2008.
We acknowledge that the integration process has taken a somewhat longer period of time to complete than is desirable, however we hope that you remain as committed to your critical role on the CLC. We want to thank you for your continuing patience as we move forward with this work, and we look forward to seeing you in the new year.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Dion, MSc.
Senior Project Manager

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
Hello Margaret

I hope that you are doing very well.

It has been awhile since we have last spoken, the bus tour around the waterfront of Toronto in July 5, 2006 with the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (now Waterfront Toronto), if I recall. I do apologize for the delay in providing a follow up regarding the EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. You had last invited Paul Murray (our consultant) and me to attend your February 6, 2006 council meeting to discuss what we were proposing in our Terms of Reference for the above EA.

If you recall, the focus of our EA was to determine the best solution that would reestablish a functioning, more natural mouth for the Don River while removing the risk of flooding to the east and south of the river.

Since February 2006, we had received provincial approval on our EA Terms of Reference in fall 2006 and were well underway to establish a full list of alternatives for evaluation when Waterfront Toronto held an International Design Competition in early 2007 to develop an overall vision for the Don Mouth, Port Lands, and East Bayfront Areas.

The primary purpose of the Design Competition was to help coordinate the various planning activities that were occurring, including our EA for naturalization and flood protection. A winning design team led by Michael Van Valkenburg Associates won the competition in early May 2007. The design prepared by Michael Van Valkenburg greatly expanded the available land and options for consideration for naturalization under our EA. As such, we had to reexamine our work in order to effectively incorporate the new river alignment so that it can be fairly evaluated against our original proposed river alignments through our EA.

We are now undertaking a new technical evaluation of the proposed river mouth alignments and would like to invite you, Chief LaForme, and other members of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to discuss the current proposed alignments, evaluation criteria, and any other issues of importance that you may have.

We would be happy to travel to your offices near Hagersville or to host you here in Toronto. I would like to suggest that we meet sometime after December 10, 2007 if you are available to do so.

I look forward to meeting with you once again as we move forward on this exciting project.

Sincerely
Ken Dion
Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
Ken Dion
MTRCA
02/15/2008 03:08 PM

To: margaret sault <masault@yahoo.com>
cc:
bbc:

Re: Monday January 7, 2008 Council Meeting Agenda Item -
Subject: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Good afternoon Margaret

At long last, I have finally been able to get a (close to 1 page) Backgrounder on the EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, as per your earlier request.

If you require any other information please let me know. In the meantime, I will await you call as to when we might be able to visit you to discuss the progress to date that we have had on the EA.

We are planning to present our work to date to the general public on March 29, 2008 in Toronto, and as such, we would very much like to meet with you well before we get to the public, preferrably in February or early March.

Have a great long weekend.

Regards
Ken

[File attachment: EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Backgrounder.doc]

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
What's this project about? It's about transforming the existing mouth of the Don River into a healthier, more naturalized river outlet to the lake. It's also about removing the risk of flooding to urban land to the east and south of the river (including the Port Lands).

Who's responsible for the project? The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) is leading the work on behalf of WATERFRON TToronto (WT) (formerly the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation).

How are decisions being made? Major public projects like this one need to go through an Environmental Assessment (EA) process. There are five steps in the process, and they are outlined in the Terms of Reference for the EA. The Terms of Reference also outline the Project's goal and objectives, the study area, the types of alternatives that will be considered, and how the EA will proceed and be evaluated.

When did the work start, and what steps are being followed? Work on the EA started in September 2006 following approval of the Terms of Reference. Work began with the completion of baseline inventories to describe the existing environmental, socioeconomic and heritage conditions. In the fall of 2006, the first two steps of this process were completed. Step 1 developed a long list of alternative methods. Step 2 conducted a technical feasibility to identify which of the alternative methods were able to satisfactorily meet both the naturalization and flood protection objectives. The results of Steps 1 and 2 were presented to the public in a forum on December 5, 2006. Early in January 2007, work began on Steps 3 and 4. Step 3 refined the remaining alternatives to add in details that can be reflected by all of the remaining project objectives. During Step 4, the detailed alternatives were compared and evaluated to identify a preferred alternative.

How will the river mouth connect to the other waterfront revitalization and city-building work being done in the Port Lands area? Early 2007, a Design Competition was held by Waterfront Toronto to help integrate the Don River renaturalization as a key part of the city-building happening around the mouth of the Don River. The goals of the competition were to create an iconic identity for the Don River and to develop a bold and comprehensive concept design that integrates development, transportation infrastructure and the naturalized river mouth in a harmonious whole. The objective of this competition was to provide fresh ideas for integrating the many projects planned for the area, many of which potentially possess competing project objectives, under a unifying vision for the area, whereby a naturalized mouth of the Don would provide a key focus for the future communities within the East Bayfront and Port Lands areas.

How does the Design Competition influence the EA? Work on Step 4 of the EA was put on hold in order to take the opportunity to integrate the results of the competition with the on-going EA work. In late 2007, Step 3 was revisited and the Step 4 evaluation was undertaken with revised evaluation criteria and a set of revised alternatives, which included a new river alignment that came out of the LDL competition process. Based on the preliminary results of Step 4, one alternative is more preferred than the other.
alternatives. To confirm that it is the preferred alternative, a number of confirmatory studies are proposed, including: hydrology and sediment modeling, soils investigations, and an economic analysis. Once those studies are complete, the alternative will be further refined to reflect a greater level of detail and an impact assessment of the alternative will be undertaken, all as part of Step 5. TRCA intends to complete the steps of the EA and document the results of the provincial Environmental Assessment by the end of 2008.
Hi Margaret

I hope you are doing well.

I just wanted to advise you that we did meet with the general public on Saturday March 29th at St. Lawrence Hall to present the status of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA.

We had a great turnout, over 210 people attended, and the response for the selected preliminary preferred alternative was extremely positive. We still have a lot of work to do to flesh out the details of the preliminary preferred alternative including more consultation, studies, design work and detailed impact analysis. However, we seem to have a strong mandate to proceed with this work for the enclosed preferred alignment of the river.

We are also very interested in visiting with you and your council to discuss and receive feedback on the direction of the EA - where we are and where we plan to go with the project.

I hope to hear from you shortly.

Regards
Ken
Hi Margaret

I just wanted to provide an interim update to you on the progress of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. A component of the EA is to look at opportunities to improve the aquatic habitat conditions within the lower reaches of the Don River known as the Don Narrows (north of the CN railway crossing up to Riverdale Park).

We held a public meeting on May 24th to seek input regarding opportunities to improve the ecological conditions within the river channel of the Don Narrows. Approximately 35 to 40 people attended the Saturday afternoon event. I have enclosed a newsletter for your review and information regarding this component of the EA.

We are also enjoying some good progress moving forward with the development of the conceptual design for the Don Mouth Naturalization component south of the CN crossing. We hope to have a draft concept completed by late summer or early fall.

Waterfront Toronto is also progressing with their Master Servicing EA for the Lower Don Lands and the North Keating Precinct Plan surrounding the Don River Mouth, through the efforts of their consultant team led by Michael Van Valkenburg Associates.

When we meet with you next, we are hoping to include 1 or 2 representatives of the Waterfront Toronto/Michael Van Valkenburg team as well so that we can talk with you regarding the developing plans for both the naturalized river mouth and the surrounding development lands in the area. I believe you know the person that is leading the EA component of the Master Servicing Plan, Karin Wall of Totten Sims Hubicki. We would expect that Karin and their project coordinator, Liz Silver from Michael Van Valkenburg Assoc, would join us in our next meeting with you. If you have any concerns with this proposal, please let us know and we will address them accordingly.

I hope that your negotiations regarding the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim are progressing well and I shall await your response as to your availability to meet with us.

Regards

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Nomlsto Dori Nmrows Natumlzation Edition.pdf
Hi Ken, and thanks for the detailed email. Sheriden Barnett is my Associate Negotiator working on the Williams file and can advise on the extent of the Williams FN's Southern boundaries.

Would just note that the Miss of New Credit have a specific claim filed only with Canada, not Ontario.

The New Relationship Fund is the source of the funding in support of FN consultation capacity building. Details are on our Ministry web site: www.aboriginalaffairs.on.ca

Hope this helps,
David

From: Ken Dion  
To: Didluck, David (MAA)  
Subject: Contact Information Request - First Nations Consultation - Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Dear Mr. Didluck

I am a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). I attended last week's breakfast workshop in Mississauga where you gave a presentation on the Future of Land Claims in Ontario, which I found very interesting and informative, and of course it raised all sorts of questions as it pertained to my own work with the TRCA.

I am currently managing a project at the mouth of the Don River in downtown Toronto called the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, which is currently undergoing an Individual EA and CEAA Screening process. This project is a component of the Waterfront Toronto revitalization works that are ongoing. The primary objectives of the project are to eliminate the risk of flooding to a large area of land to the east and south of the River, while transforming derelict contaminated former industrial lands into a functional and sustainable naturalized river mouth. In addition, Waterfront Toronto is managing a separate but parallel and highly integrated planning process to develop a number of new communities surrounding the future river mouth.

We have been actively consulting with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation throughout the process, as they do have a recognized Specific Claim in the area (Toronto Purchase).

We have not to date conducted any significant consultation with other First Nations related to this project, other than releasing period project newsletter updates, and the release of public meeting summaries. We have however, also included representatives of Miziwi Biik, which provides Training and Economic Development services to First Nations people living in the City, and provides networking services with other First Nations Service Providers throughout the City.

Given recent court cases and other recent recommendations, we were planning to expand our
consultation efforts to include the Williams Treaty First Nations. Though maps at the federal Treasury Board suggests that the southwestern limits of their Treaty lands stops a short distance north of the northern extent of our study area along the Don River, it can be easily inferred that any modifications to the mouth of the river would impose changes in fish and wildlife further upstream in the Treaty lands (all indications are that any such changes will only be positive given that the focus of our project is to improve ecological function).

Questions:

1) Would you be able to direct me where I could find out which of the party First Nations to the Williams Treaty’s, I should be approaching with regards to information on the Project? Would it only be the closest First Nation, the Mississaugas of Scugog, or should I reach out to all seven of the Williams Treaty First Nations? I understand that two treaties comprise the Williams Treaty’s involving three separate tracks of land. But it is not clear whether the tracts of land have been consolidated for use by all seven First Nations, or whether certain First Nations are interested in only some of the tracts of land.

2) I understand that there is currently ongoing litigation between the First Nations associated with the Williams Treaty (Alderville Indian Band, Beausoleil Indian Band, Chippewas of Georgina Island Indian Band, Chippewas of Rama Indian Band, Curve Lake Indian Band, Hiawatha Indian Band, Mississaugas of Scugog Indian Band v. Her Majesty the Queen, Her Majesty the Queen In Right of Ontario (Third Party), filed in the Federal Court of Canada (Federal Court Registry File # T-195-92)). Would you happen to have information as to where I could obtain a summary of the key issues related to this litigation so that I am aware of the key issues, and to assess how our project may be of interest with the claimant First Nations?

3) Third, I believe that you had mentioned at the breakfast workshop that funding is now available through the MAA to enable capacity building for First Nations to provide meaningful and active participation in these types of consultation activities. Would you be able to direct me to the application information to access this funding? TRCA would like to be able to assist the various First Nations in accessing any funding that might be available to help develop their internal capacity to participate in our consultation process.

I was also wondering, in your opinion, whether we should open lines of communication with other First Nations that do not have any existing claims within the area, but have been known to use the lands surrounding downtown Toronto during the last several centuries, such as the Huron-Wendat, Six Nations and Metis? Most of the discussion at last week’s workshop outlined the need to assess the strength of a Claim in order to assess the level of consultation a proponent should undertake for a project. With the Huron-Wendat, Six Nations and Metis, no such claims exist (that we are aware of), yet there may be some potential that we will come across some unknown cultural heritage artifacts that pre-date the Mississaugas of the New Credit in certain areas of the Project. For the most part, this risk is likely low given the level of past disturbance in the area, but in some locations, it is feasible that some heritage artifacts may remain intact. Given our past experiences elsewhere in our jurisdiction, we are leaning towards continuing to provide information updates on the project to the Huron-Wendat.

Anyhow, your advice and assistance regarding the above would be very much appreciated.

Many Regards
Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Hello Anneliese, Marc

Connected with Paul Murray at the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs this afternoon.

He was able to provide some other input.

He suggested (not advised) that we contact the 4 Mississauga First Nations of the Williams Treaty First Nations and that perhaps the three Chippewa First Nations need not be approached. As such, that would include the Mississaugas of Scugog, Alderville Indian Band, Curve Lake Indian Band, and Hiawatha Indian Band.

Paul also provided information on the status of the litigation that is ongoing - apparently the 7 First Nations are seeking litigation and making land claim. The claim argues that the 1923 Williams Treaty did not provide adequate financial compensation ($500K), provided unfair compensation on the award of additional reserve lands, unfairly removed their aboriginal rights for hunting and fishing. Apparently the government and courts have not yet ruled on the validity of their claims.

Anneliese has provided a list of contacts for the various Williams Treaty First Nations and Metis ORganizations.

Mr. Murray and the MAA has not provided comment on consultation with the other First Nations.

At a meeting with MOE in January, we still received a suggestion that we need not consult with the 6 Nations First Nations, though since we did already send a letter to the Huronne-Wendat in late 2007, it was suggested that we should continue to provide newsletters and notices to them on the EA, even though at the time we received a letter asking that we stop the project until they receive capacity funding.

I am still unclear whether the advice is to open consultation with the Metis Associations surrounding the GTA.

In summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation</td>
<td>Send introductory letter to Chief inquiring whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Treaty First Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississaugas of Scugog interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderville Indian Band interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve Lake Indian Band interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawatha Indian Band interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewas of Georgina Island</td>
<td>No communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewas of Rama</td>
<td>No communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beausoleil Indian Band</td>
<td>No communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huronne/Wendat</td>
<td>Continue releasing notices/newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Nations (Elected and Hereditary Leaders)</td>
<td>No communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA Metis Nations</td>
<td>No communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNO Region 8 Office</td>
<td>Leaning towards release of introductory letter inquiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level of interest
Oshawa Metis Council
Credit River Metis Council
Miziwi Blik

Leaning towards no communication
Leaning towards no communication
Continue as usual

Please provide your thoughts on the above.

Regards
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
March 5, 2009

Chief James Marsden
Alderville First Nation
PO BOX 46
Roseneath, ON
K0K 2X0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Marsden:

I am Ken Dion, a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Since 2002, TRCA has been working with Waterfront Toronto on a number of projects which focused on eliminating flood risk, remediating extensive areas of contaminated soils and groundwater, and increasing the amount of green public space as part of the efforts to revitalize the Toronto Waterfront. Most recently we have been undertaking the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA).

The goal of this project is to transform derelict former industrial lands into a more natural river mouth for the Don, protect 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding to the east and south of the river, and integrate this new natural area within the developing urban fabric of the City of Toronto. Enclosed is a map of the study area and proposed new alignment of the Don River, as well as a number of newsletters that have been produced through the DMNP EA.

In March 2008, a preferred river alignment was selected following a detailed evaluation of alternative river alignments at the mouth of the Don. We have since been working with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants to further develop a conceptual design for the naturalized river mouth, based on the preferred alignment.

A component of the DMNP EA is to look at opportunities for improving the quality of habitat within the Don Narrows, which will not increase the frequency of flooding on the Don Valley Parkway to the east and Bayview Avenue to the west. The Don Narrows refers to the narrow and straightened lower reaches of the Don River that extend from the Keating Channel in the south to Riverdale Park in the north (just south of the Bloor Street Viaduct).

The planning is now approaching a key stage within the EA process; the presentation of the preliminary conceptual design, which we hope to present to the general public on Saturday May 9, 2009.

As this project is located within the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim, TRCA has to date, focused our consultation efforts with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, having attended a number of their Council meetings, and providing on-going correspondence throughout the planning process.

However, we have recently received advice that our efforts to consult should have included the four other Mississauga First Nations that were signatories to the 1923 Williams Treaties, given that the ecological
improvements that are anticipated at the mouth of the Don River should provide spin-off ecological benefits that will likely propagate further upstream in the Don River.

In light of these recommendations, TRCA would like to extend an invitation to the Alderville First Nation to participate in the consultation for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. We would be pleased to meet with your Council to discuss the project more fully.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns about the project, please contact me at your convenience at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc.: Adele Freeman, TRCA
     Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
     Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
March 5, 2009

Chief Tracy Gauthier
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation
22521 Island Road
Port Perry, ON, L9L 1B6

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Gauthier:

I am Ken Dion, a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Since 2002, TRCA has been working with Waterfront Toronto on a number of projects which focused on eliminating flood risk, remediating extensive areas of contaminated soils and groundwater, and increasing the amount of green public space as part of the efforts to revitalize the Toronto Waterfront. Most recently we have been undertaking the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA).

The goal of this project is to transform derelict former industrial lands into a more natural river mouth for the Don, protect 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding to the east and south of the river, and integrate this new natural area within the developing urban fabric of the City of Toronto. Enclosed is a map of the study area and proposed new alignment of the Don River, as well as a number of newsletters that have been produced through the DMNP EA.

In March 2008, a preferred river alignment was selected following a detailed evaluation of alternative river alignments at the mouth of the Don. We have since been working with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants to further develop a conceptual design for the naturalized river mouth, based on the preferred alignment.

A component of the DMNP EA is to look at opportunities for improving the quality of habitat within the Don Narrows, which will not increase the frequency of flooding on the Don Valley Parkway to the east and Bayview Avenue to the west. The Don Narrows refers to the narrow and straightened lower reaches of the Don River that extend from the Keating Channel in the south to Riverdale Park in the north (just south of the Bloor Street Viaduct).

The planning is now approaching a key stage within the EA process; the presentation of the preliminary conceptual design, which we hope to present to the general public on Saturday May 9, 2009.

As this project is located within the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim, TRCA has to date, focused our consultation efforts with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, having attended a number of their Council meetings, and providing on-going correspondence throughout the planning process.

However, we have recently received advice that our efforts to consult should have included the four other Mississauga First Nations that were signatories to the 1923 Williams Treaties, given that the ecological
improvements that are anticipated at the mouth of the Don River should provide spin-off ecological benefits that will likely propagate further upstream in the Don River.

In light of these recommendations, TRCA would like to extend an invitation to the Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation to participate in the consultation for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. We would be pleased to meet with your Council to discuss the project more fully.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns about the project, please contact me at your convenience at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc.: Adele Freeman, TRCA
     Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
     Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
In light of these recommendations, TRCA would like to extend an invitation to the Hiawatha First Nation to participate in the consultation for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. We would be pleased to meet with your Council to discuss the project more fully.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns about the project, please contact me at your convenience at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc: Adele Freeman, TRCA
    Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
    Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
March 5, 2009

Chief Laurie Carr
Hiawatha First Nation
RR 2, Keene, ON
K0L 2G0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Carr:

I am Ken Dion, a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Since 2002, TRCA has been working with Waterfront Toronto on a number of projects which focused on eliminating flood risk, remediating extensive areas of contaminated soils and groundwater, and increasing the amount of green public space as part of the efforts to revitalize the Toronto Waterfront. Most recently we have been undertaking the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA).

The goal of this project is to transform derelict former industrial lands into a more natural river mouth for the Don, protect 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding to the east and south of the river, and integrate this new natural area within the developing urban fabric of the City of Toronto. Enclosed is a map of the study area and proposed new alignment of the Don River, as well as a number of newsletters that have been produced through the DMNP EA.

In March 2008, a preferred river alignment was selected following a detailed evaluation of alternative river alignments at the mouth of the Don. We have since been working with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants to further develop a conceptual design for the naturalized river mouth, based on the preferred alignment.

A component of the DMNP EA is to look at opportunities for improving the quality of habitat within the Don Narrows, which will not increase the frequency of flooding on the Don Valley Parkway to the east and Bayview Avenue to the west. The Don Narrows refers to the narrow and straightened lower reaches of the Don River that extend from the Keating Channel in the south to Riverdale Park in the north (just south of the Bloor Street Viaduct).

The planning is now approaching a key stage within the EA process; the presentation of the preliminary conceptual design, which we hope to present to the general public on Saturday May 9, 2009.

As this project is located within the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim, TRCA has to date, focused our consultation efforts with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, having attended a number of their Council meetings, and providing on-going correspondence throughout the planning process.

However, we have recently received advice that our efforts to consult should have included the four other Mississauga First Nations that were signatories to the 1923 Williams Treaty’s, given that the ecological improvements that are anticipated at the mouth of the Don River should provide spin-off ecological benefits that will likely propagate further upstream in the Don River.
March 5, 2009

Chief Irvin Knott
Curve Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Curve Lake, ON
K0L 1R0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Knott:

I am Ken Dion, a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Since 2002, TRCA has been working with Waterfront Toronto on a number of projects which focused on eliminating flood risk, remediating extensive areas of contaminated soils and groundwater, and increasing the amount of green public space as part of the efforts to revitalize the Toronto Waterfront. Most recently we have been undertaking the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA).

The goal of this project is to transform derelict former industrial lands into a more natural river mouth for the Don, protect 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding to the east and south of the river, and integrate this new natural area within the developing urban fabric of the City of Toronto. Enclosed is a map of the study area and proposed new alignment of the Don River, as well as a number of newsletters that have been produced through the DMNP EA.

In March 2008, a preferred river alignment was selected following a detailed evaluation of alternative river alignments at the mouth of the Don. We have since been working with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants to further develop a conceptual design for the naturalized river mouth, based on the preferred alignment.

A component of the DMNP EA is to look at opportunities for improving the quality of habitat within the Don Narrows, which will not increase the frequency of flooding on the Don Valley Parkway to the east and Bayview Avenue to the west. The Don Narrows refers to the narrow and straightened lower reaches of the Don River that extend from the Keating Channel in the south to Riverdale Park in the north (just south of the Bloor Street Viaduct).

The planning is now approaching a key stage within the EA process; the presentation of the preliminary conceptual design, which we hope to present to the general public on Saturday May 9, 2009.

As this project is located within the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim, TRCA has to date, focused our consultation efforts with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, having attended a number of their Council meetings, and providing on-going correspondence throughout the planning process.

However, we have recently received advice that our efforts to consult should have included the four other Mississauga First Nations that were signatories to the 1923 Williams Treaty's, given that the ecological improvements that are anticipated at the mouth of the Don River should provide spin-off ecological benefits that will likely propagate further upstream in the Don River.
In light of these recommendations, TRCA would like to extend an invitation to the Curve Lake First Nation to participate in the consultation for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. We would be pleased to meet with your Council to discuss the project more fully.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns about the project, please contact me at your convenience at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc  
Senior Project Manager  
Watershed Management Division  

Cc: Adele Freeman, TRCA  
Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto  
Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
Hi Ken,

Sorry about the delay, I am waiting to get a schedule from Chief and Council for when they would be available for the presentation. As for the vegetation I spoke to Jeff Beaver who has a wealth of knowledge about traditional plants and he suggested planting wildrice. The reason for this is that the plant can neutralize the water as well as work as a filter. It is a great source of food for fish, wildlife and birds. Also he was thinking that when people refer to Hay Bay or Grassy Narrows, it wasn't grass that was there it was actually wild rice. The chances that the wild rice might have already been in The Don is good, because when First Nations traveled along the waterways they planted rice where they
settled.

The only concern is, if there are a lot of Carp present in The Don, then planting the rice won't work because they eat it, Carp are one of the invasive species that have depleted the Wild Rice in Ontario.

I hope this helps.

Shari Beaver
Consultation Coordinator
Alderville First Nation
On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 9:30 AM, Ken Dion <KDion@trca.on.ca> wrote:

Dear Shari Beaver,

Thank you for your email. We would be most interested in hearing from you regarding your thoughts on natural vegetation in the design, and we would be pleased to meet with you, your Chief and Council to discuss the project in detail.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Regards
Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address:
70 Canuck Avenue
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5

Head Office:
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4

Shari Beaver <sharibeacher@gmail.com>
To: kdion@trca.on.ca

03/23/2009 08:45 AM
cc: Subje Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
ct: Environmental Assessment

Dear Ken Dion,

Thank you for your letter in regards to the Environmental Assessment on the Don. I am the
Consultation Coordinator here in Alderville First Nation. I am going to bring this topic up to my Chief and Council. I read the information provided and think that there is some significance to our community, I also might have some suggestion about natural vegetation that could be considered to help with the invasive plants issue.
I'm out of the office for the next few days, but do have email access should you have any questions.

Thank-you for your time.

Sincerely,

Shari Beaver
Consulation Coordinator
Alderville First Nation
Monday, April 06, 2009

Aaniin,

In an effort to answer any questions as to the validity of Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation and to offer the history of our Mississauga community to relevant agencies, and institutions, I have on behalf of our community requested a letter of opinion from our legal council for your files.

The following should serve to enlighten the reader and to clarify the existing legal duty for our community to be consulted with. Further, we wish to notify relevant parties of our intention to exert our right to be consulted within our Treaty Territory on issues which may affect these Rights. (see attached map),

Please feel free to forward this document to any of your colleagues, or associates, that may benefit from this information.

Meegwich,

Chief Kris Nahrgang

Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation,
Burleigh Falls Ontario.

Donald M. Gorber, Ph.D., P.Eng.
President

SENES Consultants Limited
121 Granton Drive, Suite 12
Richmond Hill, Ontario
CANADA L4B 3N4
Tel: (905) 764-9380 ext 301
Fax: (905) 764-9386
Cell: (416) 565-5838
Email Address: dgorber@senes.ca
Web Site: http://www.senes.ca/

This transmission is intended only for the addressee and may contain PRIVILEGED or CONFIDENTIAL information. Any unauthorized disclosure, use or retention is strictly prohibited. SENES does not accept liability for any errors, omissions, corruption or virus in
April 3, 2009

Kris Nahrgang, Chief
Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation
P.O. Box 1432
Lakefield, ON K0L 2H0

Dear Chief Nahrgang:

I am writing in response to your request for an opinion letter describing the Treaty and Aboriginal rights of the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation with respect to traditional harvesting practices and the care and protection of archaeological, cultural and sacred sites.

Summary

Kawartha Nishnawbe is a community whose members are descended from the original inhabitants of Curve Lake / Burleigh Falls area. Their ancestors used and occupied a large area, shown on the attached map. Although never registered as a “band” under the Indian Act (Canada), Kawartha Nishnawbe has been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada\(^1\) as a distinct First Nation community with a traditional form of governance.\(^2\)

In the case of \textit{R. v. Joseph Johnson}\(^3\) the Ontario Court of Justice held that the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe have constitutionally protected harvesting rights pursuant to Treaty No. 20 signed in 1818. The Court further held in \textit{Johnson} that Kawartha Nishnawbe was not a party to the Williams Treaties of 1923 in which their neighbouring First Nation communities\(^4\) sold their off-reserve Aboriginal and Treaty rights to the Crown. Kawartha Nishnawbe’s Aboriginal and Treaty rights therefore remain intact throughout the community’s traditional territory.

---

\(^1\) \textit{Lovelace v. Ontario, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 950} In referring to Kawartha Nishnawbe the Supreme Court said: “Their ancestral, community, political and social structures are family - or clan-based, where families have been linked together by shared use of lands and common social interests.”

\(^2\) As discussed below under the heading “Discrimination Against ‘Non-Status’ First Nations”, whether or not a First Nation community is an \textit{Indian Act} “band” is irrelevant to whether the community holds Aboriginal or Treaty rights, and has no relevance with respect to the Crown’s obligation to respect and accommodate those rights.

\(^3\) Decided January 29, 2002 at Peterborough, Ont.; unreported. The Crown filed a notice of appeal but abandoned the appeal.

\(^4\) The Williams Treaties were signed by Christian Island, Georgina Island, Rama, Rice Lake, Curve Lake, Scugog Lake and Alderville First Nation communities.
The effect of the Williams Treaties in extinguishing the off-reserve harvesting rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe’s neighbours was confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada in the 1994 *Howard* case, and again more recently by the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Divisional Court) in *Hiawatha First Nation v. Ontario (Minister of the Environment)*. This case, also known as the *Seaton Lands* case, also confirmed that the care and protection of burial sites is an Aboriginal right protected by section 35(1) of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, provided, of course, that a community can establish that it has existing Aboriginal or Treaty rights in respect of the lands in question, or a credible claim to such rights.

The law is clear that all government agents, employees and officials have a duty to engage in consultations with Kawartha Nishnawbe whenever they contemplate permitting activities which could impact on the rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe’s members.

**The Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation Community at Burleigh Falls**

The facts outlined out in this section were proven in the *Johnson* case, largely through the expert testimony of Ms. Joan Holmes, in addition to the evidence of several other witnesses.

Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation is a Mississauga community. The Mississaugas are a subgroup of the Ojibway Nation. The Mississauga and Ojibway are part of a larger grouping of Aboriginal nations called “Algonkian”. The Algonkians include the Ojibway, Cree, Chippewa and other First Nations groups.

By the early 1700s the Mississauga occupied the area now known as central Ontario, including the areas around Burleigh Falls, Lovesick Lake and Mud Lake.

Mississauga communities were traditionally based on kinship ties. They spent summers together at a “base” location, and then dispersed in the winter months to their respective family trap-lines. Mississauga communities did not traditionally live year-round in a single location or “reserve”. There was no “permanent” village in the sense of a year-round residence. The band would gather during the summer months at a village site, but then disperse during the winter to individual family trap lines or logging camps.

Mississauga communities, or “bands”, have traditionally been made up of networks of extended families which use a particular area of land for traditional harvesting, such as hunting, fishing, trapping and berry harvesting. The families which comprise the band would recognize certain respected older men as leaders, or “headmen”, who could speak for the community in political matters. Over time, some of these men came to be known as “Chiefs”. The Chiefs were not elected, they were chosen by community consensus.

Mississauga bands did not have rigidly fixed memberships. Traditionally, bands would divide and new bands form as a result of family alliances, economic or political changes or other...

---

6 *Hiawatha First Nation v. Ontario (Minister of the Environment), 2007 CanLII 3485 (ON S.C.D.C.)
factors. These divisions into new bands were often necessary to avoid intra-group conflicts, or to respond to economic or political pressures on the band.

Until the late 1800s, the families which comprise Kawartha Nishnawbe were associated with the Curve Lake band. They lived at Burleigh Falls from April to November every year, and spent the winter months on their family trap lines. During the late 1800s, a distinct community began to emerge at Burleigh Falls as certain families took up guiding and logging to augment their incomes from trapping, hunting and fishing.

