

## **Ashbridges Bay Erosion and Sediment Control Environmental Assessment (EA): Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting #2: September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

The Toronto Beaches Lions Club

6:30 – 8:30 pm

### **MINUTES**

---

*This report was written by Bianca Wylie and Suzannah Kinsella of SWERHUN Facilitation. It reflects the key points raised and is not intended to serve as a verbatim transcript.*

***Meeting Overview:** This was the second meeting of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC). The purpose of this meeting was to present an update on the work done by the project team since the first CLC meeting, including feedback from PIC 1, the updated alternatives, updated criteria and initial data on modeling wave impacts and sediment.*

### **KEY MESSAGES**

1. **Participants appreciated and enjoyed the presentation and the opportunity to review and discuss the data and modeling done to date.**
2. **Some participants were strongly opposed to including a terminus on the breakwater in any of the design alternatives which was perceived as** facilitating a bridge across Ashbridge's Bay. Participants expressed that this is not desired, and should not be included in any of the alternatives.

#### **I. Welcome & Agenda Review**

The facilitator Suzannah Kinsella opened the meeting by reviewing the proposed agenda and reviewing her role as well as the purpose of the meeting: to look at the progress that is being made on the sediment control alternatives, and the plans to evaluate the options. Suzannah also reviewed the public consultation schedule - that the next CLC meeting will be in early October, followed by Public Information Center (PIC)# 2 in late October.

Finally, Suzannah asked for comments on the first CLC meeting summary. There were no issues raised, and the attendees agreed it accurately reflected the content of the first meeting.

## II. Area Update

Lisa Turnbull, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) Project Manager for the Ashbridges Bay EA, shared a few points prior to her presentation. One update was on the dredging activities currently underway – she said there were approximately five days of work left, but the exact date of completion was subject to contractor availability and weather. Lisa confirmed that Toronto Water would currently not consider dredging at the top of the channel, where some recreational activities happen. Typically clubs fund dredging needed close to their facilities. The TRCA has provided guidance to clubs and groups in other areas when they needed to get permission from the City to dredge. - If anyone wants help with contacts to begin that process, Lisa told CLC members to contact her.

Questions of clarification from the CLC:

- We talk about dredging the channel for federal purposes. What are we trying to dredge, who are we trying to serve with this? *TRCA's responsibility, as a land owner, is to manage navigation in the channel. Around the slips it's the responsibilities of the clubs. It is not a federal user that needs to use the channel, the federal government sets the requirement for navigation (the width and depth) – for it to be a safe channel from the clubs out to the lake.*
- Is the objective of this study to maintain the accessibility of the water for the uses in the area? *Maintaining the lease areas is the responsibility of the clubs. The objective is to maintain access for all the groups into the harbor entrance of Coatsworth Cut.*
- Is there a conflict with the objective? If you want it to have access, but then you won't support full access? *Right now TRCA's responsibility is to the public docks (as shown on slide 8). TRCA did review the previous leases with the boat clubs and the responsibility for dredging in the lease areas was not articulated. It was suggested that discussions pertaining to this responsibility are undertaken by the clubs and their City lease contact.* A CLC member then decided it was preferred to see the ideas presented tonight and then decide if the CLC feel they need to continue with this discussion.
  - *Is it possible to have recreational activity beyond the wetlands?* No. Toronto Water wanted to reinforce that the wetland is associated with the treatment area. It's a functional wetland and not for recreational use.
  - Slide 16 required a correction to correctly capture my feedback, In the third line, the first word should change from "alternative" to "criteria" – the edit should appear as follows:  
"There was concern expressed that in most Environmental Assessments the method of evaluating/scoring does not allow for comparison between each alternative criteria."

Suzannah confirmed that this change would be applied to all future materials and updated in the existing materials.

### III. Sediment Control Alternatives

Lisa Turnbull gave background information on the new alternatives being presented, and the rationale for the new names