The economy of the Burleigh Falls community diverged from the economy of the Curve Lake band during this period as the members of the Burleigh Falls community continued to follow a more traditional lifestyle, primarily based on traditional trapping, hunting and fishing and other harvesting. At the same time, the Curve Lake band began to abandon these traditional economic pursuits and develop an economy based more on farming and labouring in the wage economy.

At the same time as these economic changes were occurring, (during the late 19th century) the federal government began imposing the Indian Act on First Nation communities in southern and central Ontario. Members of these communities were classified as either “status Indians” or “non-status Indians”. Only status Indians had the right to live on the reserve, vote in band council elections, and receive certain benefits from the federal government. “Non-status” Indians were excluded.

The classification of First Nations people as “status Indians” or “non-status Indians” was often arbitrary and had little or nothing to do with whether or not a person was “full-blooded” or not. Nevertheless, the “non-status Indians” who settled at Burleigh Falls were often called “Half-Breeds” or “Metis” to distinguish them from the status Indians who were members of reserve-based bands registered under the Indian Act. Many non-status Indians eventually came to refer to themselves as “Metis”. In recent years, however, the Burleigh Falls community has adopted the name “Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation”, to reflect their Mississauga heritage and culture. Some members of Kawartha Nishnawbe continue to refer to themselves as both “Metis” and “Nishnawbe”.

By 1912 a fully distinct community or “band” had emerged, with its base at Burleigh Falls. Some members of this new band continued to spend winters with relatives on the Curve Lake reserve, or on their family trap lines, but it is clear that a separate band now existed.

The Burleigh Falls band had its own leadership (Jack Jacobs was the acknowledged Chief of the community) and a distinct political, social and economic life from the Curve Lake reserve. The members of the new band were primarily “non-status” Indians whose ancestors had once been members of the Curve Lake band.

The new community was comprised of the members of five extended families. All of these families had at one time been members of the Curve Lake band, but they were not registered as “status” Indians under the Indian Act. They had established close ties to each other and to the Burleigh Falls area during the late 1800s and early 20th century.

---

8 The surnames of the five families: Jacobs, Hoggarth, Johnson Brown and Taylor.
The Treaty of 1818

Treaty No. 20 was signed in 1818 between the “Honourable Wm. Claus, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, in behalf of His Majesty, ... and Principal Men of the Chippewa Nation of Indians inhabiting the back part of the New Castle District ...”. In this Treaty the Mississauga ancestors of Kawartha Nishnawbe purportedly ceded title to a tract of land surrounding the Kawartha Lakes, from east of Rice Lake to the southern tip of Lake Muskoka, in return for £740 worth of goods, but they did not cede their hunting and fishing rights.

The Curve Lake band and Kawartha Nishnawbe did not exist as separate bands in 1818. Indeed, there was no Indian Act at that time and therefore no Indian Act “bands” or “status Indians” or “non-status Indians”. Prior to the enactment of the first Indian Act in 1876, only traditional kinship-based bands existed. The distinct Mississauga bands which now exist, whether Indian Act bands such as Curve Lake, or “non-status” bands such as Kawartha Nishnawbe, are descendants from the clans and tribes which signed the Treaty in 1818.

Although they may not have been a distinct, separate community in 1818, there is no doubt that the ancestors of Kawartha Nishnawbe were signatories to the Treaty and that any rights flowing from the Treaty flow equally to status and non-status descendants of the signatories. This fact was conceded by the Crown’s expert witness in the Johnson case and confirmed by the Court.

The (English only) text of the 1818 Treaty does not explicitly mention hunting or fishing rights. However, in 1981 the Ontario Court of Appeal held in R. v. Taylor and Williams⁹ that oral history, confirmed by the minutes of the Treaty negotiations and correspondence from the Treaty Commissioners, proved that the Indian signatories had been promised during the Treaty negotiations that the Treaty would have no effect on their harvesting traditions. The Court found that these promises constituted a part of the Treaty, although they were never added to the written text of the Treaty.

The Taylor case was treated by the Crown as a test case on the issue of whether oral promises which were not made explicit in the written text of the Treaty could nevertheless constitute Treaty rights. In Taylor, therefore, the Crown did not argue that the Treaty rights which were confirmed in the Treaty of 1818 were extinguished by the Williams Treaties of 1923. This issue was addressed by the Supreme Court in the Howard case.

The Williams Treaties

In the early 1920s the government of Ontario came to the conclusion that the Mississauga and Chippewa Nations continued to hold Aboriginal rights and title throughout large parts of central and southern Ontario. This led to uncertainty with respect to land title and the validity of deeds, leases and land use permits issued to non-Aboriginal interests.

In 1923 a Treaty Commission was appointed to negotiate a Treaty which would achieve a surrender of the rights and title of the Mississauga and Chippewa. The Commission visited the

communities to gather evidence of the extent of their harvesting territories and negotiate the terms for purchasing their existing rights and title.

The William Treaties cover a huge land area in central Ontario from the Quebec border along the Ottawa River to the Lake Ontario shoreline. Signatories to the Treaties were the Mississauga communities of Rice Lake, Mud Lake, Lake Scugog and Alderville; and the Chippewa of Christian Island, Georgina Island and Rama. The Treaty negotiations involved both the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario. These Treaties were different in many respects from other treaties in that they did not secure hunting and fishing rights nor did they guarantee possession of reserves. Instead the Crown purchased the First Nations’ hunting and fishing rights, and other rights and title, in exchange for cash.

Kawartha Nishnawbe did not participate in the Williams Treaties. There is oral evidence that Kawartha Nishnawbe’s Chief, Jack Jacobs, attempted to attend the Treaty negotiations in order to warn his fellow Chiefs that they should not sell their rights and title, but he was excluded by the “status” Indian Chiefs who did not recognize him as “legitimate” because his community was not an Indian Act band.

Legal Framework

Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 provides:

35 (1) The aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed.

(2) In this Act, “aboriginal peoples of Canada” includes the Indian, Inuit and Metis peoples of Canada.

In R. v. Van der Peet10 the Supreme Court articulated the test to identify whether an applicant has established an Aboriginal right protected by s. 35 (1) of the Constitution Act, 1982. At paragraph [46] the Court said, “in order to be an aboriginal right an activity must be an element of a practice, custom or tradition integral to the distinctive culture of the aboriginal group claiming the right.” Certainly the traditional harvesting practices of Kawartha Nishnawbe members would be protected by s. 35.

In Hiawatha the Ontario Superior Court of Justice found that “There is general agreement that the Anishnaabeg practice of honouring the burial sites of their ancestors (also) meets this test...” and is protected by s. 35(1).

In Sparrow11, the Supreme Court held that treaty or Aboriginal rights which were regulated by federal or provincial legislation prior to 1982 were not extinguished merely because they were regulated. Even rights which were heavily regulated may nevertheless be “existing” rights protected by section 35(1).

---

The burden of proving that a Treaty or Aboriginal right has been extinguished prior to 1982 is on the Crown. Extinction cannot be implied. The Crown must provide “strict proof” of the fact of extinguishment in each case. It must be “plain and clear” that the Crown intentionally extinguished treaty rights.12

As discussed below, the Crown must justify any infringement of Aboriginal or Treaty rights or any such rights which have been credibly asserted. In order to justify infringement the Crown must prove that it has consulted with the affected community and, where necessary, accommodated the community’s concerns.

APPLICATION OF LAW TO FACTS

Harvesting Rights Under the Treaty of 1818

In Taylor and Williams the Ontario Court of Appeal held that the sections of Ontario’s Game and Fish Act which restrict hunting and fishing to certain seasons could not apply to descendants of the Mississauga who held rights under Treaty No. 20 in 1818.13 In Taylor and Williams the defendants were members of the Curve Lake band. In the Johnson case it was also conceded by the Crown’s expert witness that the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe are descendants of those who signed Treaty No. 20.

There is no doubt therefore that Treaty No. 20 includes a right to hunt and fish in the Burleigh Falls area, and throughout the area covered by that Treaty. In Johnson the Crown’s expert witness acknowledged that any benefits which flow from the 1818 Treaty would flow to all of the descendants who signed the Treaty, regardless of whether or not they are registered “status” Indians under the Indian Act.

Although Kawartha Nishnawbe is not recognized under the Indian Act as a “band”, and most of its members are not registered “status” Indians, the Supreme Court has held that there is no connection between registration as a “status” Indian under the Indian Act and whether or not a person holds Treaty rights.14 The Indian Act is essentially the legislative regime for the administration of registered bands and reserves. It does not purport to define who is an “Indian” for all purposes, or to define who is and who is not a “treaty Indian” with Treaty rights. Nor could the Indian Act have such an effect since treaty rights are constitutionally protected.

In Johnson, therefore, the Court held that it is sufficient that Kawartha Nishnawbe is a First Nation community whose ancestors signed the Treaty of 1818. The tribes which signed the Treaty of 1818 were not divided into Indian Act bands and “status” and “non-status” Indians until decades after signing the Treaty.

13 In this case the court did not consider the effects of the Williams Treaties. The Supreme Court has since held in R. v. Howard that the “status” Indian Act bands which signed the Williams Treaties in 1923 knowingly surrendered their rights under Treaty No. 20 in return for cash payments.
The Williams Treaties of 1923

Once it was established in *Johnson* that the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe are directly connected to the First Nations which signed the Treaty of 1818, and therefore hold Treaty rights, the onus shifted to the Crown to prove that their Treaty rights had been extinguished. The Supreme Court of Canada has consistently held that extinguishment cannot be implied. The Crown must provide “strict proof” of the fact of extinguishment.

In the 1994 *Howard* case, the Supreme Court addressed the 1923 Williams Treaties which purport to extinguish the harvesting rights of the signatory First Nations in return for cash payments. The Court emphasized that the evidence presented by the Crown in that case showed that the bands which were parties to the 1923 Treaty had engaged in extensive negotiations with the Crown prior to signing the Treaty. The Court also emphasized that the bands which signed the Treaty were fully aware of the contents of the Treaty and had given their informed consent to the terms of the Treaty. Their consent to the terms of the Treaty extinguishing their rights was not implied but rather based on clear evidence.

In *Johnson* the Crown argued that even though Kawartha Nishnawbe had not participated in the Williams Treaties their Aboriginal rights were nevertheless extinguished by virtue of the fact that the Crown, in executing the Williams Treaties, had shown its intention to extinguish the rights of all First Nations in the area. However, in the *Sioui* case the Supreme Court held that treaty rights cannot be extinguished “without the consent of the Indians concerned”. *Sioui* confirms that the consent of the affected Indians cannot be implied, nor can it be given on their behalf by other parties. There must be strict proof of the fact of extinguishment and evidence of a plain and clear intention on the part of the government to extinguish treaty rights. The Court cannot infer or imply extinguishment in the absence of “plain and clear” evidence and “strict proof”.

The Court held in *Johnson* that Kawartha Nishnawbe was an independent First Nation community, separate and distinct from the Curve Lake reserve community and other Williams Treaty bands:

“An Indian community certainly does exist at Burleigh Falls and is now known as the Kawartha Nishnawbe. Despite the name, whether it is the Burleigh Falls community or the Kawartha Nishnawbe, in my opinion it is representative of the original group who settled in the Burleigh Falls area.”

In *Johnson* it was clearly proven that Kawartha Nishnawbe was not a party to the Williams Treaties of 1923. In fact, there is evidence that the then Chief of Kawartha Nishnawbe, Jack Jacobs, attempted to take part in the Treaty negotiations, in order to express his community’s opposition to the Treaty, but he was excluded by the “status” Chiefs of the *Indian Act* bands. No representative of the Burleigh Falls community signed the Treaties.

The members of the bands which signed the Williams Treaties of 1923 received cash payments in return for surrendering their Treaty hunting and fishing rights. With the exception of a few members of one family who were members of the Curve Lake band and had married into the

---

Burleigh Falls community, no members of Kawartha Nishnawbe ever received any of those payments or any benefits under the Williams Treaty.

As the Court found in Johnson, the Williams Treaties of 1923 could not have extinguished the Treaty hunting and fishing rights of the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe. Nor could the Williams Treaties affect the existing Aboriginal rights and title of Kawartha Nishnawbe members throughout their traditional territory.

The effect of the Williams Treaties in extinguishing the off-reserve harvesting rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe’s neighbouring First Nation communities was confirmed recently by the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Divisional Court) in Hiawatha First Nation v. Ontario (Minister of the Environment). This case confirmed that the bands which signed the Williams Treaties have no existing Aboriginal or Treaty rights which require them to be consulted with respect to archaeological sites not located on their respective reserves since they sold all of their Aboriginal and Treaty rights in 1923, with the exception of their rights to hunt and fish on their reserves.

Geographical Extent of Kawartha Nishnawbe Rights

The Aboriginal rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe are not limited to the territory covered by the Treaty of 1818. That Treaty confirmed the community’s harvesting rights the area covered by it (see map attached) but did not purport to recognize or extinguish the rights and title of the signatories throughout their traditional territory. This view is confirmed by the Williams Treaty negotiations of 1923.

Following the Johnson decision, and the Crown’s abandonment of the appeal of that decision, Ontario’s Ministry of Natural Resources acknowledged that the members of Kawartha Nishnawbe have Aboriginal rights with respect to harvesting and cultural, sacred and archaeological sites throughout their traditional territory, including much of the area covered by the Williams Treaty.

The attached map shows the area, surrounded by a broken blue line, n respect of which Ontario has acknowledged the existing Aboriginal rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe.

The Duty to Consult and Accommodate

There is no question that Aboriginal peoples have a right to be consulted on matters affecting their hunting and fishing rights and other Aboriginal rights. The duty to consult flows from recognition of the Crown’s fiduciary duty toward Aboriginal Peoples. The Supreme Court has said that the duty to consult is grounded in the honour of the Crown.

---

The duty of the Crown to consult with First Nation communities is triggered as soon as the Crown considers permitting an activity which could impact on the community’s Aboriginal or Treaty rights. In *Haida* the Supreme Court said: “the duty arises when the Crown has knowledge, real or constructive, of the potential existence of the Aboriginal right or title and contemplates conduct that might adversely affect it: see *Halfway River First Nation v. British Columbia (Ministry of Forests)*, [1997] 4 C.N.L.R. 45 (B.C.S.C.), at p. 71, per Dorgan J.”

With respect to the scope of the duty to consult, the Court said in *Haida*:

[37] There is a distinction between knowledge sufficient to trigger a duty to consult and if appropriate, accommodate, and the content or scope of the duty in a particular case. Knowledge of a credible but unproven claim suffices to trigger a duty to consult and accommodate. The content of the duty, however, varies with the circumstances, as discussed more fully below. A dubious or peripheral claim may attract a mere duty of notice, while a stronger claim may attract more stringent duties. The law is capable of differentiating between tenuous claims, claims possessing a strong prima facie case, and established claims. Parties can assess these matters and if they cannot agree, tribunals and courts can assist. Difficulties associated with the absence of proof and definition of claims are addressed by assigning appropriate content to the duty, not by denying the existence of a duty.

With respect to the determining the scope of consultations required in a particular situation, the Court said:

[39] The content of the duty to consult and accommodate varies with the circumstances. Precisely what duties arise in different situations will be defined as the case law in this emerging area develops. In general terms, however, it may be asserted that the scope of the duty is proportionate to a preliminary assessment of the strength of the case supporting the existence of the right or title, and to the seriousness of the potentially adverse effect upon the right or title claimed.

Significantly, the Court set out the following ground rules which must be observed in cases where the Crown is required to consult with First Nations:

[42] At all stages, good faith on both sides is required. The common thread on the Crown’s part must be “the intention of substantially addressing [Aboriginal] concerns” as they are raised (*Delgamuukw, supra*, at para. 168), through a meaningful process of consultation. Sharp dealing is not permitted. However, there is no duty to agree: rather, the commitment is to a meaningful process of consultation. As for Aboriginal claimants, they must not frustrate the Crown’s reasonable good faith attempts, nor should they take unreasonable positions to thwart government from making decisions or acting in cases where, despite meaningful consultation, agreement is not reached: see *Halfway River First Nation v. British Columbia (Ministry of Forests)*, [1999] 4 C.N.L.R. 1 (B.C.A.), at p. 44; *Heiltsuk Tribal Council v. British Columbia (Minister of Sustainable Resource Management)*, (2003), 19 B.C.L.R. (4th) 107 (B.C.S.C.).
Clearly, whenever any branch or department of the federal or provincial government contemplates permitting any activity which could impact on the lands or resources within Kawartha Nishnawbe’s traditional territory, as shown on the attached map, it must thoroughly consult in good faith with Kawartha Nishnawbe. In most cases there will be a duty to accommodate the community’s concerns. Accommodation could take the form of measures to prevent or mitigate potential impacts and/or compensation for impacts which cannot be avoided.

Finally, in *Mikisew*, the Court also held that the Crown must consult in good faith and cannot decide the outcome of the consultations before they begin. This type of “consultations” was described by the Supreme Court as “meaningless”:

“Consultation that excludes from the outset any form of accommodation would be meaningless. The contemplated process is not simply one of giving the Mikisew an opportunity to blow off steam before the Minister proceeds to do what she intended to do all along. Treaty making is an important stage in the long process of reconciliation, but it is only a stage. What occurred at Fort Chipewyan in 1899 was not the complete discharge of the duty arising from the honour of the Crown, but a rededication of it.”

**Discrimination Against “Non-Status” First Nations**

As noted above, Kawartha Nishnawbe has never been registered as a “band” under the *Indian Act*, nor could they become a band since the process is circular: only members of communities recognized as *Indian Act* “bands” are considered “status Indians”, and only a community comprised entirely of “status” Indians can apply to be recognized as a “band.”

Discrimination against so-called “non-status” First Nation communities and “non-status” First Nations persons continues to be widespread, with many government departments and officials erroneously presuming that only *Indian Act* bands and “status Indians” have constitutionally protected Aboriginal and Treaty rights. So-called “non-status” communities, including Kawartha Nishnawbe are frequently ignored because it is commonly thought that the *Indian Act* is a statutory mechanism for identifying those communities which hold Aboriginal and Treaty rights. This view is wholly incorrect and has been consistently rejected by the courts. In fact, the *Indian Act* has nothing to do with identifying the holders of Aboriginal and Treaty rights. It is merely the statutory framework for the administration of “bands” and reserves.

There is no legal basis whatsoever for treating so-called “non-status” communities differently than communities which are recognized as “bands” under the *Indian Act*. In fact, it has been determined that such differential treatment constitutes discrimination, contrary to section 15 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

---

20 *Mikisew Cree v. Canada*, paragraph 54.
CONCLUSION

The community of Kawartha Nishnawbe, based at Burleigh Falls, is comprised of descendants of the Mississauga signatories to Treaty No. 20 of 1818. The community arose from a division of the Curve Lake (Mud Lake) band which began in the late 1800s and culminated in the 1910s. By 1912 a distinct community had emerged.

Kawartha Nishnawbe did not participate in the Williams Treaties of 1923 which extinguished the rights and title of those First Nation communities which did participate, and received none of the benefits under those Treaties. Their rights under the 1818 Treaty, as well as their Aboriginal rights throughout their traditional territory, therefore remain intact today and are protected by s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. These rights include traditional harvesting and a right to protect and care for cultural, sacred and archaeological sites.

The Crown, at all levels, has a duty to consult with Kawartha Nishnawbe whenever it contemplates permitting any activities which could impact on the rights of Kawartha Nishnawbe’s members. Consultations must be in good faith with a view to substantially addressing the community’s concerns. In many cases it will be necessary to accommodate Kawartha Nishnawbe through modifications to the proposed activity to avoid or mitigate impacts. In cases where impacts cannot be avoided, compensation will normally be required.

Sincerely,

Christopher M. Reid
Good Afternoon Margaret

I hope that you are doing well.

I am just following up with regards to the below email I sent in March. We are preparing to present to the public, the concept design for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA on Saturday May 9th, 2009 at St. Lawrence Hall from 10:00am until 3:00pm. Waterfront Toronto will also be presenting at this public meeting, the results of their Class EA on the Lower Don Lands Master Plan, and their Keating Precinct Plan.

We were hoping to meet with you and your Council to discuss progress to date on the two processes. I suspect that at this time, we would not be able to join you for your May Council meeting. Would there be another time that we could come and visit you once again?

I will be able to send you a newsletter on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA shortly to give you a sense of where things are heading at this time. The newsletter is in its final edits before release.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4
----- Forwarded by Ken Dion/MTRCA on 04/29/2009 12:15 PM -----
with you afterwards, but I deferred doing so given the high level of desire from the other attendees to bend your ear, particularly since they would not likely have another opportunity to do so. I was particularly interested in discussing your current relations and involvement with the other Mississauga First Nations given the outcome of the Williams Treaty issues, and to find out when in August I might be able to take my boys to see your Powwow - I think they would really enjoy that.

It is unfortunate that your sound system did not work as planned, given all the debate you went through on the final script, I was very curious to hear what went with the video. Is there any chance we could receive a copy of that video at some point?

Anyhow, we do not have much to report on our end at the moment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA at the mouth of the Don.

However, we are getting close to a concept design that we would like to show to you and your Council in the coming weeks, including some interesting hydraulic modeling results and details of the ecology being proposed for the new river mouth. We are planning to go to the public on Sat. May 9th in Toronto with the concept, and would be happy to meet with your Council up to 3 weeks in advance of that meeting date or anytime afterwards. The Lower Don Lands Precinct Planning team (the team leading the infrastructure and development plans surrounding the proposed renaturalized river mouth) I suspect would also be interested in meeting with your Council as well.

On a sidebar, as we further develop the ecological plan for the new river mouth, I believe that members of your Council have in the past expressed an interest in the vegetation species being considered for the project. Would you happen to know or be able to obtain information about whether there were certain vegetation species and vegetation communities that your community would like to see reestablished at the mouth of the Don? We currently have a wide shopping list of vegetation communities that are being considered for this area based on the expected water levels, and flood protection needs for the area. But if you have any insight regarding your community interests as it relates to specific vegetation species, we can use that information to help nail down some of the vegetation community targets for the naturalized river mouth.

Warmest Regards
Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario M3N 1S4
416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca
April 30, 2009

Chief Kris Nahrgang
Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation
P.O. Box 1432
Lakefield, ON K0L 2H0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Nahrgang:

I am Ken Dion, a Project Manager at the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Since 2002, TRCA has been working with Waterfront Toronto on a number of projects which focused on eliminating flood risk, remediating extensive areas of contaminated soils and groundwater, and increasing the amount of green public space as part of the efforts to revitalize the Toronto Waterfront. Most recently we have been undertaking the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA).

The goal of this project is to transform derelict former industrial lands into a more natural river mouth for the Don, protect 230 hectares of land currently at risk to flooding to the east and south of the river, and integrate this new natural area within the developing urban fabric of the City of Toronto. Enclosed is a map of the study area and proposed new alignment of the Don River, as well as a number of newsletters that have been produced through the DMNP EA.

In March 2008, a preferred river alignment was selected following a detailed evaluation of alternative river alignments at the mouth of the Don. We have since been working with Waterfront Toronto and their consultants to further develop a conceptual design for the naturalized river mouth, based on the preferred alignment.

A component of the DMNP EA is to look at opportunities for improving the quality of habitat within the Don Narrows, which will not increase the frequency of flooding on the Don Valley Parkway to the east and Bayview Avenue to the west. The Don Narrows refers to the narrow and straightened lower reaches of the Don River that extend from the Keating Channel in the south to Riverdale Park in the north (just south of the Bloor Street Viaduct).

The planning is now approaching a key stage within the EA process; the presentation of the preliminary conceptual design, which we hope to present to the general public on Saturday May 9, 2009.

As this project is located within the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim, TRCA has to date, focused our consultation efforts with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, having attended a number of their Council meetings, and providing on-going correspondence throughout the planning process.

We are in receipt of a letter from your solicitor Mr. Christopher M. Reid (dated April 3, 2009), providing a legal opinion describing the Treaty and Aboriginal rights of the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation with respect to traditional harvesting practices and the care and protection of archaeological, cultural and sacred sites. The map accompanying the legal opinion indicates that these rights extend to the project area for our Environmental Assessment study at the mouth of the Don River.
Given this recent information, TRCA would like to extend an invitation to the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation to participate in the consultation for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. We would be pleased to meet with your Council to discuss the project more fully.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns about the project, please contact me at your convenience at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc.: Adele Freeman, TRCA
     Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
     Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
April 30, 2009

Ms. Margaret Sault
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
2789 Mississauga Road - R.R. #6
Hagersville, ON N0A 1H0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Margaret:

I am happy to enclose a copy of our latest newsletter for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment.

In the newsletter you will find information on the:
- studies that were conducted to confirm last year’s selection of the preliminary preferred alternative;
- concept plan detailing the proposed distribution of ecological communities;
- results of our hydraulic modeling;
- proposed sediment and debris management program for the concept; and
- results of the navigation risk assessment and additional soils studies conducted in the area.

We are scheduled to present to the general public, this concept design and the progress to date on Saturday May 9, 2009 from 10:00am until 3:00pm at St. Lawrence Hall in Toronto. Waterfront Toronto will also be presenting the results of their Lower Don Lands Class EA Master Servicing Plan and Keating Precinct Plan at the May 9th meeting.

We would, of course, be pleased to travel to Hagersville and meet with you and your Council to discuss these projects in detail at your convenience.

If you wish to receive more information than has been provided herein, or if you have any other comments, questions or concerns, please contact me at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

I look forward to seeing you soon.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc: Adele Freeman, TRCA
    Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
Good Morning Shari

I just wanted to send you a brief progress update on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA, including a copy of our most recent Project Newsletter.

Back in March 2008, a "preliminary preferred alternative" for the new mouth of the Don River was selected, subject to a number of confirmatory studies: hydraulic and sediment models, additional soils and groundwater studies, and a navigation risk assessment. We have since conducted these studies to the extent that we have confirmed that the preferred alternative is a viable alternative. As such, we have proceeded to develop a concept plan based on the preferred alternative alignment.

You will find within the enclosed newsletter, information on the:
- concept plan detailing the proposed distribution of ecological communities;
- results of our hydraulic modeling;
- proposed sediment and debris management program for the concept; and
- results of the navigation risk assessment and additional soils studies conducted in the area.

Planning for the DMNP EA has been proceeding in coordination with Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Infrastructure EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan team. The Lower Don Lands and Keating Channel Precinct Plan outlines a preferred concept for development massing and zoning proposals, and the recommended road, transit, and infrastructure design layout for the proposed urban form adjacent to the naturalized mouth of the Don River.

TRCA and Waterfront Toronto have scheduled a meeting to present to the public, the concept design and the progress to date for the DMNP EA on Saturday May 9, 2009 from 10:00am until 3:00pm at St. Lawrence Hall in Toronto. Waterfront Toronto will also be presenting the results of their Lower Don Lands Municipal EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan at the May 9th meeting.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the enclosed, or would like to arrange a meeting to discuss the project in greater detail, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely

Ken Dion

[DMNP News #7 was attached]
May 6, 2009

Grand Chief Konrad Sioui
255 Place Chef Michel Laveau
Village des Hurons-Wendake, G0A 4V0

RE:  Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

Dear Grand Chief Sioui:

Our best wishes to you and congratulations for your new leadership role in your community. I am writing to provide an update of our progress for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) located at the mouth of the Don River, in Toronto, Ontario. The goal of the DMNP EA is to:

- transform the mouth of the Don River from a straightened, armoured and degraded channel; flowing past former contaminated industrial lands into a more natural and functioning river mouth
- remove the risk of flooding to lands to the east and south of the Don River (Figure 1); and
- provide the foundation for a major new centralized park and open space area along the waterfront of the City of Toronto.

During our last correspondence to your community (an email addressed to Ms. Heather Bastien dated June 2, 2008) we had enclosed a number of project newsletters which described the selection process for a preliminary preferred alternative for the naturalized mouth of the Don (in Newsletter #5), and outlined options being considered to improve the in-water habitat conditions within the Don Narrows (Don Narrows special edition of the newsletter).

On June 6, 2008, we received the letter from your office (dated May 29, 2008) informing of your request to the Province of Ontario for block funding to be made available to assist with your review of development projects in Ontario, as they relate to the Huron-Wendat Nation’s rights, interests and property. Since last summer, we understand that the Province of Ontario has established funding for First Nations capacity building through their New Relationship Fund which is accessible through the province’s Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs. Given the availability of this funding, TRCA would like to take this opportunity to update you as to the progress to date on the DMNP EA.

As indicated above, a preliminary preferred alternative for a new mouth of the Don River was selected in March 2008, subject to a number of confirmatory studies: hydraulic and sediment models, additional soils and groundwater studies, and a navigation risk assessment. We have since conducted these studies to the extent that we have confirmed that the preferred alternative is in fact a viable alternative.

You will find within the enclosed newsletter, information on the:

- studies that were conducted to confirm last year’s selection of the preliminary preferred alternative;
- concept plan detailing the proposed distribution of ecological communities;
- results of our hydraulic modeling;
- proposed sediment and debris management program for the concept; and
- results of the navigation risk assessment and additional soils studies conducted in the area.
During the EA process, TRCA:
- periodically meets with Chief Bryan LaForme and the Council of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to provide project updates and receive input into our study;
- has received input and advice from Miziwe Bilk (an agency that provides training and employment services for aboriginals in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)) through our Community Liaison Committee. TRCA has also been able to pass on project information through Miziwe Bilk’s network of other community agencies providing services to the aboriginal community within the GTA;
- is in the process of arranging a meeting with Chief James Marsden and the Council of the Alderville First Nation to discuss the project and receive input into our study;
- has sent project updates to the Mississaugas of Scugog, the Curve Lake First Nation, the Hiawatha First Nation, the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation and the Huron-Wendat First Nation; and
- has sent letters highlighting the project to the Anishinabek Nation, Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians, and Chiefs of Ontario. Key recommendations were to contact interested First Nations directly, and to send letters if any archaeological findings or species at risk issues arise through the planning or implementation process.

The following issues are some of the key issues that have been raised in relation to the DMNP EA:
- The protection of potential unknown/undocumented archaeological sites
- The collection and reporting of species at risk (plants and animals), particularly those plants that were previously only found in proximity to past First Nations settlements
- Recommendations to encourage the establishment of native plant species associated with past First Nation settlements (i.e. wild rice)
- Raising awareness of the history of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and acknowledgement of the status of their Specific Claim in the area
- Concerns about the province’s selection process for “Places to Grow” legislation (2006) and the impacts on agricultural areas
- A need to be consulted regarding Growth Plans and other activities within their Specific Claims Area
- Concerns about climate change, the influence of river and lake levels on naturalized mouth and infrastructure
- Strong concerns regarding soils contamination
- Concerns of the long-term availability of funding to implement the project
- Interest in the proposed type of development contemplated for areas overlying the original sand spit outside of the proposed naturalized areas

In response to the first issue identified above, a Level 1 archaeological study recently conducted for the area states that the mouth of the Don would have been a highly attractive location for seasonal occupation and harvesting of plant and animal resources. However, past stone-hooking, dredging, lakefill and industrial activities within the project area, would have destroyed most archaeological resources resulting in a low potential for intact archaeological resources to remain. The report also identifies that the highest potential for surviving resources would be in the area of the Cherry Street beach bar, and recommends that in-field archaeological surveys and monitoring be included in the work plan of any future construction.

Planning for the DMNP EA has been proceeding in coordination with Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Infrastructure EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan team. The Lower Don Lands and Keating Channel Precinct Plan outlines a preferred concept for development and zoning proposals, and the recommended road, transit, and infrastructure design layout for the proposed urban form adjacent to the naturalized mouth of the Don River.

TRCA has scheduled a meeting to present to the general public, the concept design and the progress to date for the DMNP EA on Saturday May 9, 2009 from 10:00am until 3:00pm at St. Lawrence Hall in
Toronto. Waterfront Toronto will also be presenting the results of their Lower Don Lands Municipal EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan at the May 9th meeting. We anticipate one final public meeting to be held in the fall of 2009 prior to submission of the EA for approval in early 2010.

If you wish to continue receiving information on this project, or wish to arrange for a meeting to discuss this project in more detail, please contact me at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc: Heather Bastien, Huron-Wendat Nation
Luc Lainé, Huron-Wendat Nation
Adele Freeman, TRCA
Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
May 11, 2009

Chief Keith Knott
Curve Lake First Nation
General Delivery
Curve Lake, ON
K0L 1R0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment Update.

Dear Chief Knott:

Further to our package sent you dated March 5, 2009, please find enclosed a brief progress update on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA, including a copy of our most recent Project Newsletter.

Back in March 2008, a "preliminary preferred alternative" for the new mouth of the Don River was selected, subject to a number of confirmatory studies: hydraulic and sediment models, additional soils and groundwater studies, and a navigation risk assessment. We have since conducted these studies to the extent that we have confirmed that the preferred alternative is a viable alternative. As such, we have proceeded to develop a concept plan based on the preferred alternative alignment.

You will find within the enclosed newsletter, information on the:
- concept plan detailing the proposed distribution of ecological communities;
- results of our hydraulic modeling;
- proposed sediment and debris management program for the concept; and
- results of the navigation risk assessment and additional soils studies conducted in the area.

Planning for the DMNP EA has been proceeding in coordination with Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Infrastructure EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan team. The Lower Don Lands and Keating Channel Precinct Plan outlines a preferred concept for development massing and zoning proposals, and the recommended road, transit, and infrastructure design layout for the proposed urban form adjacent to the naturalized mouth of the Don River.

TRCA and Waterfront Toronto held a meeting on Saturday May 9, 2009 to present to the public, the concept design and the progress to date for the DMNP EA and to present Waterfront Toronto's results for their Lower Don Lands Municipal EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan. Additional information regarding Waterfront Toronto's LDL Municipal EA and Precinct Plan can be found at the following website link: http://www.waterfronttoronto.ca/dynamic.php?first=43fa75b221b08&second=4637868526923&third=45abd9e029036

If you would like to arrange a meeting to discuss the DMNP EA and/or the Lower Don Lands/Keating Channel Precinct Plan in greater detail, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division
Cc: Adele Freeman, TRCA

Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto

Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
May 11, 2009

Chief Laurie Carr
Hiawatha First Nation
RR 2, Keene, ON
K0L 2G0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment Update.

Dear Chief Carr:

Further to our earlier package sent you dated March 5, 2009, please find enclosed a brief progress update on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA, including a copy of our most recent Project Newsletter.

Back in March 2008, a "preliminary preferred alternative" for the new mouth of the Don River was selected, subject to a number of confirmatory studies: hydraulic and sediment models, additional soils and groundwater studies, and a navigation risk assessment. We have since conducted these studies to the extent that we have confirmed that the preferred alternative is a viable alternative. As such, we have proceeded to develop a concept plan based on the preferred alternative alignment.

You will find within the enclosed newsletter, information on the:
• concept plan detailing the proposed distribution of ecological communities;
• results of our hydraulic modeling;
• proposed sediment and debris management program for the concept; and
• results of the navigation risk assessment and additional soils studies conducted in the area.

Planning for the DMNP EA has been proceeding in coordination with Waterfront Toronto and the Lower Don Lands Municipal Infrastructure EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan team. The Lower Don Lands and Keating Channel Precinct Plan outlines a preferred concept for development massing and zoning proposals, and the recommended road, transit, and infrastructure design layout for the proposed urban form adjacent to the naturalized mouth of the Don River.

TRCA and Waterfront Toronto held a meeting on Saturday May 9, 2009 to present to the public, the concept design and the progress to date for the DMNP EA and to present Waterfront Toronto’s results for their Lower Don Lands Municipal EA and Keating Channel Precinct Plan. Additional information regarding Waterfront Toronto’s LDL Municipal EA and Precinct Plan can be found at the following website link: http://www.waterfronttoronto.ca/dynamic.php?first=43fa75b221b08&second=463768526923&third=45abd9e029036

If you would like to arrange a meeting to discuss the DMNP EA and/or the Lower Don Lands/Keating Channel Precinct Plan in greater detail, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division
Cc: Adele Freeman, TRCA
    Jamie McEwan, City of Toronto
    Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto
June 2, 2009

Ms. Margaret Sault
Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation
2789 Mississauga Road - R.R. #6
Hagersville, ON N0A 1H0

RE: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment: Follow-up to Issues Raised June 16, 2008

Dear Margaret:

Please find enclosed the following table that summarizes the concerns and issues that Chief LaForme and yourself raised when we last met with you on June 16, 2008 regarding the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA). The table also outlines how we attempted to incorporate and address those concerns in the overall EA framework.

If you have any concerns or questions with regards to the enclosed, please contact me at your convenience, at (416) 661-6600 (ext. 5230) or by email at kdion@trca.on.ca.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion, MSc
Senior Project Manager
Watershed Management Division

Cc.: Adele Freeman, TRCA
    Brenda Webster, Waterfront Toronto

Enc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Raised</th>
<th>How was it addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief LaForme provided TRCA with a new brochure on the History of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.</td>
<td>Document was scanned and distributed to Waterfront Toronto and the project team. The information was reviewed by TRCA staff including Cathy Crinnion, TRCA Archaeologist. Information in history brochure will be added to the consultation record for the EA and reviewed to determine whether information provided will impact evaluation of alternatives through EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised concerns regarding selection process of identifying “Places to Grow” legislation (2006).</td>
<td>DMNP EA does not provide a mechanism that can address concerns about other Provincial Policies. However, these concerns were relayed to Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto. It is our understanding that the City of Toronto has in the interim, established a City – First Nations Liaison Committee that is chaired by Councillor Fletcher. It is our understanding that this Committee will provide a forum to discuss this and other issues directly with the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Expressed need to be consulted regarding Growth Plans and other activities within their Specific Claims Area. | A major component of the DMNP EA is to remediate soils by:  
- minimizing the volumes of material that need to be handled;  
- improving the quality of the local soil and groundwater conditions through a range of treatment processes; and  
- reusing, to the extent possible, the excavated soils locally as part of the development of the Lower Don Lands. Waterfront Toronto is in the process of developing a comprehensive framework to address these contaminated soils through an RA/RM approach. |
| Raised strong concerns regarding soils contamination. | Concerns of the long-term availability of funding to implement. | This is a major concern for us as well. We believe that the political will and support for implementation is now. Our primary focus is to obtain the |
Agreed that the original spit along the Cherry Street ROW likely played an important role in allow the ancestors of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation to access the Toronto Islands historically and agreed that excavating the new river channel in this area represented the highest probability of encountering possible historical artifacts in the study area. Reiterated the importance of ensuring protocols are in place to mitigate disturbance of possible artifacts and burial lands in this area during construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>necessary approvals and then move into the implementation stages shortly thereafter. Once the EA approvals have been received, the plans that have been drafted will have a stronger footing to leverage the necessary public funds for implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The DMNP EA will detail standard archaeological surveying and monitoring protocols be applied as part of the detailed design and construction work plan for the project, especially where the new river valley crosses the Cherry St spit alignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to a question relating to other First Nations occupying this area historically, Chief LaForms stated “The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation are the only First Nation with a claim to this area... and that the Mississaugas of the New Credit are the only people that are authorized to represent the interests of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation. The involvement of other First Nations would only be triggered in the event that during construction, historical artifacts or remains belonging to other First Nations were unearthed.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA has undertaken the DMNP EA from the beginning of the process with the understanding that the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation are the only community with a claim to this area, and as such, we recognize that our Duty to Consult with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation is of primary importance over the interests of other First Nation communities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, in order to be inclusive in our efforts to consultant, we have extended invitations to a number of First Nation communities to provide comment on the DMNP EA, and to identify any other concerns or issues not previously raised by the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To date, we have sent notices and newsletters to:

- Alderville First Nation – they have expressed interest specifying that we should ensure that opportunities for replanting the river mouth with vegetation species traditionally associated with First Nations communities be considered (i.e. wild rice, with carp controls)
| o Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation – no response  
| o Hiawatha First Nation – no response  
| o Curve Lake First Nation – no response  
| o Ogemawhj Nation - no response  
| o Anishnabek Nation – informed us to contact the individual First Nation communities with an interest in the area  
| o Kawartha-Nishnawbe First Nation – no response  
| o Huron-Wendat First Nation – expressed interest but did not raise specific issues  
| o Miziwe Biik – helps TRCA distribute information, newsletters and notices to the First Nation community living in the City of Toronto, and provides advice on our Community Liaison Committee (including reiteration that the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation are the primary First Nation community we should be consulting with)  
| o Chiefs of Ontario – expressed interest but did not raise specific issues  

Hi Ken and Reese

Ken,

I am no longer working at the Alderville Band office. I have forwarded this email to our Economic Development Officer Reese Simspnon.

Reese,

Hope things are well with you, if you have any questions please don't hesitate to email.

All the best,

Shari Beaver

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Ken Dion <kdion@trca.on.ca>
Date: Thu, Jul 16, 2009 at 9:15 AM
Subject: Re: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment
To: Shari Beaver <sharibeaver@gmail.com>

Good morning Shari

In reviewing our correspondence from earlier this year, I realized that we have not yet finalized a time to meet with Chief Marsden, yourself and the rest of the Council of the Alderville First Nation to discuss the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA.

I was wondering if you were still interested in having us come up to visit you some time this summer?

Sincerely,

Ken Dion
Hi Ken,

Sorry about the delay, I am waiting to get a schedule from Chief and Council for when they would be available for the presentation.

As for the vegetation I spoke to Jeff Beaver who has a wealth of knowledge about traditional plants and he suggested planting wildrice. The reason for this is that the plant can neutralize the water as well as work as a filter. It is a great source of food for fish, wildlife and birds. Also he was thinking that when people refer to Hay Bay or Grassy Narrows, it wasn't grass that was there it was actually wild rice. The chances that the wild rice might have already been in The Don is good, because when First Nations traveled along the waterways they planted rice where they settled.

The only concern is, if there are a lot of Carp present in The Don, then planting the rice won't work because they eat it, Carp are one of the invasive species that have depleted the Wild Rice in Ontario.

I hope this helps.

Shari Beaver
Consultation Coordinator
Alderville First Nation
On Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 9:30 AM, Ken Dion <KDion@trca.on.ca> wrote:

Dear Shari Beaver,

Thank you for your email. We would be most interested in hearing from you regarding your thoughts on natural vegetation in the design, and we would be pleased to meet with you, your Chief and Council to discuss the project in detail.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Regards
Ken Dion
Dear Ken Dion,

Thank you for your letter in regards to the Environmental Assessment on the Don. I am the Consultation Coordinator here in Alderville First Nation. I am going to bring this topic up to my Chief and Council. I read the information provided and think that there is some significance to our community, I also might have some suggestion about natural vegetation that could be considered to help with the invasive plants issue.
I'm out of the office for the next few days, but do have email access should you have any questions.

Thank-you for your time.

Sincerely,

Shari Beaver
Consultation Coordinator
Alderville First Nation
Hello Margaret

Adele and I wanted to thank you once again for arranging today's meeting with yourself and Chief Laforme so that we can discuss with you, the status update for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. For the purpose of documentation, I have enclosed the following text that provides a summary of our discussion. If you see anything that is incorrect or missing, please let me know and I will make those changes.

**General Discussion:**

Our sense of the discussion today was that Chief Laforme and yourself were supportive of the intent and direction for the proposed naturalization works for the mouth of the Don River, and that your most significant concerns were related to the lack of funding available at this time to implement the project, and that the plan, as defined in the EA, could be undermined over time in the absence of this funding, due to interim pressures to use these lands for other potentially non-compatible uses.

**Topic Specific Discussions:**

1) Ques - During TRCA's last visit, a number of different possible river alignments were presented. Are those still on the table?

   **Ans** - No, the last in summer 2008 was to show the results of the evaluation of potential river alignments. At the time, we had identified that the alternative 4WS was our preliminary preferred alternative, subject to a number of additional hydraulic, navigation and soils/groundwater studies that were needed to confirm our preliminary results. In mid-2009, we confirmed the selection of the preliminary preferred alternative, and provided more details as to how the preferred alternative would look and function. We are now proceeding with a preliminary phasing/construction approach, detailed effects assessment and mitigation, and the proposed monitoring and adaptive management strategy.

2) Ques - Is the Ship Channel currently used?

   **Ans** - Yes, Use of the Ship Channel for shipping will likely increase with the relocation of industry from the LDL area to the Turning Basin in the future. Ship Channel primarily used for the shipping of aggregates and road salt.

3) Ques - How will contaminated soils be dealt with?

   **Ans** - DMNP EA will be reliant on Waterfront Toronto's comprehensive soils and groundwater management strategy. Waterfront Toronto is currently undergoing an international competition to invite different technologies to "test treat" soils from the area to determine the most effective and cost effective technology to remediate the soils for reuse in the area in order to avoid digging and dumping to other locations (to the extent possible).

   **ACTION** - TRCA will provide a copy of WT's Call for Proposals to Margaret for their interest. (Attached Below)

4) Ques - Are there any species of concern in the area already?

   **Ans** - for the most part, no. There are some occasional sightings of interesting fish species that have
been documented over the last 10 years - walleye, chinook salmon, pike. However, the prevalence of fish are invasives and less desirable fish species (carp, alewife, etc). As far as vegetation is concerned, very little of significance is currently within the study area. The fish sightings suggests that with the creation of high quality fish habitat to the area, the potential major ecological gains is very high (ie. the fish are there now with nowhere to go).

5) Ques - Are there houses in the floodplain currently?

Ans - Yes - in the south riverdale/leslieville area. The Port Lands mainly contains industrial and vacate lands. People living in the south riverdale and leslieville areas are not exposed to river flooding until very large flood events. More likely to be flooded due to sewer back-ups, rather than flooding from the river. The DMNP EA only deals with flooding from the River, which, though less likely to occur than the sewer flooding, the wide spread potential impacts of such flooding are severe.

6) Ques - Does the Waterfront Trail go through this area?

Ans - Yes, along the Martin Goodman Trail. However, the current alignment goes through extensive industrial areas - the future trail alignment will be far more engaging and scenic than current conditions.

ACTION - TRCA to provide information on next year’s Great Waterfront Trail Adventure (biking from Niagara to the Quebec Border along the Waterfront Trail route). Please find the enclosed website link to register in next year’s ride to be held on July 10, 2010.
http://www.waterfronttrail.org/gwta_web/

7) Ques - How long will it take for the project to be complete?

Ans - We roughly estimate about 10 years to build if funding was available now. Plans are to proceed with obtaining EA approvals and revise the Official Plan to reflect the EA to leverage funding to implement.

8) Ques - How do we avoid having the EA approvals and recommendations become obsolete in 5 years if no funding available immediately given interim pressures and changes over time?

Ans - a) The EA has been designed to incorporate a robust monitoring, re-assessment and adaptive management component to the approvals to ensure that the EA approvals remain pertinent to address change over time.
   b) The EA will be used to revise the Official Plan so that any development plans, initiatives that occur during the interim period are approved and implemented in conformance to the Official Plan and more specifically, are in conformance to the DMNP EA specifications.

9) Ques - Does the Panam Games help or impede the plans and/or build-out of the DMNP EA?

Ans - They are not anticipated to impede the plans as they are currently identified primarily in the WDL area. There is currently some idea that playing fields may be developed in the 480 Lakeshore Boulevard area, but some other discussion have been underway perhaps to relocate them to other areas to the east of the River, north of Lake Shore Boulevard.

10) Ques - How can members of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation be involved in the Project?

Ans - a) ACTION - TRCA will look into opportunities corporately for student involvement in archaeological field school program, electrofishing surveys, and future summer field staff job postings and will coordinate through Margaret.
   b) ACTION - TRCA will look into arranging with Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto’s Aboriginal Affairs Community Advisory Committee the possibility of a waterfront tour for the elders and Band Council, including perhaps an evening of electrofishing along the waterfront during the summer.
11) ACTION - A hard and digital copy of the EA pre-submission will be sent to Margaret in March, prior to the official submission anticipated in May.

Again, we greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with you both this morning.

Sincerely,

Ken

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.

Thank you.

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Dear Ms. Simpson,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address:  Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue  5 Shoreham Drive
Downview, ON, M3K 2C5  Downview, ON, M3N 1S4
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Dear Mr. Lainé and Ms. Bastien,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. The project site is located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kodion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Dear Ms. McCue,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

Past newsletter releases on this project were sent directly to Chief Knott via regular mail.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc  
Senior Project Manager  
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority  
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230  
Fax: 416-667-6278  
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address:  
70 Canuck Avenue  
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5

Head Office:  
5 Shoreham Drive  
Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4
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"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby
Dear Chief Carr,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4

DMNP EA_Newsletter, Vol #8 January 2010.pdf

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Dear Ms. Paradis,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-561-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address:          Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue          5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5    Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4
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"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Dear Chief Nahrgang,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4
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I will forward this to our Consultation Specialist, Sophie Sliwa but please send any further correspondence to consultation@scugogfirstnation.com in the future please.

Chief Tracy Gauthier  
Mississsaugas of Scugog Island First Nation  
22521 Island Rd.  
Port Perry, ON, L9L 1B6  
Phone: (905) 985-3337  
Fax: (905) 985-8828  
Email: tgauthier@scugogfirstnation.com  

From: Ken Dion [mailto:KDion@trca.on.ca]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2010 2:31 PM  
To: Tracy Gauthier  
Subject: Newsletter Update - Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Dear Chief Gauthier,

Please find the enclosed newsletter update for the Environmental Assessment for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. The project site is located along the central waterfront of downtown Toronto.

If you have any comments, questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I would be happy to discuss any element of the project with you.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: 70 Canuck Avenue  
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5  
Head Office: 5 Shoreham Drive  
Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4
Thanks for forwarding the article along, Adele, as I hadn't seen it yet. I was at a meeting on Tuesday at Curve Lake FN when the legal council for the 7 Williams Treaty nations (including some Mississaugua nations, but not New Credit) got the news about the offer. She said that the offer is going to go to the community via referendum. The group in that room seemed quite pleased for their 'relations'.

I presume that the duty to consult will not end with the resolution to the land claim, as I expect that the Treaty that was signed way back when will continue to exist once the two parties have agreed that the original compensation for the access to land (or lack thereof) has been settled. Moreover, from what I understand there are at least two levels of responsibility re: duty to consult: one being where there is an established reserve or land claim (there may be differences between those two distinctions), and one based on Aboriginal rights in the Canadian Constitution -- the latter of which I imagine will still apply as it does in non-Treaty areas within a Nation's traditional territory. The bottom line is that there could remain to be burials and other sacred areas within the Treaty area/traditional territory that continue to be of importance to that Nation.

I'm sure Margaret Sault from New Credit will enlighten us further once/if this agreement is accepted.

Cathy Crippen, M.A., APA
Archaeologist
Archaeology Resource Management Services
Restoration Services
Toronto and Region Conservation
(416) 661-6600 Ext 5323 / (416) 895-7185 (cell)
(416) 667-6289 (fax)
email: ccrippen@trca.on.ca

-----Adele Freeman/MTRCA wrote: -----
Attached is the article I mentioned this morning re the above.

bev

Beverley Thorpe
CTC SWP Project Manager
416-484-1807
Cell 416-844-3875
bevthorpe@sympatico.ca
secondary email for copies only - bthorpe@trca.on.ca

The contents of this email and any attached files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify Beverley Thorpe at the above address immediately. Thank you.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Toronto_purchase_land_claim.pdf
Band offered $145-million for land lost in 1805

Government to compensate Mississaugas after British paid them 10 shillings for land now occupied by Toronto

BY ANTHONY REINHART

For the modern-day price of a camping hatchet at Canadian Tire, the British sold Toronto land worth $145 million today, and the Mississaugas are demanding compensation for land they were paid 10 shillings for 180 years ago.

The Toronto Purchase in 1805 was the largest land claim settlement in Canadian history.

"It's a good start for us and it prepares us for the future," Chief Bryan LaForme, who leads the First Nation of Metis, said at a press conference Monday.

The Mississaugas filed two suits in the late 1990s, when negotiations leading to Monday's announcement began.

The Toronto Purchase, as it came to be known, dates back to a 1797 meeting at Yorkinagin, near what is now Belleville, in appreciation for the Mississauga's military support during the American Revolution. British officials gave them presents, including a large blanket and a dog named "Rum," among other things.

At the time, the British were looking for land to replace the Lake Superior to Lake Huron that they had purchased from the Iroquois in 1764.

Kim Fullerton, lawyer for the Mississaugas, said the British went ahead and settled York (later Toronto), and "it wasn't until the 1970s that the head of the Upper Canada government pulled out the old deed and said "Holy crap," he said, most likely paraphrasing. "There was no description of the land surrendered ... and they really didn't know what to do."

An 1805 meeting with new Mississauga chiefs ended in a sketchy transaction whereby the British claimed they had bought twice as much territory as was actually discussed in 1797, oblivious to the substance of those previous talks, the new chiefs chose to trust them but asked for a small sum as a confirmation of good faith.

"That's when the British came back the next day and gave them 10 shillings," Fullerton said. It's about 10 bucks ... and 10 bucks was worth more than it is now, but it's still two bucks."

About $47 in current Canadian dollars.

While Ottawa's offer of $145 million is exponentially less than the billions Greater Toronto would fork today, the question was "what should the British Crown have paid them in 1805" and "how do you bring that amount forward to today's dollars?" the lawyer said.

Mr. Straith's sum, while lower than hoped, "is a substantial offer and one that merits considerable by the members," Fullerton said. "People living in Toronto can presumably hold their heads high now ... and say, We can have a little bit more pride in the foundation of our city."

THE TORONTO 18

Bomb plotter not entrapped, Crown argues

BRAMPTON

A Toronto 18 member found guilty in a plot to bomb Canadian targets was not a participant in the terror plot and not a bystander used by police to reach one of the group's leaders, prosecutors argued yesterday.

Crown lawyer Croft Michaelson dismissed defence arguments that Sharif Abdelhaleem was involved in the bomb plot.

Abdelhaleem was found guilty last week of plotting to bomb financial, intelligence and military targets, but the judge did not enter a conviction on the entrapment motion.

Abdelhaleem and 17 others were arrested and charged with terrorism offences in 2000 and came to be known as the Toronto 18. The hearing continues today.

II The Canadian Press
Hello Margaret

I was revisiting our action items below. It appears that I did not attach the RFP from Waterfront Toronto regarding the innovative soils remediation technology pilot study.

Please find the attached document for your information.

Regards
Ken

4b47e281b0b3.pdf
------ Forwarded by Ken Dion/MTRCA on 02/03/2010 02:51 PM ------

Hello Margaret

Adele and I wanted to thank you once again for arranging today's meeting with yourself and Chief LaForme so that we can discuss with you, the status update for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. For the purpose of documentation, I have enclosed the following text that provides a summary of our discussion. If you see anything that is incorrect or missing, please let me know and I will make those changes.

General Discussion:

Our sense of the discussion today was that Chief LaForme and yourself were supportive of the intent and direction for the proposed naturalization works for the mouth of the Don River, and that your most significant concerns were related to the lack of funding available at this time to implement the project, and that the plan, as defined in the EA, could be undermined over time in the absence of this funding, due to interim pressures to use these lands for other potentially non-compatible uses.

Topic Specific Discussions:

1) Ques - During TRCA's last visit, a number of different possible river alignments were presented. Are those still on the table?

Ans - No, the last in summer 2008 was to show the results of the evaluation of potential river alignments. At the time, we had identified that the alternative 4WS was our preliminary preferred alternative, subject to a number of additional hydraulic, navigation and soils/groundwater studies that were needed to confirm our preliminary results. In mid-2009, we confirmed the selection of the preliminary preferred alternative, and provided more details as to how the preferred alternative would look and function. We are now
proceeding with a preliminary phasing /construction approach, detailed effects assessment and mitigation, and the proposed monitoring and adaptive management strategy.

2) Ques - Is the Ship Channel currently used?

Ans - Yes, Use of the Ship Channel for shipping will likely increase with the relocation of industry from the LDL area to the Turning Basin in the future. Ship Channel primarily used for the shipping of aggregates and road salt.

3) Ques - How will contaminated soils be dealt with?

Ans - DMNP EA will be reliant on Waterfront Toronto's comprehensive soils and groundwater management strategy. Waterfront Toronto is currently undergoing an international competition to invite different technologies to "test treat" soils from the area to determine the most effective and cost effective technology to remediate the soils for reuse in the area in order to avoid digging and dumping to other locations (to the extent possible).

ACTION - TRCA will provide a copy of WT's Call for Proposals to Margaret for their interest. (Attached Below)

4) Ques - Are there any species of concern in the area already?

Ans - For the most part, no. There are some occasional sightings of interesting fish species that have been documented over the last 10 years - walleye, chinook salmon, pike. However, the prevalence of fish are invasives and less desirable fish species (carp, alewife, etc). As far as vegetation is concerned, very little of significance is currently within the study area. The fish sightings suggests that with the creation of high quality fish habitat to the area, the potential major ecological gains is very high (ie. the fish are there now with nowhere to go).

5) Ques - Are there houses in the floodplain currently?

Ans - Yes - in the south riverdale/leslieville area. The Port Lands mainly contains industrial and vacate lands. People living in the south riverdale and leslieville areas are not exposed to river flooding until very large flood events. More likely to be flooded due to sewer back-ups, rather than flooding from the river. The DMNP EA only deals with flooding from the River, which, though less likely to occur than the sewer flooding, the wide spread potential impacts of such flooding are severe.

6) Ques - Does the Waterfront Trail go through this area?

Ans - Yes, along the Martin Goodman Trail. However, the current alignment goes through extensive industrial areas - the future trail alignment will be more engaging and scenic than current conditions.

ACTION - TRCA to provide information on next year's Great Waterfront Trail Adventure (biking from Niagara to the Quebec Border along the Waterfront Trail route). Please find the enclosed website link to register in next year's ride to be held on July 10, 2010.
http://www.waterfronttrail.org/gwta_web/

7) Ques - How long will it take for the project to be complete?

Ans - We roughly estimate about 10 years to build if funding was available now. Plans are to proceed with obtaining EA approvals and revise the Official Plan to reflect the EA to leverage funding to implement.

8) Ques - How do we avoid having the EA approvals and recommendations become obsolete in 5 years if no funding available immediately given interim pressures and changes over time?

Ans - a) The EA has been designed to incorporate a robust monitoring, re-assessment and adaptive
management component to the approvals to ensure that the EA approvals remain pertinent to address change over time.

b) The EA will be used to revise the Official Plan so that any development plans, initiatives that occur during the interim period are approved and implemented in conformance to the Official Plan and more specifically, are in conformance to the DMNP EA specifications.

9) Ques - Does the Panam Games help or impede the plans and/or build-out of the DMNP EA?

Ans - They are not anticipated to impede the plans as they are currently identified primarily in the WDL area. There is currently some idea that playing fields may be developed in the 480 Lakeshore Boulevard area, but some other discussion have been underway perhaps to relocate them to other areas to the east of the River, north of Lake Shore Boulevard.

10) Ques - How can members of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation be involved in the Project?

Ans - a) ACTION - TRCA will look into opportunities corporately for student involvement in archaeological field school program, electrofishing surveys, and future summer field staff job postings and will coordinate through Margaret.

b) ACTION - TRCA will look into arranging with Waterfront Toronto and City of Toronto's Aboriginal Affairs Community Advisory Committee the possibility of a waterfront tour for the elders and Band Council, including perhaps an evening of electrofishing along the waterfront during the summer.

11) ACTION - A hard and digital copy of the EA pre-submission will be sent to Margaret in March, prior to the official submission anticipated in May.

Again, we greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with you both this morning.

Sincerely,

Ken

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.

Thank you."
"Bob Stevenato" <bob.stevenato@sympatico.ca>
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To
"Shelley Gray" <sgray@aldervillefirstnation.ca>, "anne taylor" <mongohnse@live.ca>, "Melissa Dokis" "Allen Li" <all3@toronto.ca>, "Tracey Ehl" "<Tracey@ehlarrison.com>, "Ken Dion" <kDion@trca.on.ca>

Subject Don River & Central Waterfront Project

Date: March 24, 2010
Time: 11:00 a.m. - 3:00pm
Location: Casino Rama

Present: Chiefs of Mississauga and Chippewa FN re. 1923 Williams Treaty, Tracey Ehl (EHC), Bob Stevenato (EHC), Rob Bishop (MMM), Allen Li (City of Toronto), Adele Freeman, Paul Murray (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)

1. Introductions
2. 11:00-12:00 Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection EA
3. 12:00-1:00 Lunch
4. 1:00-3:00 Don River & Central Waterfront Project
   • Project Information & Update
   • Proposed Locations for Capital Projects
   • Archaeological Findings to Date
   • Protocol re. Archaeological Findings
   • Next Steps
5. Other Issues
6. Adjournment

Don River and Central Waterfront Project

Please let us know as soon as possible if you will be able to attend (& how many will attend) so we can plan for the lunch.

Don River and Central Waterfront Project – Background Information

We have requested to meet with you because the 1923 Williams Treaty land claim area extends to the Don River watershed and the City of Toronto portion of the Don River is included in our study area. Our project, the City of Toronto "Don River and Central Waterfront Project", is a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment.

The City of Toronto's waterfront is plagued by poor water quality. Due to limited capacity, combined sewers (carrying both rainwater and sewage) overflow into the Don River and Inner Harbour of Lake Ontario during heavy rain periods, polluting the waterways and impacting recreational use and fish/bird habitats.
The Don River and Central Waterfront Project will find a solution to collect and treat these combined sewer overflows and upgrade our sewers where necessary to bring harmony to the environment.

Preliminary options have been identified to improve water quality of the Don River and Central Waterfront, including: a system of tunnels connected to vertical storage shafts which will collect and temporarily store sewer overflows until they can be transported to new treatment facilities; and underground storage tanks to help provide for future growth as well as for remote combined sewer outfall locations.

We would like to discuss with you:

- the benefits to mother earth we hope to achieve with this project;
- proposed locations of facilities/infrastructure,
- preferred methods to improve the sewer system.
- archaeological protocols and process if remains, artifacts, sacred burial grounds and/or carrying places are uncovered during construction,
- treaty rights as related to this project.

To find out more about the project:

- contact our First Nations consultant, Bob Stevenato, 416-229-2115, or bob.stevenato@sympatico.ca.
- visit our project website: www.toronto.ca/involved/projects/cleanwaterways

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

We are working closely with the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to coordinate with its "Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA" to achieve benefits for the environment and people. This project will be completed over the next few months. Primary efforts for consultation have been with the Mississaugas of the New Credit, given that the project is in the area of the Toronto Purchase Specific Claim. The 1923 Williams Treaty Mississauga First Nations have received project updates over the last couple of years via email and hard copies of the Project Newsletter. The objective for the meeting would be to:

- provide a project summary of Don Mouth Naturalization & Port Lands Flood Protection Project;
- answer questions and discuss concerns;
- next steps.

We look forward to talking about this project with you.
MEETING WITH 1923 WILLIAMS TREATIES FIRST NATIONS
REGARDING DON MOUTH NATURALIZATION AND PORT LANDS FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT EA

Location: Casino Rama
Date: March 24, 2010 (11:00am - 12:00pm)

Attendees:

| Rob Bishop, Marshall Macklin Monaghan (Consultant for the City of Toronto) | Andrew Big Canoe, Georgina Island First Nation | Rhonda Coppaway, Scugog First Nation |
| Tracey Ehl, EHC (Consultant for the City of Toronto) | Adele Freeman, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority | Shelley Gray, Alderville First Nation |
| Allan Li (City of Toronto) | Karry Sandy McKenzie, Representative for the Curve Lake and Beausoleil First Nations | Paul C. Murray, AECOM (Consultant for TRCA) |
| Lori Ritter, Hiawatha First Nation | Sophie, Sliwa, Scugog First Nation | Bob Stevenato, EHC (Consultant for the City of Toronto) |
| Sheri Wilson, Rama First Nation | |

MEETING SUMMARY

A meeting was held with representatives of the 1923 Williams Treaty First Nations. This summary outline the discussion at the meeting regarding the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA). The following key points, outcomes and actions were noted:

1. Tracey Ehl (EHC) provided an introduction to the meeting and an outline of the agenda
2. Paul Murray (Aecom) presented an overview of the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and outlined the elements of the preferred alternative, benefits, impacts and next steps. Copies of the presentation were provided to those in attendance.

3. Questions and Discussion:

**Question** - What level of archaeological assessment was undertaken?
**Response** - The firm ASI undertook a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the project area, which was summarized in a report titled "Existing Conditions Report - Archaeology Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project" (November 2007). This study was undertaken in accordance to the Ministry of Culture’s Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists (MCL 2006). This study built upon a number of studies undertaken within the project area, which included:

- Cultural Heritage Study: In support of the Environmental Assessment for the Naturalization and Flood Protection for the Lower Don River (TRCA, 2004)
- "Archaeological Master Plan of the Central Waterfront" (ASI 2003)
- "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the East Bayfront, West Donlands and Portlands Areas" (ASI and HRL 2004); and
- These lands are being considered within Waterfront Toronto’s Archaeological Conservation and Management Strategy.

**Question** - When will the EA be available for review?
**Response** - The intent is to release a Pre-Submission Draft of the EA to the Ministry of Environment and interested stakeholders towards the end of June 2010 in order to receive any remaining comments in advance of the official submission. A CD containing the near final draft of the EA can be made available at this time for your review. Currently the EA is more than 450 pages long, with Appendices adding an additional 1500 pages.

**NOTE** - We are currently compiling our distribution list for our upcoming pre-submission release of the draft DMNP EA document at the end of June 2010. Please inform us where you would like us to send the CD containing the draft DMNP EA.

**Question** - How much of the site is located on created land?
**Response** - The entire project area is being constructed on lakefill overlying the former Ashbridges Bay wetland.

**Question** - How much of the new mouth of the Don will be artificially created?
**Response** - The new naturalized portions of the Don mouth will be constructed from lands currently consisting of former industrial lands and have been designed to mimic/replicate other natural coastal wetlands currently found along the north shore of Lake Ontario. The current Keating Channel will be retained and modified in order to enhance its ecological function while providing additional benefits for flood protection.

**Question** - How will Sediment be managed/removed?
**Response** - Sediment will be captured in a sediment trap proposed for north of Lake Shore Boulevard and will be conveyed to and dewatered in the...
Ship Channel before being barged to Tommy Thompson Park. However there is an opportunity to reuse some of this material for the construction on site, and potentially for the park and promontory. Sediment has been managed in this area for many years with dredging of the Keating Channel to reduce the potential for serious flooding in the surrounding areas and to maintain navigation in the Inner Harbour.

Q - Has soil testing for contaminants been carried out?
R - There has been extensive soil testing in the area for many years. Many borehole samples have been undertaken in the past and an additional 68 boreholes, of which 48 also acted as monitoring wells, were undertaken as part of this project. Waterfront Toronto is developing a process for the entire portlands area to deal with contaminated soils. Their preferred solution would be to treat within the area and reuse if possible. A pilot soil management facility should be underway shortly.

Q - What impacts will the Project have on Lake Ontario, as it relates to the expected contaminants and their management?
R - The Project will help to clean up Lake Ontario and improve fish and wildlife habitats in the vicinity of the Project. Contaminants identified via boreholes and excavated materials will be treated and reused or disposed of if necessary. The depth of excavations will vary for various components of the Project.

Q - What fish are in the Don and in the Harbour?
R - TRCA’s fisheries monitoring program has identified that minnows, carp and brown bullheads are quite common in the Keating Channel and Lower Don. However, we do have regular occurrences of walleye, northern pike, and salmonids using the lower Don as well.

Note - Excerpts from draft Chapter 3 of the EA have been added to provide more details of the fish communities and habitat conditions at the mouth of the Don.

If you have any concerns, questions or changes regarding the above summary, please direct them to Ken Dion at your convenience.
From: RWilliamson@iasi.to [mailto:RWilliamson@iasi.to]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2009 2:29 PM
To: rwilliamson@iasi.to
Subject: FW: Opinion Letter for Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation

FYI, in case you have not received this.

Ronald F. Williamson, PhD, CAHP
Chief Archaeologist and Managing Partner
Archaeological Services Inc.
528 Bathurst Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 2P9

416-966-1069-228
416-966-9723 (fax)

------- Forwarded by Ron Williamson/iASI on 04/13/2009 02:07 PM -------

Spirit of the Stone <info@spiritofthestone.ca>

04/06/2009 11:25 PM
To undisclosed-recipients:;
cc
Subject
Opinion Letter for Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation
Hi Ken,

It was a pleasure meeting you and Brenda last week. Melanie and I are very impressed with the Don Mouth Revitalization Project and are thrilled about the opportunity that the Métis community has in participating and making it a reality. Just as important, we feel that this is an excellent “spring board” in developing a great partnership between the Métis Nation of Ontario and the Toronto Region Conservation Authority.

I would like to address each action item.
1) Melanie and James will arrange for us to meet the elected Council in Toronto, perhaps the Oshawa and Credit River Councils and to present the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. This meeting will likely occur in the next few weeks in the evening or on the weekend.
This week - Through email and over the phone I will be informing the Toronto York Métis Council about the project and the opportunity to meet. I hope we will be able to set something up for mid to late June. As everyone in the community are volunteers, I anticipate a meeting sometime during the weekend.

2) TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the Metis Nation of Ontario will continue discussions regarding how we can cooperative in generating the required funding to proceed from the EA stage to project implementation.
I will leave the next phone call to be between you and Melanie to discuss any next steps or direction for obtaining funding.

3) Ken will relay your interest in participating at next year’s Paddle the Don Event. (Follow-up: The organizers of the event, Joanna and Keri - cc’ed above, and the Don Watershed Council were very pleased to hear of your interest to participate in next year’s event).
We will discuss this with the Toronto York Métis Council during their meeting.

4) Ken will relay your interest in meeting with our Archaeology Department to discuss opportunities for collaboration and research in our jurisdiction. (Follow-up: I have cc’ed our Archaeologist above - Cathy Crinnion, and will be meeting with her later today to bring her up to speed on our discussion from yesterday).
Please provide Cathy’s email address, and I will follow up with her. We may have an opportunity to provide historical relevance to the site and
cultural importance to its revitalization.

Ken, you may have noticed by now, that this email is only addressed to you and Melanie. Unfortunately, you had inserted my email incorrectly. It is jamesw@metisnation.org. Don't worry about it, but please forward this email to the original list of recipients.

Speaking for the Métis Nation of Ontario, I am strongly encouraged about the positive relationship we are growing and look forward to the Don Mouth Project and other initiatives to follow.

Miigwetch - Merci - Thank You

James W. Wagar

Consultation Assessment Coordinator
Lands, Resources and Consultation
Métis Nation of Ontario
75 Sherbourne St., Suite 222
Toronto, Ontario M5A 2P9

Toll Free: 888.466.6684
Tel: 416.977.9881 ext.107
Cell: 905.447.6612
Fax: 416.977.9911
JamesW@metisnation.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This e-mail may be privileged and/or confidential, and the sender does not waive any related rights and obligations. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient is unauthorized. Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed within the e-mail are those of the sender. If you received this e-mail in error, please advise me (by e-mail or otherwise) immediately. Thank you.

From: Melanie Paradis
Sent: May 26, 2010 2:26 PM
To: James Wagar
2) TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the Metis Nation of Ontario will continue discussions regarding how we can cooperate in generating the required funding to proceed from the EA stage to project implementation.

3) Ken will relay your interest in participating at next year’s Paddle the Don Event. (Follow-up: The organizers of the event, Joanna and Keri - cc'ed above, and the Don Watershed Council were very pleased to hear of your interest to participate in next year’s event). 

4) Ken will relay your interest in meeting with our Archaeology Department to discuss opportunities for collaboration and research in our jurisdiction. (Follow-up: I have cc'ed our Archaeologist above - Cathy Crinnion, and will be meeting with her later today to bring her up to speed on our discussion from yesterday). 

Again, it was my pleasure to meet you yesterday and I look forward to meeting with you again soon.

Sincerely

Ken Dion

Kenneth Dion MSc
Senior Project Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Phone: 416-661-6600 ext. 5230
Fax: 416-667-6278
Email: kdion@trca.on.ca

Mailing Address: Head Office:
70 Canuck Avenue 5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON, M3K 2C5 Downsview, ON, M3N 1S4

"PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE"
Subject: FW: Follow-up to DMNP EA Meeting

Just realized this did not go to you.

Can you help follow-up on these action items?

Melanie Paradis  
Director of Lands, Resources and Consultation  
Metis Nation of Ontario  
75 Sherbourne St., Suite 222  
Toronto, ON M5A 2P9

Office: 416-977-9881 x 114  
Fax: 416-977-9911  
Mobile: 519-591-9219

From: Ken Dion [mailto:KDion@trca.on.ca]  
Sent: May 14, 2010 10:14 AM  
To: Melanie Paradis; jwagar@metisnation.org  
Cc: bwebster@waterfronttoronto.ca; Cathy Crinnion; Joanna Parsons; Keri McMahon; Adele Freeman  
Subject: Follow-up to DMNP EA Meeting

Good morning Melanie and James,

I just wanted to thank you for inviting us to your offices yesterday and I am sure that that was the first of many meetings to come as we move forward on this and other projects.

I just wanted to provide a quick summary of the key action items coming out of the conversation. If I miss anything, please feel free to correct and/or add:

**ACTION ITEMS**

1) Melanie and James will arrange for us to meet the elected Council in Toronto, perhaps the Oshawa and Credit River Councils and to present the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project. This meeting will likely occur in the next few weeks in the evening or on the weekend.
Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA

Métis Nation of Ontario
May 13, 2010

Agenda

1. Background to the Don Mouth EA
2. Benefits of the Project
3. Next Steps

Background to the Don Mouth EA

Coordination of Current Projects
What Does the Study Area Currently Look Like?

Project Goal

To establish and sustain the form, features, and functions of a natural river mouth within the context of a revitalized City environment while providing flood protection up to the Regulatory Flood.

Naturalization  Revitalized City Environment  Flood protection

Approved Terms of Reference for Don Mouth EA

2006

• 2 discharge points and 4 alternatives considered
• Focused primarily on flooding and naturalization
Design Competition

2007
- Integrating mixed use community with naturalization and recreation

Hydrology

River Characteristics - (Flow Rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Frequency (years)</th>
<th>Flow Rate (m^3/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Conditions (Extent of Flooding)
Creating the Valley Feature

1. Excavate to depth of valley
2. Fill adjacent lands

Flood Protection Measures

1. River Valley Formation
2. East Bank Flood Protection Landform
3. Removal of Utility Bridge
4. Channel Modification & Sediment Basin
5. Bridge Lengthening & Viens at Lake Shore Blvd.
6. Inflow Levee
7. Greenway Wetland and Floodway
8. Keating Channel Floodway

Existing Approach to Sediment Management

- Sediment currently managed within Keating Channel
- Clamshell dredge removes up to 40,000 m³ per year
- Barge with dredgeate is towed to Tommy Thompson Park for disposal
Sediment Management Area

1. Sediment Trap
2. Sediment/Debris Management Area
3. Debris Booms
4. Barge Dock
5. Sediment Hydraulic Conveyance Pipe
6. Accommodation for Access Shaft

Naturalization

Valley Channel Creation

Lake fed wetland
River channel
Lake fed wetland
Seepage wetland

Landscape Communities

- Open Space
- Valley Slope Transitions
- Levee System
- Lake Connected Wetlands
- Seepage Wetlands
- Aquatic
How Does this Design Fulfill the Project Goals?

- **Flood protection**
  - Protects Lower Don Lands and adjacent areas from flooding

- **Naturalization**
  - Creates high-quality habitat for aquatic and terrestrial species

- **Revitalized City Environment**
  - Integrates a naturalized valley system and a mixed use community

Benefits of the Project

- River system conveys flooding
  - Permanent removal of over 200 ha of land from flooding
  - Facilitates redevelopment of Lower Don Lands
  - Protection of life, existing uses, and property

- Creation of high quality habitat
  - Wetland = 13 hectares
  - Aquatic = 12 hectares plus Don Narrows
  - Terrestrial = 21 hectares (including open space for active and passive recreation)

  - Will support greater diversity of species than existing conditions
Provides recreational opportunities

- Open space uses
- Small-craft boating
- Multi-use trails (including Don and Martin Goodman)

Aligned with adjacent development

- Bridge crossings designed to convey Regulatory Flood
- Utility crossings designed to minimize existing and future impacts on naturalized valley system

Contaminant Management in Valley Feature

1. Excavate to depth of valley
2. Over-excavate to remove contaminated soils
3. Backfill with clean material
4. Install armouring

Management of soil and groundwater

- No significant sources of hazardous material have been found
- Management undertaken as part of Waterfront Toronto’s soils and groundwater management strategy
- Will either treat soil at nearby facility or dispose off-site
- Effects from handling soils will be minimized
- Will allow for redevelopment of brownfield site
Management of river operations

- Sediment management will:
  - ensure flood protection
  - maintain viability of vegetation communities
  - protect for navigation
  - extend life expectancy of Tommy Thompson Park containment cell
- Debris management will:
  - benefit safe navigation
  - ensure flood protection
- Control of flows will:
  - manage against ice jams
  - protect naturalized system from damage during large flood events

Economic spinoffs

- Removal of flood risk and subsequent redevelopment will
  - increase property values
  - encourage investment
  - increase City’s tax base
- Construction will create and sustain direct and indirect jobs

Next Steps

Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto staff report</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EA report review</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Provincial EA report (public review through MOE process)</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Federal EA report</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA approval (anticipated)</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction</td>
<td>Timing subject to funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effects of Construction and Mitigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of 8 hectares of low quality aquatic habitat</td>
<td>• Create high quality aquatic habitat within new river channel and associated wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of 2,700 metres of dockwall</td>
<td>• Address loss of dockwall with Toronto Port Authority (TPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new river channel and associated wetlands</td>
<td>• Create new shoreline for recreational watercraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of 2 heritage buildings (avoiding others)</td>
<td>• Relocate or otherwise commemorate Marine Terminal and Atlas Crane and TPA maintenance units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement / disruption of 3 private landowners (avoiding others)</td>
<td>• Relocate and compensate Lafarge, T&amp;T, and Unilever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of soil and groundwater</td>
<td>• Provide alternative access during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic (road, rail, and trail) disruption</td>
<td>• Maintain existing servicing until new connections can be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing disruption</td>
<td>• Economic benefits of mixed-use redevelopment and protection against financial loss from flooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monitoring and Adaptive Management
Monitoring

• Collect information to confirm whether changes are happening
  – Are the pre-construction conditions changing?
  – Do the detailed design and construction activities reflect what was described in the EA?
  – Does the future river perform as anticipated?

What is Adaptive Management?

• Process to understand changing conditions and respond accordingly
  – Climate change
  – Invasive species
  – Lake level fluctuations
  – Change in regulations
• Necessary to ensure that river functions as designed

Project Objectives

1. Naturalize and rehabilitate mouth of the Don River
2. Provide flood protection for Spill Zones 1 and 2
3. Manage sediment, debris and ice
4. Integrate infrastructure
5. Encourage recreation, cultural heritage opportunities and accessibility
6. Contribute to revitalization and sustainability of waterfront
7. Design and implement this project in a sustainable manner

Naturalizations Assumptions

• Design to provide mix of aquatic, wetland, and upland communities
• Wetlands fed primarily by lake, not river
• A range of wetland access controls will be considered to reduce the presence of invasive species
• Vegetation communities expected to be highly disturbed following very large flood events
Step 3
Lakefilling of Southern Promontory
Excavation and Grading of River Mouth (Reach 4)

Step 4
Construction of Remainder of Floodplain (Reaches 2 and 3)

Step 5
Construction of Sediment and Debris Management Area
Establishment of Flood Protection Features

Step 6
Keating Channel (Reach 2a)
Good afternoon,

We wanted to keep you informed regarding project related activities and updates for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA)

Work is underway to amend the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Environmental Assessment (DMNP EA) and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure Class Environmental Assessment (LDL EA).

These changes are based on the Realigned 4WS Option that was endorsed by Council following the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) in 2012.

A public meeting was held on July 24th, 2013 to provide an update on the proposed changes to the DMNP and LDL EAs and to seek feedback on the updated plans. The attached draft summary provides highlights of overall feedback, followed by participants’ questions of clarification and answers provided by project team members at the meeting. Should you have any comments and/or suggested edits to this draft summary, please forward them to Alex Heath (aheath@swerhun.com) no later than Wednesday, September 4th, 2013. Meeting material, including a project backgrounder, agenda, display boards, and presentation, are available for download on the project website at www.trca.on.ca/dmnpea

If you have any questions regarding the status of the DMNP EA, or wish to be removed from the DMNP EA distribution list, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Alexis Wood, BSc, MES
Project Manager, Highland Creek Watershed | Toronto and Region Conservation | Head Office - 5 Shoreham Dr. North York, ON M3N 1S4 | Mailing Address – 70 Canuck Avenue, Toronto, ON M3K 2C5 | email: awood@trca.on.ca | phone: 416 661-6600 ext 5243 | fax: 416-667-6278 | web: www.trca.on.ca
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative 2013

Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment

&

Lower Don Lands Master Plan Environmental Assessment Study

William’s Treaty First Nations Meeting
August 28, 2013
Port Lands Planning Context

- **2004-2007**
  - DMNP EA

- **2007**
  - Central Waterfront Secondary Plan
  - Lower Don Lands Design Competition

- **2007-2010**
  - DMNP EA
  - Official Plan Amendment 388

- **2011-2013**
  - LDL MP EA
  - LDL MP EA Revision

- **2014**
  - Amended Secondary Plan
October 2012 City Council Direction

- Amend the DMNP EA based on the 2012 “4WS Re-aligned” option and submit to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for approval;
- Revise the Lower Don Lands (LDL) Master Plan and Keating Channel Precinct Class EA to align with the PLAI direction;
- Protect the proposed valley and stream corridors from encroachment by development;
- Complete a high-level framework plan for the entire Port Lands;
- Confirm precinct boundaries and initiate precinct planning, inclusive of business and implementation planning, for the Cousins Quay, Polson Quay and Film Studio Precincts.
The Need for Flood Protection

- Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land

Purpose of DMNP EA also establishes:
- River channel and Greenway configurations for flood conveyance
- Naturalization and city building
- Flood protection requirements
- Minimum elevations for surrounding lands
- Proposed phasing strategy for removing regulatory flood zone
- Adaptive management strategy
The LDL MP EA Study:
• Servicing infrastructure necessary to support revitalization and refines it to coincide with the optimized river valley.
• Phases 3 and 4 are being completed for Schedule C projects including streets and coordinated stormwater management infrastructure.
• Minimum elevations of bridges and roads to match DMNP EA
2012 PLAI Phasing

EXISTING

PHASE 1

PHASE 2

PHASE 3

COMPLETION OF THE PHASING

- flood area
- raised Don Roadway
- developable area
- spillway
- sediment basin

DMNP EA & LDL MP EA Study | August 28, 2013
Public Meeting | Slide 6
2013 PLAI Optimized Phasing – Overview

Phase 1
Phase 2
Phase 3
Phase 4
Phase 1 Greenway no longer necessary
Construct new Keating Channel bridge
Remove old Keating Channel bridge and abutments
2013 PLAI – Phase 1 – Development

- Raise and fill Cousins and Polson Quay Precincts (including 309 Cherry, excluding Lafarge)
- Realign and reconstruct Cherry Street
- Fill Essroc Quay
2013 PLAI – Phase 2 – Flood Protection

- Construct Greenway
- Construct flood protection landform on First Gulf site
- Construct valley wall feature on east side of Don Roadway
- Modify Eastern Avenue underpass
- Construct sediment and debris management area including lengthening of Lake Shore bridge
Development to Munitions Block
- Film Studio District Precinct and lands east of Don Roadway are flood protected
Construct Polson Slip bridge

Construct river valley system, including the low flow channel and flood control weirs
2013 PLAI – Phase 3 – Development

- River Valley Precincts
- Construct Basin Street bridge
- Raise and fill north and south of river valley
• Naturalize Polson Quay south dockwall
Building the permanent condition in a phased approach both:

- minimizes/eliminates throwaway costs of interim construction and
- meets accelerated urban development goals
Progression of the DMNP EA

Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, 2003
Approved EA Terms of Reference, 2006
Lower Don Lands Design Competition, 2007
DMNP EA Conceptual Design, 2010
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI), 2012
DMNP EA Amendment, 2013

Terms of Reference
EA Process
EA Submission
EA Paused
PLAI
EA Amendment
1. Develop Long List of Alternatives Based on:
   1. Discharge Points
   2. River Characteristics
   3. Channel Shape (Cross-Section)
   4. Habitat Types (What Grows in the Channel)

2. Evaluate Alternatives and Identify a Short List of Alternatives Based on Technical Feasibility, Including:
   - Recreational Opportunities within the River Valley System
   - Integration with Infrastructure
   - Management of Sediment, Debris, and Ice; Navigation

3. Comparative Evaluation of Short List of Alternatives

4. Select Preferred Alternative for Further Evaluation

5. Confirm and Describe Preferred Alternative
- Realignment of the Greenway
- Removal of Inner Harbour Promontories
- Phased Implementation of Flood Protection
- Accommodation of Lafarge During Phasing
- Rationalizing Developable Land and Naturalization
How does the Amended Alternative Fulfill the Project Goals?

**Flood Protection**

Permanent removal of flood risk from 240 ha of land

**Naturalization**

Aquatic Habitat: 14 Hectares
Naturalization (Terrestrial / Wetland): 16 Hectares

**Revitalized City Environment**

Phased flood protection allows development to proceed in step with completion of the new river valley
Overview of the Effects and Mitigation

**Flood Protection**
- Phased construction of river will progressively remove lands from flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere
- Permanent removal of 240 ha of land from flooding

**Naturalization**
- Creation of 14 ha of high quality aquatic habitat
- Creation of 16 ha of naturalized habitat (wetland/terrestrial) which is expected to attract locally significant species

**Recreational and Cultural Opportunities**
- New river mouth provides greater recreational opportunities than the existing river (e.g., boating, trails, enjoyment of naturalized landscapes)
- Heritage resources within the footprint of the river valley system will be conserved, relocated, raised, or commemorated
Overview of the Effects and Mitigation

Operational Management and Constructability
- Flood protection minimizes throwaway costs between phases
- Sediment management uses existing infrastructure where possible and allows for the use of dredgate during lakefilling
- Design and phasing limits impacts to existing operations and shipping

Planned Land Use
- Nuisance effects on existing/future residents and businesses (e.g., noise, dust, and traffic) due to construction will be mitigated

Sustainability (Soil Mgmt.)
- Excavated soil will be treated and reused on-site where appropriate
- Remaining soils that must be transported off-site will have minimal effects on traffic, air quality, and noise
• In 2010 City Council approved a Transportation and Infrastructure Master Plan (Phases 1 and 2) for the entire LDL and completed the EA process (Phases 3 and 4) for the Keating Precinct.

• The completed EA was approved for the lands west of Cherry Street. The remainder was put on hold pending the completion of the Gardiner Expressway EA.

• 2012 PLAI Plan requires revisions to the approved Master Plan.

• Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA are being completed for all lands south of the Keating Channel.
LDL EA MP Study - Content

Scope for LDL EA MP:
• Water
• Sanitary
• Roads
• Bridges
• Transit
• Stormwater
Complete Phases 3 and 4 of Class EA: Location not Changed from 2010

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Roads – Cross Sections

Figure 11-2 Cross-section for Cherry Street between Lake Shore Boulevard and Villiers Street

Figure 11-20 Cross-section for Commissioners Street (formerly Villiers Street Alternative 1)
**Alternative 1 – Bridge** – structure comprised of a deck on piers

**Alternative 2 – Causeway and Bridge** – combination of filled embankment and smaller bridges where the water has to pass through – underneath the bridge deck could be completely open or box culverts.

**Alternative 3 – River Ford** – where the road is built at-grade down into the spillway and floods during 1 in 25 year events and is impassable at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1: Bridge</th>
<th>Alternative 2: Causeway</th>
<th>Alternative 3: At-grade river ford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>The bridge would provide both movement of peak flood flows and the potential for some natural elements beneath the bridge depending on final bridge design.</td>
<td>The causeway would provide for movement of peak flood flows, but since the structure would have more structural impediments, it would require more land for the spillway north of the roadway. Since the water would move through culverts beneath the road, there is no opportunity to naturalize that area.</td>
<td>The at-grade river ford would provide both movement of peak flood flows and the potential for some natural elements adjacent to the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>Since all three routes occupy the same general area, and there are no nearby residences, the three alternatives would have the same social impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Environment</td>
<td>Likely to add the most economic benefit, as it would provide full access to all planned development lands.</td>
<td>Less economic benefit, as the causeway would require a larger spillway to the north to accommodate flood waters, reducing the future development area.</td>
<td>Likely to add the most economic benefit, as it would provide full access to all planned development lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
<td>No significant cultural resources are likely to be affected by any of the alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Both the bridge and causeway would provide numerous opportunities for the accomplishment of sustainable construction practices for the roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The roadway would probably require more maintenance and rebuilding after every major flood event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Property</td>
<td>Requires land currently owned and leased by TPLC. The road would be constructed in the future at the time of redevelopment, so any leased land holdings could be addressed by then.</td>
<td>Also requires lands owned and leased by TPLC, but the causeway would cause the need for a larger area north of the roadway to be set aside as open space to accommodate flood water backup created by the causeway, so less property is available for development.</td>
<td>Requires land currently owned and leased by TPLC. The road would be constructed in the future at the time of redevelopment, so any leased land holdings could be addressed by then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>The bridge and the causeway would provide adequate transportation access to allow future development and network traffic distribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The river ford would also provide adequate transportation access and traffic distribution most of the time, but in the event of a major flood, access would be cut off in this route, so there would not be a secondary egress route, so this option is inferior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>All three alternatives would be built in an area where the municipal services are being completely reconstructed for the flood protection spillway, so there is no difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete Phases 3 and 4 of Class EA: Location not Changed from 2010

Proposed or Relocated in this Addendum
Bridges – Conceptual Drawings

Polson Slip Bridge

Commissioner Street Bridge
Next Steps
The City has included in its Development Charges report to City Council provision for City-wide development charges. This is now before City Council.

City is exploring the potential for area-specific development strategies.

The landowners have formed a group to explore funding infrastructure costs once the EA has been adopted.

City, WT, and TRCA will continue to pursue funding from senior levels of government when and if funds are available coordinated with other City and Waterfront renewal efforts.
Next Steps

- Prepare public meeting summary report
- Review and incorporate feedback received
- Prepare Draft EA and LDL MP EA documents for review
- Submit final DMNP EA Amendment
- Submit final LDL MP EA Study
Continued Planning in the Port Lands

Planning Frameworks

- Port Lands Planning Framework:
  - High-level framework to articulate the vision for the Port Lands

- South of Eastern Strategic Direction:
  - A three-pronged strategy to plan and facilitate investment and economic growth in the South of Eastern area

Port Lands and South of Eastern Class EA

- Arterial and collector streets, including:
  - Planned function and character of Lake Shore Boulevard
  - North-south connections
  - Potential connections across the Ship Channel
  - Transit routes
  - Pedestrian and cycling facilities

- Servicing infrastructure for anticipated development (water, storm and sanitary)
Precinct Planning

- The City and Waterfront Toronto are developing precinct plans for Cousins Quay and the Film Studio Precinct.
- The Precinct Plan for Polson Quay is currently on hold.
- Central Waterfront Secondary Plan sets out that precinct plans be prepared prior to enacting zoning by-laws.
- The establish the location, scale and character of:
  - blocks and streets
  - type and amount of development
  - Building heights
  - parks and public spaces; and
  - community facilities
- More detailed urban design guidelines are developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 2013</th>
<th>Q3 2013</th>
<th>Q4 2013</th>
<th>Q1 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Lands Planning</td>
<td>Initiation/Background</td>
<td>Vision/Objectives</td>
<td>Alternatives/Analysis</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework / Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands and South of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Class EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Studio Precinct</td>
<td>Initiation/Background</td>
<td>Vision/Objectives</td>
<td>Options/Analysis</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins Quay Precinct</td>
<td>Initiation/Analysis</td>
<td>Vision/Objectives</td>
<td>Alternatives/Implementation</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>DC SAC CCM</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>SAC CCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Wednesday August 28, 2013
Start Time: 10:00 am
Project Number: 60228858

Project Name: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project
Location: Mississaugas of Scugog Island FN Administration Office

Regarding: Amendments to the DMNP EA

Attendees:
- Ken Dion, Adele Freeman (TRCA)
- Shalin Yeboah (Waterfront Toronto)
- Cassidy Ritz (City of Toronto)
- Monica Sanford, Mississaugas of Scugog Island FN
- Corey Kinsella & Melissa Dokis, Curve Lake FN
- David Simpson, Alderville FN
- Diane Sheridan, Hiawatha FN

Distribution: Attendees
Minutes Prepared By: Ken Dion

PLEASE NOTE: If this report does not agree with your records of the meeting, or if there are any omissions, please advise, otherwise we will assume the contents to be correct.

Purpose of Meeting
- Provide an update on the amendments to the Don Mouth Naturalization Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment (EA) and Lower Don Lands (LDL) EA Master Plan and obtain feedback to be considered.

Project Overview
- KD provided a presentation on the project including:
  - A description of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) process;
  - Scope of the PLAI, DMNP EA and LDL EA;
  - Background and rationale of the DMNP;
  - What has changed since the April 2011
  - Project phasing opportunities (including potential impacts to HONI infrastructure during Phase 2);
  - A description of the flood protection landform and valley wall feature;
  - A description of the grading plan;
  - Components of the LDL EA Addendum; and,
  - Project schedule for the DMNP EA and LDL EA.

Questions about whether a comprehensive Archaeological Master Plan has been developed and details on specific studies that have been undertaken.
- WT to provide a copy of the Port Lands Archaeological Master Plan to Monica for distribution.

Action
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment suggests that there may be potential archaeological resources available within the sand spit that used to exist in the approximate alignment for the existing Cherry Street. When excavating the valley system in Phase 3, additional archaeological studies will be required and undertaken.
- Additional areas that have been identified as having archaeological potential within the Port Lands will not be impacted by the new river valley.

### Requested a copy of the PPT presented on August 28, 2013 and information on the other Projects underway in the Port Lands Initiative

- KD – Will send Monica a copy of the PPT for distribution.
- CR & SY – Will send details of the Port Lands Framework & Master Plans and Precinct Plans as the studies progress

### Concerns regarding the human attempts to control nature. Nature works best when it can work on its own.

- KD – The study area of the DMNP EA reflects that statement. The extensive marshes of Ashbridge’s Bay were filled in the early 1900s and the Don River was channelized and directed into the Keating Channel. The DMNP EA would re-establish natural functions that were lost, provide areas for meadows and wetlands, and to encourage wildlife to return to the Toronto Central Waterfront. Currently the river is in a straitjacket of concrete.

### Concerns regarding contaminated soils on the effects on a naturalized river.

- KD – The DMNP EA has highlighted the need to address contaminated soils and groundwater. We recognize that the Port Lands were created by fill in the early 1900s with little environmental controls. In addition, the industrial use of the Port Lands has contributed to additional contaminants to the soils. The DMNP EA assumes that the valley will be over-excavated, followed by a form of barrier being placed before clean soils returned to form the valley, river channel and wetland features. The specific approach for managing soils will be implemented by an RA/RM approach during detailed design prior to implementation. Soil and groundwater studies have highlighted where the most impacted soils and groundwater in the area.

### Stewards of the Land

- It was noted that Scugog Island First Nations treaty extends to Yonge Street and they are stewards of the land with traditional knowledge. Some other EA projects are very disruptive but in this instance we are being stewards of the land.

### Concerns regarding future planning

- How much capacity remains available to accommodate future growth at the Ashbridge’s Bay Treatment Plant?
  - CR – We are assessing capacity through the LDL EA and will likewise do this as the other planning studies progress.
  - City’s environmental standards for SWM for new development have improved and that as redevelopment proceeds, current SWM issues would be greatly improved.
- **Does this project include consideration of climate change?**
  - KD – Yes. The river valley system has been designed with the capacity to convey an additional half metre depth of water for a Hurricane Hazel sized flood event. In addition, during the detailed design phase, the wetlands will be designed to ensure that wetland habitats will remain available even if water levels drop in Lake Ontario. The inclusion of the weirs at Lake Shore Boulevard also provide an opportunity to better regulate the flows through the natural valley system to address a changing climate.
- **How is the Gardiner Expressway EA being addressed in the DMNP EA?**
  - KD – TRCA, City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto are working closely on all the projects in the Port Lands, including the Gardiner EA. The Gardiner EA project managers are aware of the requirements of the DMNP EA in the area of overlap and we are working closely in the development of their study to ensure that the needs for both projects will be respected as the Projects proceed.
- **How bad was the July floods in the Port Lands and will the DMNP EA resolve this in the future?**
  - KD – The July floods over the Don River were less than a 10 year return period. Very small compared to the design flood the DMNP EA will provide protection for. The DMNP EA will not stop flooding to the GO Train line or DVP as both are located adjacent to the river within the low lying floodplain (less than 2 year return period event).
- **A request was made to ensure that as planning efforts proceed for the Port Lands, including detailed design for the DMNP EA and LDL Class EA, that the Williams Treaty First Nations be afforded opportunities for meaningful input and consultation through those processes:**
  - KD, SY and CR – Confirmed that as planning efforts continue, opportunities for consultation and input will be available.
- **A request was made to incorporate interpretation opportunities in the natural areas.**
  - CR – Interpretation opportunities would be welcomed and encouraged when detailed design is underway.
- **Please send a copy of the Draft DMNP EA in digital format to Monica Sandford.**
  - KD – Digital copy will be sent in mid-Fall for review.

An overview of the Williams Treaty Specific Claim details was provided involving geography, the details of the Claim (Crown’s claim of extinguishment of Rights to the Land – countered that the dollars provided were not commensurate with the land involved), and status of the legal process.

**Next Steps**
- TRCA – Provide copy of Minutes, PPT, and Draft DMNP EA (in digital format)
- CoT/WT – To continue consultation regarding Port Lands Planning and Precinctt Plans
- WT – To provide copy of Waterfront Toronto’s Archaeological Conservation and Management Strategy and draft LDL Master Plan Class EA (in digital format)
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A Word from the Consultation Team

For several decades, there has been tremendous public interest in the future of Toronto’s Port Lands. In November 2011, Lura Consulting and SWERHUN were retained by Waterfront Toronto and the City of Toronto to provide independent consultation and facilitation services for the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative. Public consultation was seen by the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative proponents as being so important that it was identified as a core deliverable for the project.

Between December 2011 and August 2012, more than 1600 people attended a public meeting and/or provided input through the Port Lands Consultation website to help shape the future of the Port Lands. Representatives from nearly 100 organizations and businesses – many with connections to a much broader organizational constituency – participated on either the Stakeholder Advisory Committee or Land Owner and User Advisory Committee.

This concise summary report presents the key feedback themes emerging from the extensive Port Lands Acceleration Initiative consultation process. While the report provides a “big picture” synthesis of what we heard during the consultations, many additional ideas, opinions, hopes and dreams for the future of the Port Lands can be found in the report appendices – which document the feedback received during four rounds of public consultation and multiple advisory committee meetings.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work on this project with the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative project team and the many individuals and organizations that share a passion for making the Port Lands the jewel of Toronto’s waterfront.

Sincerely,

David Dilks
Project Co-Facilitator
Lura Consulting

Nicole Swerhun
Project Co-Facilitator
SWERHUN Facilitation and Decision Support
Consultation Process Overview

Over the past several decades, numerous plans, studies and reports have been prepared for the Port Lands, including Unlocking the Port Lands, precinct planning for the Lower Don Lands and the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project EA. Significant individual developments – such as Pinewood – have emerged in the area, while opportunities for others, such as the Hearn, remain. Many of these planning and development initiatives have been the focus of extensive public consultation, drawing on energy, ideas and input from numerous committed and passionate stakeholder organizations and individuals with an interest in the future of the Port Lands.

As City Council directed, the public consultation process for the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative was envisioned as a key deliverable for the project. The consultation process was designed to engage not only with the broader public, but also with four key audiences. These included: city-wide business organizations; local waterfront and city-wide community and resident organizations; broader public-interest groups (e.g. environment, transportation, and recreation); and local land owners, tenants, and port users.

A number of specific engagement mechanisms were employed. There were four rounds of public meetings, including: (1) a kick-off public meeting to solicit goals and ideas; (2) an open house and two feedback workshops to present and seek feedback on key findings and preliminary options; and (3 & 4) two further public meetings to present and seek feedback on draft findings and recommendations. In addition, a social media and web-based information and input forum (www.portlandsconsultation.ca) ran in tandem with each round of the consultation process. In total, approximately 1600 people attended the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative public meetings and/or provided input through the web-based platform from December 2011 to August 2012.

Other key engagement mechanisms included a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and a Land Owner and User Advisory Committee (LUAC), each of which met five times over the course of the consultation process. The SAC consisted of representatives of city-wide business, community, resident, and public-interest organizations. The LUAC consisted of land owners and tenants in the Port Lands and immediate area, as well as users of the Port of Toronto. Combined, these Advisory Committees engaged representatives from nearly 100 organizations and businesses, many with connections to a much broader organizational membership/constituency.

A series of one-on-one meetings between land owners/tenants/users and the project team was also held over the course of the consultation process. In addition, the project team participated in several meetings at the request of specific constituencies or organizations, including the Outer Harbour boating community and two meetings with Code Blue. Lastly, ongoing contact was maintained with Aboriginal organizations with a potential interest in the Port Lands to ensure that every opportunity for them to participate in the consultations had been provided.
Consultation Process Diagram

The diagram below illustrates the timing and key facets of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative consultation process:

- **2011**
  - Kick-Off Public Meeting: *Dec 12*
  - SAC #1: *Feb 1*
  - LUAC #1: *Feb 15*

- **2012**
  - Round 2 Public Meetings: *Mar 31, Apr 3-4*
  - SAC #2: *Feb 29*
  - LUAC #2: *Feb 29*
  - SAC #3: *Mar 21*
  - LUAC #3: *Mar 21*
  - Round 3 Public Meeting: *May 24*
  - SAC #4: *May 23*
  - LUAC #4: *May 23*
  - Round 4 Public Meeting: *Aug 8*
  - SAC #5: *Aug 1*
  - LUAC #5: *Aug 2*

**One-On-One Meetings with Owners, Tenants and Users**
Summary of Feedback – Six Key Themes

The following is a high-level summary of the feedback received through all engagement mechanisms. It is organized into six key themes: A Range of Opinion on River Alignment; Importance of Green Space/Park Space; Support for Phasing as Part of an Overall Plan; Funding and Financing Development and Infrastructure; The Need for Transit in the Port Lands; and, “Lock It In” – Provide Certainty. More detailed reports on the key engagement activities (including summaries of public meetings, SAC and LUAC meetings) can be found in the Appendices of this report.

1. A Range of Opinion on River Alignment

- **There was a range of opinion on the project team’s proposed river alignment in Round 2 of the consultations.** Some participants liked that a form of 4WS remained as the preferred river alignment, stating that 4WS realigned seemed reasonable. Others felt that 4WS realigned compromised the original vision too much. Most participants in the online portion of Round 2 were supportive of the original 4WS from the 2010 Don Mouth Naturalization Plan EA. This range of opinion was reflected at the third SAC meeting, with participants expressing both general support for the realigned 4WS and concern about its lack of beauty and vision.

- **This range of opinion on the river alignment carried over into Round 3 of the consultation process,** with some participants stating that they felt that 4WS realigned had lost the magic of the original design – that it was uninspiring, too pragmatic, and that the pendulum had swung too far in favour of cost and development. Others felt that 4WS realigned was a balanced approach, and pragmatic in its use of the slip and accommodation of port uses.

- **In Round 4 and at the fifth SAC and LUAC meetings, there was a general appreciation that the new iteration of 4WS realigned had improved greatly from the iteration presented in the previous round of consultation.** Participants felt that many elements of earlier plans were present, and that the new iteration was comparable with that presented in the 2010 Don Mouth Naturalization Plan, but with the added benefit of having a business case to back it up. The sentiment that the new iteration contained elements of the original plan was echoed by participants at the fifth SAC meeting. However, some participants still felt that the original vision was superior to the 4WS realigned.

2. Importance of Green Space/Park Space

- **In Rounds 2 and 3 of the public meetings and online consultation, as well as at SAC meetings, concerns were expressed about the reduction in green space/park space.** Potential impacts of this reduction in green space/park space were seen to include slower/lower land value growth and/or a “tug of war” between recreational uses and natural uses. Some were concerned that the realigned 4WS appeared to prioritize development over green space and naturalization. The importance of maintaining public access to the water’s edge was emphasized.

- **In Round 3 of the public meetings, a number of refinements were suggested, including:** larger and increased park space; consolidating some of the smaller, scattered parks; and creating a park that would serve not just the local population, but one that would draw people from the entire city.
• In implementing planned park land, it was suggested in Rounds 3 and 4 of the public meetings that land should be reserved for parks, that these should be built as early as possible, and that further work on the planning and design of parks should be carried through to the precinct planning process.

3. Support for Phasing as Part of an Overall Plan

• Starting at the kick-off public meeting and continuing at subsequent public and advisory committee meetings, participants expressed support for phasing, as long as it is part of a clear overall plan. Participants noted that phasing makes the Port Lands “more digestible”, facilitates development by responding to market conditions, and helps to raise revenue for implementing following phases.

• Participants throughout the consultation process appreciated that flood protection could be phased, though there was some concern that the completion of all phases would not occur for many years, or that completion would be pushed off indefinitely. It was suggested that the City of Toronto and Waterfront Toronto examine phasing the original plan; that the amount of naturalization should be increased in earlier phases; and that the implementation of naturalization should be separated from the planning and implementation of development in the Port Lands.

• During Round 3 of the public meetings and at the fourth SAC and LUAC meeting, there was interest in more information on the sequence and timing of phasing. Some participants were interested in combining phases 1 and 2 so that more land was released for development earlier on. Others were interested in combining phases 3, 4 and 5 to better ensure that the final work on the river mouth is implemented.

4. Funding/Financing Development and Infrastructure

• Starting at the kick-off public meeting and continuing throughout the consultations, participants expressed support for the exploration of a number of funding and financing options, particularly those that provide the opportunity to maintain public stewardship.

• Throughout the consultation process, there was a range of opinion on the appropriate balance between public and private sector contributions to funding/financing development-enabling infrastructure in the Port Lands. Some felt that developers should be required to pay for all infrastructure while others felt that the greater the number of development charges/fees, the less developers would pay for the land, ultimately leading to less revenues available for funding/financing infrastructure. Still others felt that public funding/financing was the only way to achieve the development of public assets, such as naturalization, sustainability and affordable housing.

• In addition to providing feedback on the various financial and funding mechanisms, some participants emphasized the need for the City and Waterfront Toronto to engage further with senior levels of government on sustainable funding for redevelopment of the Port Lands.

• Stemming from projected retail demand emerging from the business case model, online and public meeting participants and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee expressed concern about big box/mall/suburban-style retail in the Port Lands. Many felt that big box/mall/suburban-style retail was an inappropriate type of development for the Port Lands.
Additionally, specific concern was raised about the potential impact on local retail in adjacent communities.

5. The Need for Transit in the Port Lands

- The importance of providing transit within and to the Port Lands was continually emphasized by online and public meeting participants the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Land Owner and User Advisory Committee throughout the consultation process. Given the need for transit in the Port Lands, participants were particularly concerned about funding for transit and the timelines for the full build out of transit, including the progression of transit service from BRT to LRT. It was suggested that that the securing of transit ROW’s and coordinating transit planning/provision with that in East Bayfront and West Don Lands should be top priorities.

6. “Lock It In” – Provide Certainty

- The importance of “locking in” plans was noted by a number of public meeting and advisory committee participants. For some, “locking in” plans was seen as a way to prevent further revisiting of decisions that had already been informed by and supported by previous planning and public consultation work. For others, “locking in” plans was seen as a way to minimize uncertainty for current Port Land users in their leasing and investment decisions. Local landowners expressed interest in entrenching the recommendations of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative in the City’s Official Plan and zoning bylaws as soon as possible.

- The question of governance and accountability for implementing the outcomes and recommendations of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative was raised by a number of public meeting participants and at the SAC. There was interest in seeing the leadership role of Waterfront Toronto in the development of the Port Lands and the waterfront as a whole reconfirmed. It was felt that reconfirming Waterfront Toronto in this role would mean that all three levels of government are still committed to the waterfront and that no one level would be able to overturn a decision following an election.

Next Steps

A report on the recommended directions for the entire Port Lands will be considered by the City’s Executive Committee on September 10th, and by City Council on October 2nd and 3rd. This report will also include all of the studies undertaken as part of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative.
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative

Public Consultation Round 4

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A. Feedback from Completed Table Discussion Guides
ATTACHMENT B. Feedback from Completed Individual Discussion Guides
ATTACHMENT C. Feedback from Other Written Submissions
ATTACHMENT A.  
Feedback from Completed Table Discussion Guides
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Port Lands as a whole?

August 8th, 2012

- Some would like a more detailed plan
- Wanted mixed-use developments
- Have a plan/strategy for:
  - Commissioner’s Street: should be wider, like the present Kennedy Ave in Montreal. It’s more attractive and can handle a greater flow of pedestrians
  - Have to consider transportation impacts on existing area surrounding
  - Transit must have many options and be integrated with all surrounding transit routes, not just one loop to Union Station
- Concerned about airport-regulated heights in Cousin’s Quay (50 ft.)
- Density is good but should be well thought out to avoid creating a huge wall
- Waterfront should be filled with public space
- No high rise buildings in this area
- Phases should be enveloped in a master plan
- Concern with making Planning Amendments with Framework Plan for the entire Port Lands Framework
- Need an overall plan before precinct planning takes place
- Is there enough park space to accommodate density?
- Like to see the Port Lands transit plan coordinated with the EBF and WOL transit plans
- The overall Port Lands planning process/framework is unclear and the overarching Master Planning
- Priorities beyond 3 precincts
- Green space/key north/south corridors
- Transit priorities for entire area and back to the city
- The ship channel
- Staging
- Integration of industry and residential around the ship channel and film part will work
- How do the Port Lands connect with the rest of the city?
- Not selling the sizzle of the parks and naturalization
- Too much focus on buildings and infrastructure
- Widen Cherry St?
- Phasing starting with naturalization (the part we can afford)
- How long will it take to clean contaminated lands?
- Transportation should be more concrete → links to the city
- Phasing looks good
- Location of the green space is preferred over the previous versions.
- Green space is to be commended
- Ensure the catalytic sites are protected in the EA into the future
- Proceed with the most important transit needs
- Transit concern → Union station is saturated with commuters, consider an alternative north/south line to Bloor-Danforth station
- Questioning if cost is so great, if it’s worth it, will the private sector cover it?
- Sad that the project will produce nothing except condos
- Where is the affordable housing?
- Should be more public benefit; including affordable housing from the beginning, quite disappointed there was little to no mention
- No mention of schools
- Set minimum requirement for affordable housing
• Consensus on above
• More explicit ‘sustainability’ principles → in particular, all buildings are LEED certified green buildings, or LEED neighbourhood developments
• Make it a sustainability zone
• Bicycles for transportation to and from downtown and within the Port Lands (and the surrounding waterfront) did not primarily depict project for recreational usage
• How are cycling routes planned to be completed?
• There appears to be difficulty for parks to maintain the parks developed in the waterfront
• Will sailing clubs be able to continue as they are? There is theft and damage to property
• Concern over access to boats and ensuring that clubs continue without the loss of protection
• Secure leases? Will they be able to continue?
• Generally satisfied with parks/area/transit/cycling plans
• Want to see sustainability issues/food and agricultural issues
• Want interesting architectural focal points, not a wall of condominiums along the waterfront
• Concern that the vision will be chipped away on a development by development basis – there is a need for a strong plan
• Plans lack any character, the design is not artistic
• Vision has changed from the original plan
• Lack of focal point
• Wall to wall of condos
• Hopes to be a spectacular architectural city like Chicago, launch competitions/open calls for architects or cultural institutions to set up in the Port Lands
• Parcel development and the impact of one parcel over another, parcels should not be jeopardizing the overall vision
• Transit needs a more comprehensive ‘transit first’ plan
• Don’t wait for development to happen and people to come
• What is BRT; we need more detail
• Cost savings don’t seem to be very good vs. the LRT
• Staged transit plan required → more detail on how transit will progress
• LRT along Cherry to go directly to Union Station
• Area south of shipping channel should have some kind of overall master plan that is more detailed (no matter how preliminary) so as to provide a planning context for the rest of the Port Lands
• Connectivity to the city, not just transit but physical connectivity; would really like to avoid an experience like the Gardiner and the condos below
• Concern about new shiny area that will impoverish the area north of the Port Lands; north of the Keating Channel, specifically in terms of retail
• Revised plan is improvement compared to plan from Dec. 2011
• One participant thought that industrial use still needed to be thought out
• Caution against homogeneity in neighbourhood development
• Public transit connection increased and accessible
• Mixed-income housing and sustainable building needed
• The more park land the better
• One participant believed Cousin’s Key is best location for any higher buildings (i.e.: 12 storeys)
• Another participant thought that the high rises should be stepped up from the water towards the east
• False Creek model
• Maintain public realm along the waterfront
• Don’t want tall buildings to block the waterfront
• Like the juxtaposition of a hard and soft edge
• Nice to see previous recommendations have been carried up
• More detail in precinct planning (e.g. Height, office to residential ratios
- Will the island airport reduce property values?
- Address ongoing industrial use
- How dangerous/often would floods be? What about costs and alternatives
- Is it flood-proofed now / are people in danger now?
- Can we promote this as a gateway to the lake, through signage, architecture, viewing area etc.?
- What will the parking situation be? Can we make it underground
- How safe is the plan from economic and political changes?
- What is the ratio of residential vs. commercial? (It’s based on demand)
- Bigger focus on residential and small commercial
- Distinction/variation of residential heights (condos, houses, etc…. should be low rise, like in Amsterdam)
- Exciting plan
- Concerned about public private partnerships; sometimes good design gets cut
- Is it realistic as a 30-year plan?
- Building heights? Answer was glib
- Lafarge property limits?
- Buy out Lafarge, Redpath
- As part of precinct plan, include a parkland plan
- Is land for a hospital set aside
- Recommend a height restriction
- Exciting plan, somewhat confused about the differences with the changes
- Unsure about public/private funding, it can cause lots of problems and can pull accountability away from the design concept
- Design concept needs to be maintained as much as possible
- Sustainability was not mentioned
- How to ensure that this 30 year plan actually gets done
- Selling off lands – very questionable that private lands will really be sold
- Are there any waterfront interactivity/recreation possibilities?
- Development is separate from Don River
- Mouthwork impacts on the EA are difficult
- Two pieces should be separate; flooding/water quality of the development of the Port Lands is a bad marriage
- Consider land expropriation for Lafarge
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Lower Don Lands/River Configuration?

- Concerns about channel/dyke height
- Don River to ship channel to deal with flooding
- Fill quality important what will silt deposit be made of and what is the consequence of material in Bay
- Catch basin and debris, wants to be sure with naturalization there is a method to catch debris if it gets into the harbour – this must be in place
- Better for it to be naturalized
- Worried about depth of channel, just a runoff might not work well if in the off season it is dry
- Canoe/kayak docks on the river
- Debris/boom catcher at the mouth of Don Lands - real issue that has problems
- Emphasise the needs of migratory species for habitat
- Use natural vegetation to attract migratory species
- Designate it as an area/park for migratory species
- Specify which areas have the most polluted soil
- Consider wetlands at the mouth of the Don
- Will the river mouth create a delta with loose soil
- Like lots of green space but we might have to give some of it up to bring down building heights
- Likes the revised river mouth
- Wetlands, marshland good
- A couple of participants were disappointed that public land had been reduced
- Buildings could be set back to the allow more green space
- East of Don Road should have more green space
- Yes to the 4WS realigned
- Mouth of the Don:
  - improvement, good that it goes beyond the flood plain
  - Like the idea of an upland forest
  - Promontory: better than last meeting, although disappointing compared to 4WS (original preferred)
  - Green space should be enhanced ecologically rather than just flood protection and recreational green space
  - If the flooding technically works it’s fine
  - New design is okay, however it doesn’t encompass the original vision
- If Lafarge can be moved to another area it will provide the opportunity for a better design
- Redpath ship parking should also be moved to another area
- Liked 4WS preferred, 4WS realigned does not have the pizzazz of the original
- No consideration of climate change or sustainable system
- See: Permaculture by Mollison followed by other cities in design principle
- Consider hydroponic gardens (it makes sense here!)
- Fix river elbow so that it is not a right angle ➔ look at a more natural approach
- Make the explanation more explicit for a natural river
- Keating Channel more of a showpiece, commercial and cultural
- View of downtown from west of Cherry St needs to be exploited and designated as a civic centre
- That area more holistically ➔ use public spaces and parks to fund it turn it into a revenue generator to make it an international city
- Recognizing that the industrial uses will continue to operate into the future is an interesting solution
- The berthing of Redpath boats in the winter adds character and provides an opportunity to act as an attraction
- Good start to imagine what the naturalization will look like, more work needs to be done and we need more consultation as well
• What will the process be?
• This is an improvement, we’ve moved past the ‘pretty pictures’ and now have a Business plan
• What has happened to the sophistication of the LDL Plan
• Sun and wind studies, massing, set backs etc.?
• Multi-use recreational facilities
• Need a more natural flow, east harsh lines/separation
• Worried that the tree farm that the city has built already at great expense seems to have disappeared
• Marsh is nice to look at but is a waste of land that could be used for other things, glad it has been reduced, and should be reduced more
• Spillway is an excellent use of land
• Hasn’t been discussion of commercial development of river: boarding, fishing
• Would like to see the plan include Venice-style canal systems that allows people to boat into other parts of the city through an in-land waterway
• There should be more thought/planning for more activities, not just looking at the water but also for boating
• I don’t see the structure that protects the back of the shipping channel from the flood flow through the greenway, flood water might not go where you expect
## What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Business Case?

- What sort of density will support itself financially and yield a positive return?
- Current revenues and expenses in the Port Lands, if they’re generating profits, they should be put into the revitalization
- What values are associated with the numbers presented?
- What are the data inputs used to arrive at the numbers shared and what does that translate to on the ground, density, massing, etc...
- Concerns with economic situation downturn in the coming years
- New council coming in and no longer approving B.C
- Look at accountability of B.C 00> based on future funds
- Reconsider the use of TIF’s. If the project is successful you’d only be losing a portion of the revenue
- Key is finding and utilizing funding, set a timeline
- Consider funding catalytic development as a means to stimulate funding and development
- First piece of development (phase 1) should be sold after the land values increase
- Consider the use of Parking Increment Financing
- Avoid city-wide development charges, focus on the area and specific development charges which can expand to include broader waterfront areas
- Increasing the area of consideration further north, up the Don
- Ford brothers should ask the Tories for money → federal funding is needed
- Meet the mandate of C40 to get funds
- Concerns over how the city can afford this without proper supports from other levels of government and political will
- Don’t want privatization and public/private partnerships
- Partnership with TIFF?
- Olympic 20024 bid to pay
- This is a public benefit, an asset and should be developed with public funds (there is concern about private sector control and lower quality by developers)
- Waterfront transit should be included with Metrolinx plan and funding
- Lack of federal or provincial funding sources; Toronto, being the largest city in Canada, other levels of government should get involved
- The City of Toronto should not hesitate to go with the plan even if there are funding issues, the city and its citizens will benefit in the long run
- Transportation planning and funding for Waterfront Toronto should be part of the existing Metrolinx plan
- Not enough info to discuss intelligently, need more detail to comment → though it seems like better news than before
- Seems like a reasonable approach
- Need more data
- Concerns as can it be supported?
- Prefer breaking business cases down to staging at 10 year intervals
- Sounds reasonable
- Concern with private funding, would like more public involvement paid for by taxation
- If housing prices decrease and then stagnate, as is expected in the coming years, does that seriously affect the city’s ability to break even?
- Concerned that profit maximization will impact social housing and count too much on higher sales
- Concerned about lack of inclusion of costs of cultural use and community facilities (schools, community centres, libraries, etc…)
- People who are going to benefit from the development should pay a larger share of the costs
• Density for the sake of breaking even should be the model
• Make developers pay as much as possible
• Encourage other levels of government to include money for non-profit housing
• Projections → some seem like wishful thinking, so let’s clarify
• Include the T.I.F option
• Do we have tenants for the film studio area?
• Too much private sector?
• Too vague/sceptical regarding funding
• Transit plan requires a commitment
• Up front money from the city (the norm around the globe) why aren’t we doing that?
• Public/private partnerships are sometimes suspect, who will pay and how much?
• When will the dollars flow?
• Will things really get developed?
• It’s all about the money
• How does, or will this, process be insulated from political cycles?
• Reconsider public financing
• Recommend convertible units, changeable from 1 to 2 or 3 units with ‘knock-down’ walls
• Retail - $60/ft² → is that realistic? It seems pretty expensive, will any retail pay that?
• P3 model is a necessary evil; PANAM is P3 and if that means it gets built, just design needs to stay in focus
• Making sure there are checks and balances → the process needs to be transparent
• Need a real finance plan in place for something to actually happen
• Asking private sector to put in all upfront costs/and that might not be realistic
• Who is actually going to see through the financing? Who is driving the financing?
• Federal/provincial funding wasn’t mentioned during the presentation
• Implementation dollars → haven’t given it enough thought
• Think it’s not financially viable given cost of infrastructure and the cost of remediation
• Planning needs to reflect timing
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Next Steps?

- Leslie to Queen and north
- Plan for developers/market selection of sites that don’t fit phasing plan
- Connect to “stuff” underway already, like Leslie
- Ensuring public input should be kept involved during the process
- Is 30 years a realistic plan? It seems like it could take longer
- Not much mention of tourism and recreation component, all mention of residential, retail and office this will be a huge developer/draw for tourism free
- Didn’t say anything in particular about provincial/federal partnering initiatives
- Overall, pleased with the progress
- Start with phase 1
- Need more information on height restrictions of buildings
- More community consultation and stakeholder consultation
- Neighbourhood place (height of buildings, recreation, schools, libraries, community centres)
- Continuing mechanism to get feedback on design
- Many more smaller community consultations
- Maintain public engagement
- Maintain updates to the public and participants
- Just in a wait and see mode, but overall pretty good
- Precinct planning for each area, as early as possible
- Continue community consultations; should be part of all next steps, not just the EA
- Lake Ontario Park should be integrated, potentially as a part of the area south of the shipping channel
- More public consultation meetings should be set up
- Participants feel the existing plans are too vague, more public consultation will help the citizens of Toronto to better understand the plan
- Development of public transportation and cycling infrastructure. This needs to be a priority and move along quickly
- We need to consider Ontario’s role in this, provincial partners or impediments?
- Physically separated bike lines
- Uni-directional
- Look at decreasing the speed of traffic to 30km/h in the area
- Put efforts towards developing a traffic flow that protects cyclists and pedestrians from moving traffic
- Consider Official Plan amendments
- Tie density with transit and put the numbers together
- Height restrictions → in the contract at sale, make a commitment to build low
- Limit height, but not density
- More interactive park space, i.e.: community gardens, not just as a means for transportation
- Greenway paths → to ensure connections to the rest of the city
- Ensure connections to greenway paths from city are consistent
- Find some way of acknowledging historical uses of the area → acknowledge historical bogs
- Clarify responsibility
- Who gives approval? This needs to be more clear, is it the city or the province
- More input from city parks and design staff, do they back it?
- Concerned about a lack of power in Waterfront Toronto, can they drive it forward?
- How far can council and the community go to alter plans?
- Show council the visualization for nature-only plans
- More detailed briefing to explain everything in finer detail
- Governance ➔ it’s extremely important that Waterfront Toronto be reaffirmed as the lead to ensure that the process remains apolitical, to the greatest degree possible
- Would like to see an “open source” approach to plans, business plans, financials, etc....
- Transformational use could be a ‘Toronto Museum’
Any other advice?

- Wondering about how parks will work
- 1.4 million
- Need clearer picture of residential plan, number of people at built form
- 9,700 residential units seems like a lower number
- What are the population estimates
- You can put a lot of density in the city without high-rise, though high-rise is appropriate in some places
- Don’t just include rapid transit, pedestrian and vehicle ways, but include bicycle as a means of primary transit
- Concerns re: residential so close to the airport, will mid-rise be okay?
- Health staff on committee → or if they have been involved let us know
- Would like to see process and research not just the results of the business case
- Encourage growth of the movie industry since facilities are nearby
- Ensure it’s all green, because there is no excuse! Don’t wait for criticisms after: use solar panels, renewable energy sources, other energy sources using the lack, look to Ontario Place
- No large condos! 4 storey max
- Include family amenities and schools
- We are currently pleased with the degree of communication of information and consulting public input
- First Nations consulted? The land was never ceded
- Affordable space for working artists and not just major cultural institutions
- “They came a long way down”
- Bikeways, water, bike trail volume and additional ‘users’ don’t seem to project capacity → recreation vs. a real commuting route
- Real value in environment
- See this as similar to the island
- Safe access and making connections to existing neighbourhood needs more attention, sharing the ‘space’ complete street approach is essential
ATTACHMENT B.
Feedback from Completed Individual Discussion Guides
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Port Lands as a whole?

Aug 8th

- You have put the river into another ship channel, Cousin’s Quay – with the shipping quay down one back
- The Port Lands development is separate from the completion of the mouth of the Don. It has overwhelmed the Don Mouth work and the current plan will make the EA very difficult
- Need for overall plan that connects the precincts and shows a total community development that makes sense together. How will the industrial sites be related to the residential?
- Make sure we don’t lose the strong environmental standard of the original plan – eg. Buildings placed to sun and wind to conserve energy
- need to be clearly established
- sustainability
- sports facilities, especially indoor and varied outdoor needed
- Don’t lock into BRT for initial phases without defining standards. If BRT is to include private right of way the savings are often very marginal compared to rail options. Any BRT option must also be explicit in phasing intent, minimizing throw away work when LRT is implemented – permanent BRT on Commissioners is unacceptable.
- Current transit implementation appears to assume a developed Queens Quay East, rail options must be developed to respond to short term rail implementation on Queens Quay.
- Strongly consider very minimal BRT and through routing via the Esplanade to avoid bus service interfering with LRT intentions
- Happy to see shipping/industrial uses. Any light industrial/commercial lands here now, near the film studio?
- Designate the entire area as a “Gateway to the Port Lands to highlight the area’s importance to the City as a hole (i.e its transportation, industrial, river valley/wetland)
- Residential, commercial, office development is vague, artists’ impressions leave ‘ghost’ high-rises (makes area seem open, but actually quite closed in if developed in such a manner)
- We already have ‘lost’ the high-rise condo battle along Queens Quay and the railway lands
- Also, high buildings surrounding the wetlands for migratory birds seems illegal
- I like the idea of lots of green space, public space, but not if it means walls of high-rises
- And what happens to the dinghy sailing clubs south of Uniwn Ave? They should be considered part of the ‘fun’ component of your opening remarks, the source of the lovely boats in the artists impressions!
- Width of cycle and pedestrian paths
- Public park – phase one, rugby field, Lake Ontario Park
- Phase Three – lower parcel, 4WS
- Flood plane, No2 – plan evolution
- River park north, 4WS, high water table
- 4WS revised still has a strong right angle
- more mixed use/income housing
- Liked the green arteries
- Elaborate on soil remediation?
- Uses/Activities for winter? Especially on Commissioner’s
- The relationship between the Port Lands and the rest of the city (transportation, land uses, open space network, built form …)
- The Don Valley Trail is great
- Designate the Port Lands as a special sustainability zone
- Require all buildings to be LEED certified
- Coordinate transit plan with plans for East Bay Front and the West Don Lands
- Infrastructure plan for the whole area is needed
- Include local park space in development parcels during precinct planning
- BRT to LRT phasing is a very good plan. Will it be the wide-gauge Red Rocket system, standard gauge new LRT or both serving the Port Lands?
- If it will be a major residential and commercial space, it will need regional rail (ie. GO) service, perhaps a “Union 3” will be needed
- How will the Port Lands connect to the DVP and Gardiner?
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Lower Don Lands/River Configuration?

Aug 8th

- It may be time to create new permanent links to the Island, either a bridge or a tunnel from the Port Lands
- Emphasis on water/sewage purification through use of parkland and wetlands
- Could the city save money by building sewage infrastructure on the industrial side?
- West of Cherry St. wholly for civic space for cultural amenities
- Keating Channel → commercial and cultural water channel like in some European cities
- Are industrial ships able to share the channel with private commercial craft?
- Pollution concerns from said industrial operations
- 4WS revised, the right elbow, will it not cause problems?
- Promontory Park Plaza
- $ 2 Billion – 30 years, $100 million shortfall
- River route, flood plain parkland looks good
- But the rest of the development should be compatible with the naturalized river mouth
- Little detail about the area east of the Donway
- Designate river configuration with wetlands and meadows as a migratory wildlife area/transition zone for wildlife.
- Let’s celebrate this area as a stepping stone habitat
- Looks fine, don’t mind the changes to retain shipping.
- River naturalization is much better than the horrendous acceleration plan
- Ensure Trinity bridge is completed as early as possible
- More consultation about details of use and layout of Keating Channel area
- Reform the Bring Back the Don River City Committee, maybe with a new name
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Business Case?

Aug 8th

- Lessening the impact of Toronto on Lake Ontario, continuing the RAP
- Major employment? In what industries?
- Government cannot just decide not to contribute – this project belongs to the whole city which will benefit hugely over the long term
- All levels of government need to be committed to the decision and process
- Governments can endorse borrowing facility
- Ask accountability of the council
- Premise is that the development money fall back is property taxes, which our elected Mayor has refused
- And the development has been spoken against often in this consultation process
- DC overall citywide increase → residential only? Not for commercial?
- Bonds?
- Borrow money against future land sales? How?
- Reconsider the Tax Increment Financing option for financing the redevelopment of the Port Lands
- Dedicated property tax (industrial, commercial, residential) to help fund the redevelopment
- Too broad and vague to be clear and able to be commented on
- Why should we be trying to “break even” or “make money on this”?
- It is a huge civic development project – if the idea is to make it something to benefit the city as a whole, the city should retain control of it (not just in broad strokes, with wide scope for private developers
- Planning bylaws, etc. will be important, when will this be in place? How can citizens endorse something that is vague enough to be potentially disastrous
- Precinct plans will be crucial
- 150 – 300 million – 850 acres
- public transit connection for business community
- Federal funding!!
- More holistically, keep it natural
- Use THO Parks to fund it, people will come to be in park space
- Make money such as concepts like the Highline in New York; get public paying into the park creating a community
- Parking charges within the area (parking increment finance?) for transit infrastructure?
- TIF district only within boundary area of Port Lands would not impact other areas of the city if Toronto does not back the bonds
- What kinds of strategies are prepared for employment lands?
- How to draw not just industrial, but office, commercial, retail functions in the area?
- What regulations exist to discourage big box retailers?
- Meet the mandate of C-40 cities (through the World Bank) to get funds for the Port Lands development
- The business plan shows there is high risk and low return. Why not think outside the box? Maybe condos and offices are not a good business plan. There is a need for international destinations for Toronto, such that could generate returns, as in the Highline in New York. Look at the Hoover Dam, what can Toronto offer the world that would generate the money to build it?
- Studies show tourists greatly prefer rail based transit as it is viewed as a more sure option to get somewhere
### What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the Next Steps?

**Aug 8th**

- Transit first development could be incorporate better
- Any anticipated tourist traffic?
- Zoning laws can be modified to allow or force solar energy optimized buildings, ie. Control of buildings shadows over neighbouring property
- Thought and effort to make sure developers don’t get their way using the OMB – land should only be sold under certain conditions!
- Have detailed briefing on precincts ASAP to give time to respond at the Executive Committee meeting
- Publish staff report and all auxiliary material ASAP to give time for a considered response at the Executive Meeting
- Vision of the Port Lands → the world class attractions for tourists to experience
- No film studio!
- Keep public informed
- Building height restriction → sell land with height restrictions in the sale
- Report Waterfront Toronto
- I would urge low to mid rise buildings, max. 8 – 10 storeys, such as was envisioned in the Railway lands west of Spadina 25 years ago, but has been abandoned now)
- Include significant mixed-use residential (gear-to-income, co-op, social housing, etc...)
- Make bike lanes, not just bike paths (part of stereotype, part of a commuter network)
- Clarify responsibility of powers of the ‘precinct process’
- Input of city park’s and design staff
- Do research wealth v. wellness
- Forest, laketown, airport
- Clarify what research has been done
- What pauses do councillors have?
- Can they have alternative visions?
- Attempt to fund precinct planning for entire Port Lands at earliest possible date
- Begin to emphasize integration with Lake Ontario Park publically
- Full implementation of Lake Ontario Park should be emphasized, particularly in terms of section 37
- The dedicated transit study needed soon, irrespective of timeline concrete plans needed to avoid cost escalation and unexpected complications (like what happened on Queen’s Quay east)
- Lakeshore LRT east of Cherry highly questionable from all perspectives
- Unwin Ave needs consideration, would be desirable to route truck traffic via Unwin, Leslie, and Lakeshore but will require upgrades, particularly to bridges
- More detailed plans for precincts and overall connective idea
- Residential south of the Slip
- Channel along Cherry Park
- EA’s → the 1990s, 20 years
- Combine Commission and the Bring back the Don processes
- Impervious impacts of Toronto on the various measures of health of Lake Ontario – what are the changes expected from this development?
Any other advice?

Aug 8th

- The exercise to change the negative impact of the Don River watershed on Toronto’s area of Lake Ontario has been going on for over 20 years
- The Port Lands exercise or project has been added in the last few years and in this iteration, the problems of the Port Lands in the current government fiscal environment has overwhelmed the long term work and planning of the Don River – The Port Lands and Bring Back the Don are at the moment, not a good marriage
- It will make for a very tough EA process
- Affordable housing % should be combined
- Smaller park areas in residential areas, eh. Playground facilities and local use
- How can the raised Don Roadway NOT divide the Port Lands?
- I very much like the greenway, better than before and better for wildlife to move to Lake Ontario Park from the Don Valley
- I like the focus on pedestrian walkways and bike paths. Let’s keep this in focus as development progresses
- Overall, I think this is a useful outcome and not too far from the original and can be phased in!
- Well-done Waterfront Toronto!
- The concept of “Complete Streets” should be a guiding principal for shared SAFE use for transit/cars/motorized cycles/bicycles/pedestrians (including children and the elderly)
- The visuals show recreational/individual cyclists, however, there is a growing trend for bicycles to be used by commuters, reducing the need for car use
- There appears to be attention focussed on Phase 1 and sequential phasing, what about considering some logical exception, such as the Leslie Street Greenway, which would make the Leslie Spit (Tommy Thompson park) safely accessible
- Also, considerations for connecting neighbourhoods such as Lesliville to the “Port Lands”
- There are opportunities for a multifaceted approach using responses to emerging challenges and opportunities
- Attract people to the flood plain development with the two rugby fields, which is a low cost start up.
- Will the flood protection greenway be an active/used space?
- Will the bike network implement separated lanes?
- Will there be any bike showering facilities ➔ for any employees who work in the Port Lands?
- Will Cherry Beach have better sand and rock removal?
- Will the abandoned wharfs off Ward’s Island have any public seating/paving improvement to provide views of the Port Lands
- Will the abandoned power plant be reused?
- To David Kusturin: Is the methodology used to estimate the project costs released in public? A brief into to the methodology/assumptions would be helpful in understanding presented numbers
- Take advantage of the water’s edge
- Sustainability
- LEED certified zone
- Place to live, but also cultural/social place
- To be a world class tourist destination
- No film studio, the Port Lands is too valuable to allow such an industry; Toronto has a lot of space for that but not in the Port Lands
- Transformational use: City of Toronto Museum
- Is bridge over the Keating Channel at Munitions St. included this time? It wasn’t shown in the presentation
- Keep Waterfront Toronto as the principle developer
Westons and Thompsons can finance, see Musée Carnavalet in Paris

The industrial harbour as a theatrical feat is a great idea, but it has to be developed: commercial venues, tourist attractions, video projections on ships, water sports shows, the sky is the limit!

Add a major rail station, it will almost definitely have to be underground however, very expensive

A possibility with climate change and global warming is an up to 6 foot drop in Great lakes level; do any plans incorporate that statistic? This change may occur within the 120-180 year plan presented

Bicycles for transportation to and from downtown and east of Toronto and within the Port Lands (and the rest of the Waterfront) not just for recreation

Financing options – fund investment in advance of revenues

DCs, section 37

Borrow money

Public/private sector model

High cost to develop b/c of flood zone

Brownfield, poor ground conditions, high water table, poor infrastructure

$2b to build infrastructure

fin. Analysis Approach – real estate developers and financers

forecast GTA market demand

Port Lands development scenario

Maintain port operations

Phased industry relocations

Enable flood protection

River channel and mouth

Create dynamic and new communities

Public spaces – sidewalks and paths

Promontory Park – edge of river and lake

Putting the mouth of the Don into Cousin’s Key (instead of Keating Channel) is a bad idea – for a lot of reasons, mostly green ones

Discount rate 10% - 8%

$20 million residential

$65 million DC → city wide?
ATTACHMENT C.
Feedback from Other Written Submissions
Dear Sir,

It the hope of the rugby community the two rugby fields receive positive representation allowing its construction in advance of 4ws realigned or 4ws preferred. If this not possible the fields be located in Cherry Beach

Respectfully Yours

Dear Sir,

New York City has conducted an ambitious recyclable landfill development waterfront. This program was highlighted on Trashoplis creating park space and unnecessary dumping in land fills.

The flood plain can be expanded to handle larger concentrations of water with shoreline with a ready supply of material.

Sincerely

Hello to who it concerns. My name is Dwight Gordon from Scarborough and I unfortunately missed the August 8 Waterfront Toronto forum. I've been missing a number of them lately. So I'll try to give my input through e-mail. Regarding the issue of the portlands, I love the thought of the Gardiner Expy. east of Yonge being torn down. But I don't think that's going to happen, but I still have an idea about that. If we look at Montreal, I think a portion of highway that straddled some waterfront was re-routed to make way for some waterfront parkland. If we look at Gardiner east of Cherry St., part of it (as well as Lakeshore Bl.) straddles that Keating Channel. What about re-routing Gardiner and Lakeshore to allow for some parkland that's not cut off from Keating Channel. That part of Gardiner Expy. is a bit curved like a pretzel anyway, making for more travel distance if you're going to or coming from Don Valley Pkwy. Also, I made a comment at a forum a few years ago that had to do with that grand film studio at the portlands. But I'm not sure if it's recorded down. I'm wondering if there should be some portlands development with some film-related theme to it. Maybe something similar to Hollywood with it's film studios and its surroundings. Who knows, maybe it will influence the usefulness of that studio ( I think it's called Filmport). This is all I can think of for now. Thanks and all the best
INPUT SUGGESTION

Sirs:

I am peripherally involved with visits by Canadian Naval and other ships to Toronto. So far, for many years, the berthing and visitor access arrangements have been not only poor but very embarrassing. I like the city, and would welcome visitors. But when HMC Ships are berthed near the foot of Yonge Street, accessible only via a poorly paved commercial parking lot, with no entrance sign, pathway or anything for visitors, this is an embarrassment for anything like a major city. Windsor, Hamilton and others - 1/4 our size, do far better.

To be part of the solution rather than just part of the problem, I suggest the following:

Dedicate an eight-foot pathway, lined with small trees in urns, or a fenced area leading from Queen's Quay to the dockside, to a paved lot. With an arched sign indicating, on the ships' side "WELCOME TO TORONTO," and on the Queen's Quay side "VISITING SHIPS" or something. This would be a modest beginning. It need not even be permanent - removable for winter time if necessary.

At the moment the arrangements, in the opinion of visitors in the ships, and those going down to see them, are shoddy in the extreme, the sign of a really 3rd rate city .... which this should not be.

Regards

Good morning:

Here are my thoughts on the plan as presented at the August 8 meeting.

General Impression

As with the third iteration of the plan, I still feel that there’s a sense that the stuff everyone wants to see comes rather late in the game and may not ever be built. It’s noteworthy that you use images of the parkland as the “sizzle” to sell the plan, but the most important part of that park is in Phase 3 when the river finally gets its new exit to the lake. Given Toronto’s long history of failing to execute, or at least complete, projects, I can’t help thinking this borders on false advertising. If the land where the river should be (south of Commissioners, west from Don Roadway) remains fallow ground, a major attraction of the new layout will be missing.

To that end, what seems to be omitted from the presentation (but may be in the background documents, and if so requires greater prominence) is a look at alternative staging plans. For example, if
the revenue expected to pay for a lot of the work depends on future development, there are (at least) two ways to go about it. One is to pay as you play and hope that there’s enough development to more or less keep up with infrastructure investments. The other is to go full steam ahead on infrastructure and let development catch up.

Waterfront Toronto’s history has actually been on the latter course because of the seed investment from other governments. Now that you have to pay for stuff with new money, you are shifting to a pay as you play model, and trying to concoct financing schemes that may interfere with expeditious project delivery by dragging out the process.

Council should at least have the option of knowing what a project scheme with increased public investment up front would look like including timelines to deliver the new infrastructure. The decision appears to have been prejudged in light of the original Council motion about minimizing investment.

Transit

I am very disappointed that the whole discussion of the East Bayfront appears to already have been settled in WFT’s mind as a BRT for the foreseeable future. This runs counter to the motion about looking at advancing the EBF LRT including the Cherry connection. Again this is a case of the study prejudging the outcome rather than presenting alternatives with financial scenarios.

Of particular note is the fact that Cherry will be realigned south of the rail corridor in Phase 1, but the LRT won’t join in until Phase 3. We need to know what’s involved in advancing this step so that a through service from Cherry to EBF and Union can be delivered sooner rather than later.

A related question is the demand projections. The whole EBF/Port Lands/Cherry LRT system was justified mainly based on substantial demand from the Port Lands. There should be an update showing the evolution of demand from all of the pending developments that these lines will serve.

A question about the retail development in the Studio district: how are people supposed to get there? If this is not intended as big box retail surrounded by parking, then the only alternative is transit. However that does not materialize much beyond some improved service on the Pape bus in the timeframe when these lands would be developed. Saying that the area will not be developed as big box is cold comfort to those of us who wonder just what the transportation arrangements will be. Of particular note is the fact that this area is nowhere near high capacity transit and likely the best it will ever see is the Commissioners LRT line.

A related problem is that although you show many future north-south connections into the Port Lands, the transit is very much on an east-west axis. The north-south links may never be as important for transit, but they will have a role in connecting the waterfront communities to the existing older city. As a general point, you have illustrations showing LRT operations, but by your own admission the LRT is way off in the future. There is an error in the presentation, by the way, where you show LRT in the cross section of Bouchette Street when on the maps it is actually on the Don Roadway.

There needs to be a discussion of how the transit infrastructure will be built so that an LRT conversion does not require complete rebuild. For example, provision for track, power feeds, platforms of sufficient size, etc need to be in the initial build. The transit link east to Leslie and Commissioners also
needs to be discussed in the context of providing a dual connection to the TTC’s yard. This is not a WFT issue per se, but part of the larger discussion of the evolving LRT/streetcar network.

The cost associated with transit should be made clear. From a conversation at the meeting, I learned that the costs shown are only for BRT. This is misleading especially if you really do have LRT in Phase 3. There needs to be more detail in the cost breakdown so that Council and the public understand the component costs and whether anything has been omitted. It’s one thing to talk about moving parts of the project between phases, but if there are some costs not even included, that’s a nasty “gotcha”. Indeed it would imply that you actually don’t ever expect the LRT to be built.

Development Rollout

Even for those of us who follow the waterfront plans in detail, there is a lot to stay on top of. One big problem is that each precinct is treated in isolation, and we rarely see how everything fits together. A while ago, the Design Review Panel had a drawing made showing the waterfront in its future, built-out condition. However, what is badly needed is a map showing the known and likely developments (including those that are not strictly part of Waterfront Toronto’s property) over the next 20 years or so. This will put whatever happens in the Port Lands in context as well as showing the buildout, the evolution of neighbourhoods and the expanding demand for transit. This needs to be keyed to show when various developments will come online, and you may need a set of maps showing the evolving layout over time. Accompanying info would show the evolution of units, population, etc in various areas.

Financing

Some of the possible financing tools involve developers paying for infrastructure. Previously, the waterfront lands were upgraded from your nest egg of government contributions, and it is unclear how much of this investment was actually recouped. I can’t help thinking there is some double counting of revenue because of the inclusion of both land sales and development charges. If the DCs are regarded by developers as part of the price of a site, then one has to look at total revenue and how increasing DCs could simply depress the market value of the land. This gets to the whole problem of the relative value of serviced vs unserviced land.

The idea of “private sector” investment is mentioned, but it is unclear what model is being discussed. If this is simply another word for DCs (and similar schemes), that’s really not a private sector “investment”, it’s a tax by another name. If on the other hand, the private sector builds infrastructure for you in return for something (like cheaper land), well that’s just another way of slicing the revenue pie. If the private sector builds public infrastructure with a hope of a leaseback return, then that creates a future expense stream that must be accounted for. You need to be a lot clearer about just what you are proposing here.

I was glad that the idea of city-wide DCs was downplayed in the presentation. Everyone wants to dip their hand into the pool of general revenues (for which a city wide DC is only one example), but this presumes (a) that such a charge would be politically acceptable and (b) that the waterfront would be an agreed high priority recipient of such funds. There is a similar issue with the proposed transit tax revenue, and that will be made even more difficult by the uncertainty about which body – local municipalities, a GTA agency, or Metrolinx – gets to administer it and decide on priorities.
In the discussion of the business case, your goal is to get to a “positive return”. However, some of the ways you achieve this hypothetically are simply a matter of accounting – shifting transit costs onto a new revenue stream. It’s still an investment in the Port Lands even if someone else pays for it. If you are going to throw around phrases like “business case” you have to be honest about the total public investment.

Conclusion

I cannot help thinking that too much of this report prejudges the outcome, if only by failing to present alternative scenarios and showing how you arrived at the one that is presented. In this I am not talking about the built form of the flood protection, but of the more general rollout of infrastructure, investment and development in the whole waterfront.

Thank you for the update and comment opportunity on August 8.

What refinements, if any, ...

i) Port Lands (as a whole)

It would be helpful if you could explain the residential density target you have suggested. I see a target of 8,700 - 10,700 units, which at 2011 PPU extends to 22,000 - 27,000 people. Is that a reasonable share of the 673,460 additional people that the Province forecasts for the City of Toronto by 2036, for the Port Lands land area to carry? Will the residential density be comparable to the average density for Toronto (approx 4,000 / km2)? Is this new population sufficiently large to support the ongoing municipal operating costs for this size area? I assume your suggestions are sensible, but they are not explained clearly relative to the acknowledgement that “this is the last large development area available in the city.”

You suggest the "modified plan includes generous public spaces and..."

That expression is subjective and wishy-washy. It would be better to say the "modified plan reserves nn% of the area in public spaces and..." I think most people would be impressed if you reserved 51% of the Port Lands excluding Lake Ontario Park; if you are proposing something closer to 3%, then less people would be impressed.

I heard one speaker suggest that the bridges at the shipping channel would be mechanical (lift or swing). That is unfortunate. With that style of bridge there is at least a theoretical risk that the mechanical bit would break seriously at the least convenient time and perhaps for weeks before repairs could be completed. That could leave ships locked out, or locked in, and even if the bridge was working it might impede fire, ambulance and police vehicles at the wrong time. I think it would be worth the effort to look seriously at fixed bridges similar to our existing railway overpasses within the city, and then consider how the bridge can become a social and commercial venue in its own right rather than just an awkward bit of transportation infrastructure. Why couldn't a really wide bridge also be a restaurant
patio, beer garden, winterized dining room, or all of those things with a remarkable view of the inner harbour?

ii) Lower Don Lands / River Configuration

It may be useful to add a diagram to illustrate the peak water levels along the river course if we experienced a wet storm with twice the volume of a normal once in 300 year storm. Illustrate what the mess would look like if the run off was sufficient to overwhelm both the Keating channel and the Don River mouth, and race at volume through the spillway. Is the shipping channel dock wall east of the spillway sufficient to prevent flooding of the Film precincts from the south.

The containment structures you have illustrated protect that area only from the west. That assumes that all the water that makes it into the shipping channel will turn west into the harbour. I would assume the water would flow both west and east in the shipping channel until the turning basin filled up enough to push it back out against or over the flow from the spillway, but I don’t know that the north wall of the shipping channel is high enough to prevent back flooding into the north precincts. Another way to describe the situation is to answer the question, how big is the storm that could do that? Is it only 50% larger than hurricane Hazel was (likely), or is it ten times the size of Hazel (unlikely)?

iii) Business Case

It would be helpful if you would outline to what extent the City can influence investment in the Port Lands development by prohibiting development outside the Port Lands. It might be true that developers would like to, or prefer to, build in other areas of the city, but the City has some influence through control of building permits .. I least, I assume the City has some influence.

iv) Next Steps

As soon as the Acceleration Initiative is stamped by Council, then step on the accelerator. Make an heroic effort to get the detailed precinct plans and zoning by-laws completed before December 31, 2013.

Regards,

Please review these comments about the Portlands Acceleration Initiative. I am a young Toronto resident entering planning school who has been following Waterfront Toronto’s work for a number of years.
I like the regularization and expansion of the two development blocks in the Lower Don Lands area. The waterways cutting through the site will isolate those neighbourhoods to a certain extent. So, the shape of the development blocks must not constrict them further. And each of the blocks needs a critical mass to ensure self-sustainability. Moving and straightening the spillway is also a good idea.

But the fatal flaw of the phasing plan is the provision for the Lafarge plant to continue operations indefinitely. As long as that remains, we’re really talking about a three phase project that ends without the full naturalization of the river mouth. The plan should not concede this accommodation.

Similarly, the concession to keep the dock walls along the promontory park and south block are too accommodating of the port users to the detriment of the public spaces. Only the ship channel should be used for mooring. The idea that irregular coastline impedes navigation is laughable when GPS is considered.

What type of Business Plan would it take to incorporate the reality and rarity that already exists and has world class recognition?

We are recognized internationally as one of the largest cities on the continent with an unique native wilderness at it's centre. The Don Valley that can be seen from space, and now with the spite, are the core of the Central flyway in North America for migratory birds. This is a precious and rare reality that could be easily destroyed by over planing and building all the Portlands.

We need someway to plan and maintain a passive natural connection between Tommy Thompson Park and the Don valley for the flora, the fauna- the animals and the birds to maintain a healthy regional reality. Maintaining nature is better business than the cost and upkeep of a zoo to see nature.

A business plan that could help to enhance what nature has given us to honour and enjoy could include a concept centre in the west Donlnds connecting these two natural features. It could be a wilderness information centre for tourists and teaching centre for students of any age.

Having a wilderness school in the centre of the city would have world class uniqueness. Students residences, observation pathways and observation station locations would be justified, along with an educated population on natures reality, to care for and treasure. Whose business is it, if not ours?

With respect and best regards,

(on my 77th birthday)
Hi, Mr. Campbell:

I appreciate the public forum that you convened recently (public mtg #4). I found the presentations highly informative and was glad to have the chance to pose questions to the experts in attendance, and provide my feedback and have the discussion at our table. I would strongly request and suggest that you continue to keep the public informed and continue to conduct such public meetings at suitable intervals in the future. This will help to build support and should diminish the chance that the public will be presented with any unpleasant surprises.

With respect to the recommendations, I have the following comments:

I am generally supportive of the draft recommendations for the implementation, flood protection and land use planning.

I have concerns about the financial components of the business plan, and would strongly suggest that they be addressed substantially before the recommendations and business case are sent to Toronto City Council.

**Brownfield remediation:** while this is mentioned in the presentation, the related costs do not appear to have been included in the business case yet. Since these costs could easily amount to tens of millions of dollars, if not hundreds, it is critical that they be estimated and accounted for somewhere in the business case. Either the city will have to bear the cost directly by organizing and paying for the work, in which case the developers will pay normal market rates for the land, or else the developers will be asked to pay, in which case they will naturally deduct the cost from the price that they pay for the land. In either case, the city will bear the cost, either directly or via reduced revenue. City council must have an idea of the scale of this cost before they can make any responsible, informed decisions.

**Infrastructure:** while the business case included infrastructure costs, it was not clear how expansive the meaning of infrastructure was. Is it restricted to utility-type components, such as roads, bridges, and systems such as sewer, water, natural gas, phone, cable and hydro? Or does it include such necessary city-run facilities such as new schools, fire halls, police stations, libraries, recreation and community centres, and city maintenance yards? If it does not, then their capital costs should be added into the business case, as should their operating costs.

Thank you for your attention. I wish you continued success with the rest of the process.

Regards.

Ward 39
Dear Consultation Team,

Thank you for all of your work in supporting public input into this process. Here are my comments in response to Public Meeting #4:

Suggested Refinements to findings and recommendations:

Port Lands (as a whole)

**Need for a Master Development/Land Use Framework**
- Waterfront Toronto, in partnership with the City should proceed immediately to develop a master development/land use framework for the full Port Lands in order to provide an integrated approach to development, even for parts of the Port Lands that may not be developed for many years.
- A master development framework should, among other things:
  - set out over-all objectives for Port Lands development in keeping with the principles of the Central Waterfront Plan
  - lay out the lands to be protected for the course and mouth and green infrastructure association with of the Don River and Don Greenway
  - Identify and recommend methods to secure important public assets such as Lake Ontario park lands, established or anticipated land and aquatic recreation uses, sensitive wildlife and fish habitats.
  - identify the areas that have been designated in the medium term, at least, as reserved for activities integral to port and city operations
  - Identify important view and vista locations and corridor
  - incorporate a high level street and block plan that will ensure opportunities for connections to the rest of the city, particularly South Riverdale and Leslieville are identified and prioritized
  - Incorporate a high level Transit First /bike/pedestrian plan that will similarly ensure coordination with the overall transit planning and promote multiple north-south connections between the Port Lands and the rest of the city.
  - incorporate a high level servicing plan that identifies potential short and long term servicing needs and critical issues to ensure coordination with servicing plans outside of the Port Land
  - Incorporate a high level community services plan
  - Identify initiatives currently underway, such as the Leslie Street transit facility that need to be incorporated into a Port Lands development framework
  - locations, identify precincts that need to proceed to detailed precinct planning at this time
  - layout and characterize potential development precincts and special planning areas within the Port Lands
Identify the precincts or features that need to move into detailed precinct planning at this time
- Identify ownership and control issues affecting development
- Identify events that would trigger the need to move additional precincts into the active precinct planning process

Social Sustainability
- As with other parts of the waterfront, better strategies for funding affordable housing will be needed to ensure income mix and access for essential workers, seniors and low income families and individuals

Lower Don Lands/River Configuration
- Although much has been achieved, continued work needs to be done in refining the naturalizing and green infrastructure concept for the river course and river mouth as part of the next steps in completing the EA. Michael van Valkenburg should be invited to continue the work he has done to date, particularly with respect to the new concept for the promontory park and the Greenway.
- Waterfront Toronto, TRCA and the City should move quickly to do what is required to complete the EA.
- Waterfront Toronto, in partnership with the City should be directed to immediately commence detailed planning for the Don Greenway, the Quays (and the film studio district)
  - No development proposals should be sought or entertained until a public precinct planning process has been completed and approved by the City
- More detailed transit planning and transit financing work is needed to ensure that the Lower Don Lands transit plan can deliver the high order transit identified as critical in the market soundings with the development industry and to ensure that LDL transit can be integrated as soon as possible with East Bayfront and West Don Lands transit initiatives.

Business Case
- It would be helpful to have more information about the development assumption behind the land valuation modelling, including the built form assumption, land use assumptions, etc. that have gone into making the business case
- Net revenues from Port Lands leasing activities should be identified and specifically included in the potential sources of infrastructure funding.
- It is important that the emphasis on City-building, sustainability excellence in design and creation of an outstanding public realm that has inspired waterfront revitalization not take a back seat as we look for creative ways to finance Port Lands development. We need to have a clear idea of what we want to achieve in each precinct before we can understand the appropriate balance of private-public sector investment to meet those goals.

Other feedback:
- The reputation, expertise and social capital developed by Waterfront Toronto is a huge asset for Toronto - as is its tripartite structure that keeps the other government levels involved, even though short-term funding prospects have been affected by the global financial crisis. The past year has been an intense period of joint and highly constructive collaboration with senior city staff. It is hoped that coming out of this, Waterfront Toronto will be unequivocally confirmed in the continuing role of master developer for the waterfront, including for the Port Lands.
- Thanks to all, especially the members of the Executive Steering Committee and their staff for all of the work done over the last year and for careful attention to the concerns of the community.
COMMENTS

FINAL PUBLIC MEETING

PORT LANDS ACCELERATION INITIATIVE

Comments are provided as per the handout structure.

1) Port Lands (as a whole)

The overall land use planning areas – and related stages – are well thought out and reasonable, given the dual parameters of (1) continued operation of the Toronto port functions and (2) recognition of the continued operation of the southernmost Cherry Street cement plant sitting on land owned outright by the operating firm.

Some improvements should be made however in the transit plan component; however, if the comments that follow are deemed worthy for follow up lead then the lead on this aspect should be through the City of Toronto’s Planning Department (transportation planning section) and the TTC network planning/service design departments.

It is obvious that there must be acknowledgement within the overall port lands acceleration initiative of a transit plan (both short and long term) but general ‘route lines’ on a map within a land use planning exercise do not necessarily translate into a concrete integrated waterfront transit network.

The word “LRT” is used in order to indicate to the public and developers that the longer term intent is to provide LRT service. Really!

Technically LRT is an intermediate capacity rail mode, utilizing coupled vehicles in trains, on a segregated right-of-way (RoW) with periodic stops that are less than standard subway stop distances BUT much greater than the frequent stops of conventional streetcars, operating either within mixed traffic or on its own dedicated RoW.(e.g. St Clair and Spadina car lines)

The final draft should be very clear with respect to what is meant by LRT in the context of the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative.

While the public meetings have made it very clear that in the short term transit service will be by bus, the plan must also make it clear that the very first priority in developing the transit plan (in the context of the recommended development phasing’s) must be the securing of the segregated RoW’s for the longer term ‘Spadina/St. Clair” type LRT service (different from the
new Eglington/Finch/Sheppard LRT lines which will be operating on standard gauge railway track).

I think that it is important to have (as an appendix, to the Acceleration Report) the long term transportation plan pertaining to the proposed future Portland LRT services *in the context of the broader waterfront “LRT” network and further transit network connectivity/integration*.

Perhaps the current west harbour front transit route services; those being the Union Station-Exhibition Park service and the Spadina-Union service, can serve as a template and model for the service implementation east of Bay street. Consider the following service routes as a possibility.

- Union Station – Broadview Station via Queens Quay East, Cherry/King Street, Queen Street and Broadview Avenue (tunneled)
- Continuation of the Parliament Street bus via Cherry Street to Cherry Beach (In order to serve Cherry Beach and the new Lake Ontario Park)
- Continuation of the Parliament Street bus via Cherry Street to Cherry Beach (In order to serve Cherry Beach and the new Lake Ontario Park)

2) **Lower Don Lands/River Configuration**

Given the constraints stemming from the (1) ongoing port activities and (2) the fact of the private ownership of the lands occupied by the southerly cement distribution facility, the river configuration is much improved over the last iteration of the plan.

Most welcome is the re-assignment of some of the overall Portland open space/park assignment to act as a tableland buffer between the ‘as constructed’ river valley and the adjacent tableland.

*A proportion of this park tableland immediately adjacent to the river valley should be dedicated to developing symbolic (at minimum) upland forest*

3) **Business Case**

The broad approach and key principles underlying the development of the business case are fine. In particular, I support the principle that a suite of financial tools be utilized and that in certain cases the burden of the specific tool may be property, precinct or area specific; as well as city wide (e.g. the Lakeshore bridge widening/replacement project component)
For broader public (and Council) understanding, the overall project cost/financing risks perhaps could be presented in the final report in terms of: (1) known known’s, (2) known unknowns and (3) unknown unknowns. Due diligence requires proof that all known risks are outlined and an appropriate upper limit contingency funding plan is in place.
John Campbell CEO/Waterfront Toronto
Nicole Swerhun/David Dilks: Facilitation Team 9th August, 2012

Re. Final Public Meeting: Port Lands (Acceleration) Initiative

Just three (3) comments relative to the August 8th Public Meeting.

(1) as someone who has attended Waterfront Toronto Revitalization Meetings for more than a decade, the room-filling attendance at the Toronto Reference Library is testimony to the ongoing/committed interest of Torontonians in avoiding a repeat of the "stolen waterfront" along Queen’s Quay East & West.

(2) while I can accept the redesigned Don River Mouth Revitalization proposals from Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (Preferred 4WS/Amended), scrapping the Promontory Parks to pacify the Toronto Port Authority is unacceptable.

The Toronto Port Authority continues to be a cancer in the city. Desperate to justify its continuing existence, in spite of its ever diminishing role, we’ve had the Rochester Ferry Terminal fiasco; the expansion of Island Airport activity (Porter Airlines)(Mayor Daly of Chicago had the right idea when he ordered the bulldozing of that city’s waterfront airport); now we see the Port Authority causing Waterfront Toronto to scrap the two Promontory Parks. The 1% served by Porter ignores the needs of the 99%.

The "acceleration initiative" reduces park space by 25% (to 10.8 hectares) and increases development area by 15% (to 41.6 hectares). One hopes we are not replicating the Queen’s Quay East & West fiasco to once again satisfy developers.

As I’ve pointed out in previous correspondence, my interactions with the new Canadian/immigrant communities made me aware of the importance these groups attach to Toronto’s Islands & Waterfront. These are their spring/summer/fall playgrounds given that the Muskokas/Kawartha/Temagami are often out of reach. The Toronto Port Authority executive/board is clearly disinterested in this fact.

(3) I remain concerned with issues of (a) visual corridors/viewscapes of the lake from the city core and that (b) building heights near waterfront areas be restricted and set-backs for stories beyond the third story be required.

Thanks John and Nicole for the opportunity of participating in the redevelopment of Toronto’s waterfront. I remain concerned with the Ford induced "acceleration" component. It’s already having a negative effect.

copies: Councillor Mary-Margaret McMahon; Councillor Doug Ford; TorStar
DON WATERSHED REGENERATION COUNCIL

August 17, 2012

BY EMAIL: info@PortLandsconsultation.ca

Neutral Community Facilitator’s Office
720 Bathurst Street, Suite 308
Toronto, ON M5S 2R4

Dear Mr. Kusturin:

Re: Port Lands Acceleration Initiative: Comments from the Don Watershed Regeneration Council on the Findings and Draft Recommendations

The recommended Plan represents an evolution of the original idea based on the realities of existing and continuing industrial uses, and the financial realities of encouraging new development. The Don Watershed Regeneration Council (DWRC*) is pleased to see a more natural river alignment and generous green space, as compared with the greatly constricted “channel” represented in the May 12, 2012 version. The iconic character and magic quality of a new river should not be underestimated as a catalyst in attracting design and development interest, both local and international, as in the case of the West Donlands. Our primary goal in the Port Lands is to achieve a completed, naturalized river and mouth of the Don as soon as possible and the DWRC will support every initiative to move forward to this goal.

We also acknowledge and commend the work of the consulting team in presenting the detailed, peer reviewed, estimates in the draft business plan, which provides a realistic and tangible base for developing financial mechanisms to implement the plan. In summary the DWRC supports the consultants’ recommendations with the following additional comments:

- Protection of lands for the river corridor is the first step in ensuring the river will be implemented and should be addressed in the City of Toronto's Official Plan, currently under review. However it is not a guarantee. Strong policies are also needed within the Official Plan to ensure that the river and adjacent wetlands are the only uses permitted within this corridor, and that they will be the only option permitted to achieve flood protection for the identified areas.

- The two “parkways” along the Don Roadway and Commissioners Street offer attractive potential for development of the adjacent lands and therefore present a strong argument for earlier development of the river (as well as the spillway), rather than leaving the naturalized river and mouth to Phase 3.

- The DWRC support the relocation of the “community parks,” as depicted in the May 12, 2012 version, to create more open space and a more natural river corridor. This will give the wetlands a better chance to be established and be protected from heavy public use, which may not otherwise be the case with the limited public green space in the May 12, 2012 version.
In adding to the green space along the river, the DWRC is concerned about the lack of neighbourhood parks for a potential population of 20,000. This was not sufficiently addressed in the presentation materials. There are adequate mechanisms in the Planning Act to ensure the provision of local parks as a condition of development. Open space and recreation needs must be calculated at the precinct level, and the lands must be protected for public, and not private, use within the Secondary Plan.

The DWRC recognizes that the Port Lands will continue to be an active port for the foreseeable future. These activities do not necessarily detract from development potential (for example, Vancouver’s False Creek has a functioning cement plan), and the ships that overwinter on the dock wall are a potential visitor attraction. The location of the industrial uses, and their environmental impact, are the only concerns. In this regard, Lafarge is currently located in the middle of Polson’s Quay - the development of which is scheduled for the first phase - and may represent a significant deterrent to initiating private investment in the Port Lands. The DWRC underlines, once again, the importance of Waterfront Toronto and the City in taking an active role in finding a suitable site and assisting Lafarge in relocating.

The plan identifies two potential “catalyst” sites for arts/cultural or other special attractions: one on Cousins Quay and the other on Polsons Quay. As these sites will establish a brand, or signature, for the Port Lands and thereby attract development investment, Waterfront Toronto and the City should actively seek out appropriate uses rather than rely on market forces.

The DWRC was pleased to see the residual value analysis with a realistic methodology and an optimistic result confirmed by the peer review. Good work has been done to this point. As we move forward, it is important that the projections be replaced with hard numbers at regular intervals in order to make the case for public investment at all levels – municipal, Provincial and Federal. The Port Lands is a long term project and the current financial downturn will eventually be replaced with a new growth cycle, creating opportunities for new revenue streams through carefully timed and targeted public investment.

The landowners and stakeholders have a long standing investment in evolution of the plan and now, the final recommendations on development of the Port Lands. It is important that they continue to be consulted at regular intervals on the business plan and financing mechanisms, as well as precinct plans, and that these be available and transparent to all interested groups and parties for review and comment.

Yours truly,

Phil Goodwin
Chair, Don Watershed Regeneration Council

PG:MB:aw

cc: Gwen McIntosh, Director, Waterfront Secretariat, City of Toronto

*Don Watershed Regeneration Council*

The Don Watershed Regeneration Council (DWRC) is a formal community-based committee established by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) in 1994 to help restore the Don River watershed to a healthy, sustainable natural environment. The DWRC reports to the Authority on a regular basis and is composed of community members, elected officials and representatives from businesses, agencies, environmental groups and academic institutions located within or concerned about the future of the Don River watershed.

A new, updated regeneration Plan “Beyond Forty Steps” was endorsed by the DWRC and approved by TRCA in 2009 and guides the DWRC in commenting to other government agencies (federal, provincial and municipal) on matters pertaining to the future of the watershed. The new Plan addresses the broad watershed issues of sustainability including water and energy efficiency and emerging challenges such as climate change.
Friends of the Spit

P.O. Box 51518
2140A Queen Street East
Toronto ON M4E 3V7
info@friendsofthespit.ca
www.friendsofthespit.ca

10 August 2012

BY EMAIL AND MAIL

Waterfront Toronto
Mr. J. W. Campbell, President and Chief Executive Officer
20 Bay Street, Suite 1310
Toronto, Ontario
M5J 2N8

City of Toronto
Mr. J. Livey, Deputy City Manager
11th fl. E., 100 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2N2

The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Mr. B. Denney, CAO
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, Ontario
M3N 1S4

Re: Final Port Lands Public Meeting, August 8, 2012

It has become clear to Friends of the Spit that the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative should be renamed: renamed simply to be the Lower Don Acceleration Initiative.

From a Friends of the Spit perspective, the Spit, the Baselands, and all lands south of the Ship Channel have been ignored. Only the errant squiggle of a Planner’s stylus to indicate a completely inappropriate bike trail through the Baselands is the sole initiative visible on the plans.

A glorious opportunity has been squandered: an opportunity to plan a complete parkland system south of the Ship Channel. By concentrating strictly on the economic necessities of acceleration and construction in the Don, the focus for parkland opportunities and initiatives south of the Ship Channel has been ignored.
Oddly, the Spit has always benefited from being ignored: however in this instance, we had hoped that greater minds would see the importance of linking the Spit and the Baselands by extensive parkland through to the Lower Don Initiative.

There is still time to plan this parkland as part of this current initiative. At the very least, do review Friends’ “Parkland in the Port Lands” proposal of May 31, 2012, which was previously forwarded to you as part of our SAC involvement in this planning process.

Yours sincerely,

FRIENDS OF THE SPIT
per:

[Signature]

JOHN CARLEY, Co-Chair

cc: Councillor P. McConnell
Councillor P. Fletcher
Councillor M-M. McMahon
P. Tabuns, M.P.P.
M. Kellway, M.P.
Craig Scott, M.P.
CodeBlueTO
Interested parties
TOPIC: FLOOD PROTECTION, NATURALIZATION AND GREEN SPACE

Question #1: What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendation for the:

(i) Portlands (as a whole):

I disagree with several of the draft recommendations in the final report but before listing them, I must say that I think it is a mistake to combine the development of the lower Don Lands River Configuration with the development of the Portlands east of the Don Roadway.

As outlined in the Amended EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection Project (April 11/2012), the naturalization of the river mouth is a major public works project with strong multiplier effects phased over 10 years. (pg 2 of Appendix Q)

Waterfront Toronto should respect this finding and consider the Don Mouth Naturalization as a separate project to be funded primarily by public money. The Portlands east of the Don Roadway will likely take place over the next 30 years and be funded primarily by the private sector.

In reference to the naturalization of the river as being a major public works project, it should be noted that the Federal government recently committed $143.7 million over 10 years to develop Rouge National Urban Park. If the Feds can allocate money for this project, then surely they can find some money for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection project.

In terms of the draft recommendations, the following is a summary of my comments:

a) Initial revitalization should focus on flood protection and the naturalization of the mouth of the Don, not on revitalization of Cousins Quay, Polson Quay and the Film Studio precincts.

The Amended EA (April 11/2012) (pg 14 of Appendix Q) illustrates two examples of increased property values in neighbourhoods adjacent to the development of high quality open space. I would bet that putting the development of the Don river mouth and flood protection ahead of the revitalization of Cousins Quay etc would result in a larger increase in property values in the area west of the Don Roadway.

b) The recommendation “confirm and employ additional sources of funding and financing if required to supplement private sector investment” should be changed to “confirm and employ additional sources of funding if required to supplement public sector investment” when applied to the Don Mouth Naturalization project.

c) The recommendation “endorse option 4WS realigned for the DMNP EA should be changed to “endorse the 2010 DMNP preferred alternative 4WS plan.”
d) Don’t revise the Lower Don Lands Class EA Infrastructure Master Plan but retain the April 11/2012 Amended EA for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Flood Protection project.

e) The recommendation “maintain existing critical port and industrial uses in the Port Lands” is a red herring with respect to rejecting the original 2010 preferred alternative 4WS plan.

On page 7-49 of the Amended EA(April 11/2012), it states that while the construction of the original promontories will have a negative effect on current port operations, this negative effect can be minimized by mitigation measures outlined in the EA.(refer to table 7-40)

On the same page(7-49), it says quote “that construction phasing strategy can be modified to provide continued dock wall and waterlot access for Lafarge at their current location while the rest of the project is being implemented until such time as an alternative location or resolution can be identified.”

With respect to the Lafarge operations in the Polson Quay area, why can’t these operations be moved to the Lafarge property that is part of the Concrete Campus adjacent to the turning basin?

With respect to Redpath’s need to have winter mooring in the Cousins Quay area, why can’t this winter mooring be switched to the dock wall along the south side of the shipping canal? Page 18 of the handout for the public meeting #4 shows a large ship moored along that dock wall.

(ii) Lower Don Lands/River Configuration:

a) Revert to the configuration in the 2010 DMNP preferred alternative 4WS plan.

Subsequent to the May public forum, one of the respondents said that the 4WS preferred plan is the interesting one while the 4WS realigned plan is the Wal-Mart plan.

The analogy that comes to my mind is the story of Cinderella’s step sister trying to squeeze her foot into the tiny glass slipper. Whereas the sister failed to fit the glass slipper on her large foot, Waterfront Toronto has been successful in squeezing the mouth of the Don into a narrow band that suits the Mayor’s aims for more and faster private development.

b) Another feature of the 4WS realigned plan that I think is faulty is the conversion of Commissioner’s street into the major east-west street at the expense of Villier’s street which now becomes a secondary road.

A 40m wide Commissioner’s street with its large traffic volumes (because it will connect with the Film district to the east of the Don Roadway) will certainly not enhance the beauty and the natural wonder of the river park north. (think of busy Parkside drive adjacent to High Park) Further, it will serve as a barrier between the park and the residents who reside north of Commissioner’s street.
Question#2: What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the:

(iii) Business Case:

a) Port lands market data and land value assumptions:

(i) How valid are they? Predictions out 30 years have a high degree of uncertainty

(ii) Financial and land use data in the April 11/2012 Amended EA compare quite favourably with the data presented at the August 8th meeting. Specifically, on pg.2 of Appendix Q of the Amended EA, it says quote: “the DMNP project will have a strong multiplier effect, resulting in total economic activity of more than $1.2 billion and 8,800 full-time job years of employment over the life of the project”. On pg.11 of Appendix Q, it states that over a 20 year time period, 8,100 residential units and 0.5 million ft2 of commercial development will take place in the Don River precinct east of the Don Roadway. Which set of data is more reliable? Do you know?

(iii) To cover the transit funding requirements, Waterfront Toronto should make sure that all of their transit priorities get included in Metrolinx’s priority projects so that they will be eligible for money raised by Metrolinx’s fund raising tools.

(iv) Petition the Federal Government for funds for the naturalization of the mouth of the don portion of the Port Lands project. If the Federal Government can contribute $143.7 million for the Rouge National Urban park, it can contribute money for the naturalization of the mouth of the Don.

(iv) Next Step:

Review the public feedback comments from all four public forum meetings to quantify the public’s perception of the preferred 4WS vs. the realigned 4WS plan. I am sure that you will find that a majority of the public thought the preferred 4WS was the better plan. Make sure you include this observation in any report you make to the Executive Committee.
What refinements, if any, would you make to the updated findings and draft recommendations for the……..

1) Port Lands as a Whole

- Need a “Master Plan” of the whole Port Lands – a framework that will include protection of green space and public realm, outline road, bike trails and transit connections, include plans for sustainability and a commitment to affordable housing. This must be done before any precinct plans are completed.
- Need a clearer understanding of how Industrial use areas and Residential areas will co-exist

Transit

The proposed BRT is not ambitious enough and should not be considered acceptable for a development of this magnitude. More work with the TTC is required to create a system of LRT’s or streetcars that will provide seamless transportation from Union Station along Queen’s Quay linking East Bay Front and the Port Lands. Also, the continuation of Cherry St streetcar south of the railway. A further connection north from the TTC yard at Leslie would complete the route to enable people from all areas to have easy access to this showcase development especially when the Catalytic Sites/Cultural Buildings are created.

2) Lower Don Lands / River Configuration

While the MVVA revised version of the realigned 4WS is an improvement over the previous 2 versions, there is still a lack of understanding that the River is the transformational event.

- fear that phasing means that the final result will never happen or will take too long to complete.
- What will attract people to purchase housing or visit the area without the naturalized river mouth?

The phasing needs to be faster or more compressed.
3) Business Case

- Need more information about the magnitude of revenue that can be expected by each of the possible funding sources
- Not mentioned – revenue from the current leases in the Port Lands – will it be directed to seed development? How much would that be?

4) Next Steps

Governance – Waterfront Toronto must continue as the lead agency in the development of the Port Lands. As an agency of a tripartite agreement, the development can remain apolitical. This will help ensure any approved plans are locked down to prevent them from being overturned by successive changes in government.
Port Lands Acceleration Initiative

Response to public meeting #4, 6 Aug, 2012

From: Julie Beddoes, Member of the SACs for the DMNPLFPP, West Don Lands Transit and Central Waterfront Transit EAs

I wish to recognise the immense labour involved in producing the plans we saw on 6 August in less than one year and to applaud the proponents’ openness to community concerns and requests.

Suggested Refinements to findings and recommendations

1. Port Lands as a whole

(a) A comprehensive infrastructure plan must be in place before detailed precinct plans are developed or any sites made available for development. This would include utilities, roads and transit, designated open space. This must be a legally protected document with no loopholes for compromise, especially in the protection of designated open space.

(b) The full value of early development sites cannot be realised without a transit system that can be taken seriously, one with a minimum of transfer points. As well, if these sites are to be developed with a minimum of space given uneconomically to vehicle storage and accommodation, attractive transit must be in place when the first residents and businesses arrive.

   The transit plans shown in phases 1 and 2 are inadequate. There is no way for passengers on the proposed Cherry St. busway to transfer to the West Don Lands LRT and it is assumed that the East Bay Front will also be served by a busway. Unless decisions have been made secretly and in contradiction to the process explained to the stakeholders at a recent meeting, the decision to instal a busway on the East Bay Front has not been taken.

   The sites indicated for development in phase 1 will be particularly dependent on good transit connections to other parts of the city; otherwise their isolation will make them undesirable. A route to the Bloor-Danforth subway could be established if the Cherry St. LRT were extended southward. The EBF and phase 1 development would benefit from a continuous LRT across the waterfront as a whole.

(b) Plans for the port lands must be protected from the changing whims of governments after every election. To ensure this, Waterfront Toronto must be master developer. If it is necessary to give WT additional authority in order to protect the future of the area, this should happen as soon as possible, on the condition, of course, that its record of public transparency and consultation be maintained. Other public agencies must not be allowed to derail plans and projects approved through full public process.
2. **Lower Don Lands/River Configuration**

It is a widespread concern that the postponing of rivermouth naturalisation until the last phases of the exercise could lead to this being abandoned or compromised even more than it has been during the PLAI exercise. Whatever documents are to be approved and adopted by the various governments must contain safeguards that naturalisation is protected and that ways be found to make it happen in the shortest possible time.

3. **Business case**

It must be understood that the current fashion for governments to go to the electorate boasting of the money they have not spent is detrimental to the long-term health of the economy as projects whose pay off comes over decades, not electoral cycles, are not undertaken.

    Waterfront Toronto must be supported by all three governments in undertaking work with a long-term payoff period which will eventually return many times its original investment.

    Long-term social and environmental benefits and the opportunity costs of not proceeding must be included in all cost-benefit calculations, even if only approximately quantifiable.

4. **Next steps**

The report to the Executive Committee with its accompanying documents must be made available to the public as soon as possible so that groups wishing to participate in its journey through council have time to read and discuss their response with members.

5. **Other feedback**

Re: Catalytic or transformational projects

    The transformational project is the naturalised rivermouth. This is what will provide amenity and quality of life for the whole GTA for centuries while in the short run making sites attractive to the kind of development hoped for. However the work is phased, the naturalised rivermouth must always be top of mind as the central purpose.

    If some additional “catalytic” project or public institution is to be sought, however, ephemeral events like world’s fairs do not necessarily leave anything behind that will improve their surroundings for subsequent decades. An educational institution and/or museum would have more enduring value. The City of Toronto doesn’t have its own museum; perhaps a few of the wealthy citizens who have benefited from the City’s growth could be persuaded to finance one on the port lands. This would only be feasible if a more realistic transit plan than the one shown on August 8 were in place.
Q-8 Comments and Responses on the 2013 Draft EA Pre-submission
Correspondence with Members of the Public
Feb. 5, 2014

Mr. Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP
Consultant Project Manager
AECOM Canada Ltd
105 Commerce Valley Dr. West, 7th Floor
Markham, ON L3T 7W3

Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc
Special Projects Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON M3N 1S4

Dear Mr. Rose and Mr. Dion,

Re: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

On behalf of Castlepoint Numa, we are very supportive of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP) and specifically Alternative 4WS proposal.

As a landowner in the Port Lands and an active stakeholder, we are pleased with the findings of the DMNP and the efforts to better align flood protection measures for the Port Lands/South of Eastern area with the development and public realm investment currently planned for this area. We believe that having a phased approach to alleviate the flood risk to over 290 hectares of land east and south of Don River not only makes sense from a business and economic point of view, but it ensures that the flood and other infrastructure investment will be properly phased and tailored to meet the needs of the planned mixed use neighbourhoods.

We would like to thank TRCA, Waterfront Toronto and the City for all of their work associated with amending the DMNP and in supporting the revitalization efforts across the Port Lands/South of Eastern area. We are supportive of the finding outlined in the draft DMNP EA Report.

Yours very truly,

Elsa Fancellio, MES, MCIP, RPP
Development Manager, Castlepoint Numa
Thanks for the comments, John. As we finalize the EA report, we’ll examine how we can better address the opportunities you’ve identified.

Take care!
Marc

We have moved, please note my new contact information below as of October 21, 2013

Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP
Senior Environmental Planner
Environment
D: 905-747-7793  C: 416-579-8628
marc.rose@aecom.com

AECOM
105 Commerce Valley Drive West, 7th Floor
Markham, Ontario  L3T 7W3
T: 905-886-7022  F: 905-886-9494
www.aecom.com

To better serve our clients across the region, AECOM’s Markham offices have joined together. Effective October 21, 2013, we will be located at the above address. Please update your records accordingly.

Marc and Ken,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft amended Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection EA. The revised EA document accurately reflects the changes that were devised and agreed upon through a series of public and stakeholder forums in the Port Lands Acceleration Initiative (PLAI) during 2011 and 2012.

I have reviewed the material with particular reference to changes that may have occurred in the planning environment surrounding the DMNP while the PLAI was unfolding. On several counts I believe that there are opportunities for synergies between the DMNP and other nearby initiatives. If these are documented at the outset of DMNP implementation there may be positive outcomes beyond the scope of any single initiative, but if not recognized they may be opportunities lost.
1. Naturalization at the sediment and debris management zone

A. The Don River and Central Waterfront Project being undertaken by Toronto Water will construct and wet weather flow storage shaft approximately 30 meters in circumference in close proximity to the sediment and debris management operations area of the Don River sediment trap, just south of the CN Rail bridge. There may be a potential risk of cumulative detriment to the habitat corridor and fish migration functions through doubling the infrastructure “load” (1 sediment management, 2 WWF management) at a narrow “pinch point” connecting the new Don Mouth with the Don Narrows.

Conversely, care should be exercised to coordinate the projects to minimize the natural environment impacts and optimize habitat functions that can be incorporated opportunistically in the two project areas. For instance, it may be possible to incorporate habitat features into the designs and take advantage of small, secluded areas for thickets, hedgerows or fish habitat structures that double as security barriers or other functional components.

B. Similarly, these two uses together could cumulatively impair the natural experience of trail users passing nearby on the Lower Don Trail or the Lake Shore Boulevard Pathway. Care should be taken to landscape the sediment operations area and WWF facility naturalistically (as far as functionality will allow) to minimize visual, noise, and nuisance effects on trail users.

2. The Lower Don Trail Gateway

The trail connections between Lower Don Trail, Lake Shore Pathway and Waterfront (Martin Goodman) Trail will be significantly altered. The DMNP can identify an opportunity to coordinate with the Gardiner Expressway East planning process and the Lower Don Infrastructure EA implementation to improve this connection.

The construction of the sediment trap will require the removal of the bike/pedestrian bridge that currently connects the Lake Shore Pathway to the Lower Don Trail across the Don River. The Lake Shore trail is now proposed to cross the Don River on the south side of the new five-span vehicular and rail bridge. This relocation may create an awkward link between the two paths, requiring Lake Shore Path travelers to cross Lake Shore vehicular lanes twice to reach the Lower Don Trail. This condition should be avoided.

The integration of the DMNP, the Gardiner East process and the Lower Don Lands Infrastructure plans should promote improved connectivity for active travellers on these trails and create a “gateway” to the Lower Don.

3. Augmenting Terrestrial Habitat Zones
In the naturalized area through Reaches 2, 3, 3a and 4, the four hectares of terrestrial habitat has remained as a long, thin strip of valley slope transition at the crest of the floodplain. It is so thin that it is unclear how much habitat value it will provide by itself. The quality of terrestrial habitat may be ameliorated if synergistic opportunities between DMNP and Precinct Planning activities is identified at the outset.

A longstanding goal of naturalizing the Don Mouth has been to create a habitat link between the Tommy Thompson Park Important Bird Area and the Don Valley. This eventually links Lake Ontario to the extensive bird nesting areas on the Oak Ridges Moraine and the Canadian boreal forest. Acknowledging this opportunity, Lower Don Lands Precinct Planning may be undertaken with parkland design that complements the four hectare terrestrial habitat strip proposed in this EA. Furthermore, in built areas of all Port Lands Precinct Plans, bird-friendliness standards of the city’s Green Standard can be set aggressively high to require compliance with standards that elsewhere in the city are considered “voluntary”. With respect to Toronto’s Bird Friendly Development Rating system, in the Port Lands precincts, development standards should move beyond the “Minimum” to the “Preferred” and “Excellent” levels.

4. Fish Habitat Optimization

The extensive and welcome fish habitat commitments in the DMNP should be coordinated and optimized with the Toronto and Area Waterfront Fish Management Plan currently being undertaken by Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

I suspect that many, if not all, of these opportunities have been identified. Documenting them in the DMNP in some way would help to ensure that project managers keep these synergies at top-of-mind during the implementation of the DMNP and each of the identified projects nearby.

John P. Wilson

Feb. 7, 2014
February 27, 2014

John Wilson
36 Riverdale Avenue
Toronto, ON M4K 1C3
Email: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for your email on February 7, 2014 regarding the amendment to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft environmental assessment (EA) report and provide us with your comments relating to the project.

At the start of your letter, you noted the following:

There are opportunities for synergies between the DMNP and other nearby initiatives. If these are documented at the outset of DMNP implementation there may be positive outcomes beyond the scope of any single initiative, but if not recognized they may be opportunities lost.

In response to your comment, please know that throughout the preparation of the EA the Study Team has worked alongside teams from other planning processes underway in the Project Study Area to ensure the DMNP is effectively integrated into their projects. Please find references to these plans and their relationship to the DMNP described in Chapters 1, 3, and 6 of the EA.

Further, you outlined several comments about the detailed design of the DMNP. In summary, you noted the following:

• The need for coordination between the DMNP and the Don River and Central Waterfront Project in the Sediment and Debris Management Area to ensure that the new habitat created in the area is high functioning with diverse habitat features that allow fish to migrate through this area in the future.
That care should be taken to design the landscape surrounding the Sediment and Debris Management Area to minimize visual, noise, and nuisance effects on trail users.

The DMNP should coordinate with the Gardiner Expressway East planning process and the Lower Don Infrastructure EA implementation to improve the trail connections within the Port Lands and promote improved connectivity that creates a “gateway” to the Lower Don.

The four hectares of terrestrial habitat appear to be a long, thin strip of valley slope transition at the crest of the floodplain which, in your view, is unlikely to provide much habitat value if synergistic opportunities between the DMNP and future Precinct Planning are not explored. You suggested that the Lower Don Lands Precinct Planning should improve habitat connections in the area and that future development should be required meet the “preferred” and “excellent” levels of the Toronto Bird Friendly Guidelines for development.

The fish habitat commitments in the DMNP should be coordinated and optimized with the Toronto and Area Waterfront Fish Management Plan currently being led by Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.

Following your comments you highlighted that you, “suspect that many, if not all, of these opportunities have been identified. Documenting them in the DMNP in some way would help to ensure that project managers keep these synergies at top-of-mind during the implementation of the DMNP and each of the identified projects nearby.”

As confirmed above, the co-proponents have and will continue to meet with project teams from planning processes underway within the Project Study Area to ensure that plans are fully integrated and that the objectives of the DMNP continue to be met - including, as you mentioned, making a more natural river mouth form that has high functioning aquatic and terrestrial habitats as well as new walking and cycling connections that serve as a gateway for connecting the City to the waterfront.

As referenced in Chapter 8 of the EA in Section 8.2.3, Table 8-2 and in Chapter 10 in Section 10.4, the Study Team is committed further consultation with the community and stakeholders during detailed design and construction to ensure that they are provided the opportunity to review and provide feedback on future design and construction plans.

Thank you again for your response. The information you provided have assisted the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto, and the City of Toronto in finalizing the DMNP. We have recorded your comments and will keep these on file for use during the project and they
may be included in project documentation. Comments and information received will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

If you have any additional comments please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Marc Rose at your earliest convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP</th>
<th>Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Canada Ltd</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Commerce Valley Dr. West, 7th Floor</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, ON L3T 7W3</td>
<td>5 Shoreham Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 905-747-7793</td>
<td>Downsvie, ON M3N 1S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:marc.rose@aecom.com">marc.rose@aecom.com</a></td>
<td>Phone: 416-661-6600 x 5230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:kdion@trca.on.ca">kdion@trca.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of the Study Team, I want to thank you again for reviewing the draft report and for your input to this important project.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kenneth Dion  
Special Projects Manager  
Toronto and Region Conservation
Correspondence with Agencies and Landowners
Dear Mr. Dion and Mr. Rose,

In our initial review, we have confirmed that Hydro One Transmission facilities are located within immediate vicinity of the proposed site in your study area. Please allow appropriate lead-time in your project schedule in the event that proposed development impacts Hydro One infrastructure which requires relocation or modifications, or needs an outage, that may not be readily available.

In planning, please note that developments should not reduce line clearances and limit access to our facilities at any time in the study area of your Proposal. Any construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage.

The integrity of the structure foundations must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the structures.

Note that existing rights of ways may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc). Please take this into consideration in your planning.

Once details are known and it is established that your development will affect Hydro One facilities including the rights of way, please submit plans that detail your development and the affected Hydro One facilities to:

Toni Paolasini, Hydro One Real Estate Management  
185 Clegg Road, Markham L6G 1B7  
Phone: (905) 946-6232  
Toni.Paolasini@HydroOne.com

Please note that the proponent will be responsible for costs associated with modification or relocation of Hydro One facilities, as well as any added costs that may be incurred due to increase efforts to maintain our facilities.

Regards,

Cyrus Elmpak-Mackie  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
Secondary Land Use  
Transmission Asset Management  
483 Bay Street, North Tower 15th Floor  
Toronto, ON, M5G 2P5  
416.345.1265
February 27, 2014

Cyrus Elmpak-Mackie  
Secondary Land Use  
Transmission Asset Management  
Hydro One  
483 Bay Street, North Tower 15th Floor  
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5  
Email: Cyrus.Elmpak-Mackie@HydroOne.com

Dear Mr. Elmpak-Mackie:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for your email on December 16, 2013 regarding the amendment to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft environmental assessment (EA) report and provide us with your comments relating to the project.

In your letter, you confirmed that Hydro One Transmission facilities are located within the limits of the Project Study Area and asked that we allow appropriate lead-time in our project schedule in the event that proposed development impacts Hydro One infrastructure which requires relocation or modifications, or needs an outage, that may not be readily available. Additionally, you specifically noted the following regarding potential impacts to HONI infrastructure:

In planning, please note that developments should not reduce line clearances and limit access to our facilities at any time in the study area of your Proposal. Any construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage.

The integrity of the structure foundations must be maintained at all times, with no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. There must not be any grading, excavating, filling or other civil work close to the structures.
Note that existing rights of ways may have provisions for future lines or already contain secondary land uses (i.e. pipelines, water mains, parking, etc.). Please take this into consideration in your planning.

Throughout the preparation of the EA, we have met with HONI to consult on the design and future construction plans of the DMNP. The results of our meetings, which are documented in Chapter 10 of the EA, align with the comments that you provided in your letter. We have integrated Hydro One’s suggestions to date into the EA and will continue to meet with your organization moving forward to ensure that your interests/concerns are incorporated into the preparation of future design plans.

Further, you requested that, “once details are known and it is established that your development will affect Hydro One facilities including the rights of way” we submit our detailed plans to Hydro One for review. As noted above, we are committed to additional consultation with Hydro One to discuss any potential modification or relocations of Hydro One facilities during detailed design of the DMNP. Specifically, in Chapter 7 of the EA in Section 7.3.4 we note the following:

- The Study Team will also continue to meet with local utility providers throughout detailed design and construction to ensure impacts to existing infrastructure are minimized and, when required, to confirm that utilities may be removed, retrofitted, relocated or extended and that opportunities for cost sharing are explored.

This commitment has also been integrated into Chapter 8 of the EA in Table 8-2.

Thank you again for your response. The information you provided has assisted the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto, and the City of Toronto in finalizing the DMNP. We have recorded your comments and will keep these on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Comments and information received will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

If you have any additional comments please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Marc Rose at your earliest convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP</th>
<th>Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Canada Ltd</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Commerce Valley Dr. West, 7th Floor</td>
<td>5 Shoreham Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On behalf of the Study Team, I want to thank you again for reviewing the draft report and for your input to this important project.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kenneth Dion
Special Projects Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation
Thank you for your email of January 16, 2013 regarding the draft EA report for the Don Mouth.

As part of the Government of Canada’s plan for Responsible Resource Development which seeks to modernize the regulatory system for project reviews, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012) came into force on July 6, 2012.

The CEAA 2012 applies to projects described in the Regulations Designating Physical Activities (the Regulations). Under CEAA 2012, the proponent must provide the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (the Agency) with a description of their proposed project if it appears to be described in the Regulations. For more information on CEAA 2012, please access the following links on the Agency’s website:

Overview of CEAA 2012
http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=16254939-1

Regulations Designating Physical Activities, and
Prescribed Information for a Description of a Designated Project Regulations
http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=9EC7CAD2-1

Guide to Preparing a Description of a Designated Project

If it appears that CEAA 2012 may apply to your proposed project or if you have questions, please get in touch with our office through the switchboard at 416-952-1576.

Regards,

Ellen Campbell

Ellen Campbell
Project Manager
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ontario Region
55 St. Clair Avenue East, Suite 907 Toronto ON M4T 1M2
ellen.campbell@ceaa-acee.gc.ca
http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca
Telephone 416-952-7006
Subject: FW: MEDTE Comments on Draft EA Report Don Mouth Naturalization Project

From: Helfinger, Michael (MEDTE/MRI) [mailto:Michael.Helfinger@ontario.ca]
Sent: January-06-14 11:29 AM
To: Rose, Marc; Kenneth Dion (kdion@trca.on.ca)
Cc: Dupuy, Damian (MEDTE/MRI); Alexis Wood (awood@trca.on.ca)
Subject: MEDTE Comments on Draft EA Report Don Mouth Naturalization Project

Gentleman:

Thank you for providing the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Employment (MEDTE) the opportunity to review and comment on a draft of the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project Environmental Assessment Report.

We do not possess the expertise within the Ministry to comment in detail on the technical merits of the Report. However, MEDTE fully recognizes the potential contribution of the proposed undertaking to economic development and revitalization in downtown Toronto. We note that the Board of Directors of the proponent, Waterfront Toronto, includes representation from the financial services, business services, entertainment, information and communications technology and life sciences sectors. These sectors are key drivers of the economy in downtown Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area as a whole. The improvements in aesthetics, environmental quality and recreational opportunities that would be brought about by the proposed undertaking could be expected stimulate investment and job creation by these strategic sectors in the vicinity of the Port Lands.

MEDTE therefore looks forward to the timely approval of the final Environmental Assessment and commencement of work on the project.

Sincerely,

Michael Helfinger, MA, MBA
Senior Policy Advisor
Cabinet Office Liaison and Policy Support Unit
Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Employment
Ministry of Research and Innovation (Ontario)
900 Bay Street 6th Floor Hearst Block
Toronto, ON M7A 2E1
Tel. 416.325.6519 Fax 416.325.6825
michael.helfinger@ontario.ca
Date: February 4, 2014

Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc
Special Projects Manager
Toronto Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON M3N 1S4

Dear Mr. Dion:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Portland Flood Protection Project

The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has had the opportunity to review the subject amended environmental assessment report. MNR appreciates the time you took to walk staff through the report and explain the flood remediation measures proposed through this environmental assessment.

MNR is supportive, in principle, of the efforts of the City and the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to remove the Toronto Port Lands from the floodplain. Through this assessment, and the detailed design to follow, TRCA must ensure that all flood protection measures are carried out in accordance with the MNR’s Natural Hazards Technical Guides, 2002, as they relate to the natural hazard of flooding. Once the works have been completed in accordance with the provincial guidance and these lands are demonstrated to be no longer subject to flooding, the Province will work with the City and the TRCA to adjust the Special Policy Area (SPA) designation within the study area. The detailed flood assessment to be completed as part of this EA could be used, in part, as justification for any future adjustment of the SPA.

Sincerely,

Jackie Burkart
District planner

C: Marc Rose, AECOM: marc.rose@aecom.com
Mark Christie, MMAH: Mark.Christie@ontario.ca
Sybelle Von Kursell, MMAH: Sybelle.VonKursell@ontario.ca
Denis Lemoire, MNR: Denis.Lemoire@ontario.ca
David Johnston, MNR: David.P.Johnston@ontario.ca
February 27, 2014

Jackie Burkart
District Planner – Aurora District
Ministry of Natural Resources
50 Bloomington Rd
Aurora ON, L4G 0L8

Dear Ms. Burkart:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for your letter dated February 4, 2014 regarding the amendment to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft environmental assessment (EA) report and provide us with your comments relating to the project.

In your letter, you noted that, in principle, MNR is supportive of the proposed plan to remove the Toronto Port Lands. In addition you noted the following:

> Through this assessment, and the detailed design to follow, TRCA must ensure that all flood protection measures are carried out in accordance with the MNR’s Natural Hazards Technical Guides, 2002, as they relate to the natural hazard of flooding. Once the works have been completed in accordance with the provincial guidance and these lands are demonstrated to be no longer subject to flooding, the Province will work with the City and the TRCA to adjust the Special Policy Area (SPA) designation within the study area. The detailed flood assessment to be completed as part of this EA could be used, in part, as justification for any future adjustment of the SPA.

In response to your point regarding ensuring it is clear that the co-proponents adhere to the MNR’s Natural Hazards Technical Guide (2002) during both the EA process and detailed design, the following statement has been added to Chapter 6 of the EA in Section 6.1.1:

- During detailed design, the Adaptive Management of Stream Corridors in Ontario Natural Hazards Technical Guides (MNR, 2002) will be consulted to ensure that all flood protection features are in accordance with the Ministry of Natural Resources’
(MNR’s) natural hazard policies as they relate to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

Further, we have also added the following commitment in Chapter 8 of the EA in Table 8-2:

- Prior to the start of works, ongoing discussions between MNR, MMAH, City of Toronto, TRCA and Waterfront Toronto will be required to determine the appropriate approach and timing for modification or removal of the SPA designation.

Thank you again for your response. The information you provided has assisted the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto, and the City of Toronto in finalizing the DMNP. We have recorded your comments and will keep these on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Comments and information received will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

If you have any additional comments please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Marc Rose at your earliest convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP</th>
<th>Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Canada Ltd</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Commerce Valley Dr. West, 7th Floor</td>
<td>5 Shoreham Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, ON L3T 7W3</td>
<td>Downsview, ON M3N 1S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 905-747-7793</td>
<td>Phone: 416-661-6600 x 5230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:marc.rose@aecom.com">marc.rose@aecom.com</a></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:kdion@trca.on.ca">kdion@trca.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of the Study Team, I want to thank you again for reviewing the draft report and for your input to this important project.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kenneth Dion  
Special Projects Manager  
Toronto and Region Conservation
February 7, 2014 (by email only)

Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc.
Special Projects Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON M3N 1S4

Dear Mr. Dion,

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment Report
Project: Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project, Individual EA
Location: City of Toronto
MTCS File: PLAN-20EA042

As part of the Environmental Assessment Act process, the Ministry of Tourism and Culture has an interest in the conservation of cultural heritage resources including archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

Comments on the December, 2010 Environmental Assessment Report for this project were submitted by Paula Kulpa in a letter dated February 18, 2011, and were substantially addressed in responses and revisions by the proponent. Many of these comments referred to components of the Environmental Assessment Report which remain unchanged in the current version. We have the following comments regarding the revised preferred alternative as described in the December, 2013 Draft Environmental Assessment Report:

Chapter 7 notes a number of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that will be or may be partially or completely displaced during construction, namely:

- Port Lands Industrial District (CHL 1)
- Commissioners Street streetscape (CHL 9), Villiers Street at east terminus (CH 17) and Cherry Street streetscape (CHL 27)
- Keating Channel (CHL 28)
- Polson dockwall (BHR 3)
- Marine Terminal 35, Atlas Crane site and one storey brick warehouse at 242-292 Cherry Street (BHR 21)
- Keating Channel Bridge (BHR 29)
- Railway Line (CHL 2)
- Concrete silos on property at 54 Polson Street (CHL 6) (Phases 1-3)
- Toronto Harbour Commissioners Storage Buildings at 62 Villiers Street (BHR 16)
- Three warehouses on north side Villiers Street, west of Don Roadway (BHR 18, 19, 20)
- Commissioners Street streetscape (CHL 9) and Don Roadway streetscape (CHL 31)
- Former Dominion Bank building at 275 Cherry Street (built heritage resource)
- Toronto Hydro Substation at 281 Cherry Street (built heritage resource)
- Essroc Toronto Terminal silos at 312 Cherry Street (BHR 26)
Fire Hall No. 30 at 39 Commissioners Street (BHF 10) as well as the one-storey brick building beside the Fire Hall (BHF 11)

Mitigation measures listed for these impacts include the preparation of cultural heritage evaluation reports for a number of these resources, to assess their cultural heritage value, the extent of the impacts and potential conservation and mitigation options. We prefer that all necessary cultural heritage assessment work be carried out during the environmental assessment process, in order that mitigation measures and net effects on resources can be known during stakeholder consultation and can inform the selection of preferred alternatives.

If it is not possible for all of the cultural heritage assessment work to be completed at the environmental assessment stage, we look forward to reviewing these cultural heritage assessment documents before construction.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this Draft Environmental Assessment Report.

Best Regards

Dan Minkin
Heritage Planner
416-314-7147
dan.minkin@ontario.ca

cc: Marc Rose, Senior Environmental Planner
    AECOM

    Solange Desautels, Supervisor, Project Review
    Ministry of the Environment
February 27, 2014

Mr. Dan Minkin
Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport
Hearst Block, 9th Floor
900 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2E1

Dear Mr. Minkin:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for your letter dated February 7, 2014 regarding the amendment to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft environmental assessment (EA) report and provide us with your comments relating to the project.

In your letter, you responded to the requirement outlined in Chapter 7 of the EA that cultural heritage evaluation reports would be prepared in the future to assess the cultural heritage value of a number of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that may be partially or completely displaced during construction. In addition, you noted the following:

“We prefer that all necessary cultural heritage assessment work be carried out during the environmental assessment process, in order that mitigation measures and net effects on resources can be known during stakeholder consultation and can inform the selection of preferred alternatives.

If it is not possible for all of the cultural heritage assessment work to be completed at the environmental assessment stage, we look forward to reviewing these cultural heritage assessment documents before construction."

As the project is in the final EA stage, timing does not permit the ability to complete the cultural heritage assessments prior to the final EA submission. However, as requested, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport will be informed of the timelines of the cultural heritage assessment reports moving forward and these will be made available for the Ministry’s review during detailed design.
Thank you again for your response. The information you provided has assisted the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto, and the City of Toronto in finalizing the DMNP. We have recorded your comments and will keep these on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Comments and information received will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

If you have any additional comments please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Marc Rose at your earliest convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP</th>
<th>Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Canada Ltd</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Commerce Valley Dr. West, 7th Floor</td>
<td>5 Shoreham Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, ON L3T 7W3</td>
<td>Downsviw, ON M3N 1S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 905-747-7793</td>
<td>Phone: 416-661-6600 x 5230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:marc.rose@aecom.com">marc.rose@aecom.com</a></td>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:kdion@trca.on.ca">kdion@trca.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of the Study Team, I want to thank you again for reviewing the draft report and for your input to this important project.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kenneth Dion
Special Projects Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation
February 7th, 2014

To: Marc Rose, Consultant Project Manager  
Kenneth Dion, Special Projects Manager  

From: Heather Richards, Environmental Response Team, Toronto Public Health  

Re: Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP) Environmental Assessment.

Toronto Public Health is acutely aware that the implementation of the DMNP plays a pivotal role in the extensive plans of the revitalization of the City of Toronto's Port Lands, and the naturalization of the Don Mouth. This initiative will provide many advantages to the area such as the re-establishment of a natural, functional wetland at the mouth of the Don River, and the provision of flood protection to approximately 230 hectares of land south and east of the existing Keating Channel. There are clear benefits directly related to public health with the design of the naturalized new river valley and river mouth to maintain a regular water flow, thereby reducing standing water in the area. As an example, this component of the initiative has a direct contribution to the reduction of the public health risk to West Nile Virus.

Conversely, there are a number of initiatives which will take place in the course of the proposed Phase 1 to Phase 4; in pre-construction; during construction; and, lastly, during the establishment of the plan through to the post-establishment activities, that constitute a potential risk to public health. There are activities that have been defined in the report as having a predictive outcome as negligible; however, receptors in the nearby residence and business locations may experience adverse effects from, for example, noise, dust and combustion emissions which may warrant intervention from Toronto Public Health.

The DMNP Environmental Assessment has highlighted various examples of the project objectives, which are areas of potential public health concern:

**Watercourse contamination**
- Potential degradation of water quality during widening of the channel
- Potential degradation of water quality resulting from sediment and contaminated material unintentionally entering the watercourse
- Potential spillage during the removal of abandoned oil pipelines
- Managing construction runoff and erosion for storm water management and contaminated material
Air pollution
- Excavation on site movement and stockpiling of contaminated soil
- Relocation of sediment and debris management
- Odours from prolonged exposure to contaminated soil prior to their conversion
- Combustion emissions associated with construction equipment
- Dust generation and dispersion from gravel aggregate and construction activities

Noise pollution
- Construction activities associated with infrastructure; bridge and road modifications; earthworks; and, vegetation clearing and grubbing
- Extensive dewatering activities during the applicable operations

As prescribed by the Waterfront Toronto Environmental Management Plan, and as outlined by the Best Management Practices, there are planned mitigation measures to decrease the potential risks to public health in terms of the air, water and noise pollution. However, these applications will minimize but not eliminate the adverse effects.

Toronto Public Health is frequently the first point of contact for the public with concerns to the potential health effects of adverse air and water quality, as well as, excessive noise levels.

As a result, to ensure the progression of the DMNP activities will be effective in managing the potential risk to public health and to provide accurate information to the public, there is a strong recommendation from Toronto Public Health for the presence of a member of the Environmental Response Team within Healthy Environments to provide consultation on the advisory committee of local stakeholders.

For any questions or concerns you may have, please contact me at hrichar@toronto.ca, or at 416-338-1821.

Sincerely,

Heather Richards, MRes, CPHI (C)
Environmental Response Team, Healthy Environments
Toronto Public Health
February 27, 2014

Ms. Heather Richards
Toronto Public Health
277 Victoria Street
5th Floor
Toronto, ON M5B 1W2

Dear Ms. Richards:

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Thank you for your letter dated February 7, 2014 regarding the amendment to the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project (DMNP). We appreciate you taking the time to review the draft environmental assessment (EA) report and provide us with your comments relating to the project.

In your letter, you noted that there are a number of initiatives that will take place during detailed design, construction, and post-establishment that could pose a risk to public health. Specifically you noted that,

_There are activities that have been defined in the report as having a predictive outcome as negligible; however, receptors in the nearby residence and business locations may experience adverse effects from, for example, noise, dust and combustion emissions which may warrant intervention from Toronto Public Health._

_As prescribed by the Waterfront Toronto Environmental Management Plan, and as outlined by the Best Management Practices, there are planned mitigation measures to decrease the potential risks to public health in terms of the air, water and noise pollution. However, these applications will minimize but not eliminate the adverse effects._

Currently, the DMNP accounts for the fact that nearby residence and business locations will likely experience adverse effects from noise, dust and combustion emissions during construction. We determined that those impacts would be negligible because future constructors will be required to adhere to the Best Management Practices (BMPs) outlined in Appendix G of the EA. This appendix outlines the standard construction
techniques and mitigation measures that are required to ensure that impacts on receptors in the area are avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible.

In addition, you raised the following point regarding future involvement on the project’s advisory committee of local stakeholders:

*Toronto Public Health is frequently the first point of contact for the public with concerns to the potential health effects of adverse air and water quality, as well as, excessive noise levels.*

*As a result, to ensure the progression of the DMNP activities will be effective in managing the potential risk to public health and to provide accurate information to the public, there is a strong recommendation from Toronto Public Health for the presence of a member of the Environmental Response Team within Healthy Environments to provide consultation on the advisory committee of local stakeholders.*

In response to your suggestion above, we have added a commitment in Chapter 8 of the EA in Section 8.2.3 and in Table 8-2 to continue to work with the Toronto Public Health Environmental Response Team as part of the project’s advisory committee. Specifically, we note that the project team will establish an advisory committee of local stakeholders who will be involved during detailed design and construction, particularly as it relates to soils and groundwater management issues relating to public health and risk. Further, we have updated our BMPs to reference that the project team will ensure that a member of the Toronto Public Health Environmental Response Team within Healthy Environments is part of the project’s advisory committee moving forward.

Thank you again for your response. The information you provided has assisted the TRCA, Waterfront Toronto, and the City of Toronto in finalizing the DMNP. We have recorded your comments and will keep these on file for use during the project and may be included in project documentation. Comments and information received will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

If you have any additional comments please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Marc Rose at your earliest convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP</th>
<th>Mr. Kenneth Dion, MSc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Project Manager</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Canada Ltd</td>
<td>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On behalf of the Study Team, I want to thank you again for reviewing the draft report and for your input to this important project.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kenneth Dion
Special Projects Manager
Toronto and Region Conservation
Hi Ken,
Thank you for the information.

Jeffrey

From: Ken Dion [mailto:KDion@trca.on.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 2:57 PM
To: Jeffrey Tam
Cc: Arlen Leeming; Michael Charendoff; Adele Freeman; Webster, Brenda; smckenna@toronto.ca
Subject: Re: Fw: Wilson Yard - Lower Don Lands

Good afternoon Jeffrey,

Thank you for your email. The DMNP EA has been undertaken with the understanding that the Wilson Yard will remain in operation. However, the DMNP EA and Lower Don Lands Master Plan envision an enhanced trail system connecting the Don Watershed to the Lower Don Lands in the area between the Wilson Yard and the proposed sediment management facility. While the DMNP EA does not set the final design for pathway system, the initial concept as shown by the enclosed depicts a minor intrusion crossing the Wilson yard. The alignment and design of the trail is subject to change through the detailed design process. As such, we have not assessed the impacts of the trail on the Wilson Yard since the alignment at this time conceptual.

The DMNP EA also identifies the potential for exploring for loading sand that was dredged from the Don River onto rail cars in either the Wilson Yard or along the Keating Channel Spur. However, we have a number of other options that are also available regarding the handling of sand if the use of rail is not available.

Sincerely,

Ken Dion
Hi Michael,
I have been reviewing the Lower Don Lands plan because Metrolinx has some property interests in the area. I have been unable to determine exactly how the Wilson Yard (See attached – outlined in red) fits into the overall plan. Do you know if TRCA/TPLC/Waterfront Toronto/The City have any plans for the Wilson Yard?

Thank you for your assistance.

Jeffrey Tam
Realty Services Officer, Property Acquisition & Disposition
Metrolinx, 20 Bay Street, Suite 600, Toronto, Ontario, M5J 2W3.
Phone: 416.869.3600 X 5161 | Cell: 647.228.1298

This e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete all copies of the e-mail together with any attachments.
Correspondence with Aboriginal Groups
Good afternoon,

Take note that Mr. Luc Lainé no longer represents the Huron-Wendat Nation. Please remove him from your mailing list.

The person now in charge of our Ontario file is Chief Line Gros-Louis. You may send correspondence to her at the same address or via this email.

Regards,

Tina Durand
Secrétaire exécutive jr., secteur politique
Conseil de la Nation huronne-wendat
255, Place Chef Michel Laveau
Wendake (Québec) G0A 4V0
418-843-3767
December 17, 2013

Toronto and Region Conservation  
5 Shoreham Drive  
Downsview, ON M3N 1S4

Att: Kenneth Dion, Special Projects Manager

Re: Notice of Draft Environmental Assessment Report for the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood Protection Project

Dear Kenneth Dion,

Thank you for your consultation request to Alderville First Nation regarding the Don Mouth Naturalization and Port Lands Flood protection project which is being proposed within our Traditional and Treaty Territory. We appreciate the fact that Toronto and Region Conservation recognizes the importance of First Nations Consultation and that your office is conforming to the requirements within the Duty to Consult Process.

As per the Alderville First Nation Consultation Protocol, your proposed project is deemed a level 3, having minimal potential to impact our First Nations’ rights, therefore, please keep Alderville apprised of any archaeological findings, burial sites or any environmental impacts, should any occur. I can be contacted at the mailing address above or electronically via email, at the email address below.

In good faith and respect,

Dave Simpson  
Lands and Resources  
Communications Officer  
Alderville First Nation

dsimpson@aldervillefirstnation.ca  
Tele: (905) 352-2662  
Fax: (905) 352-3242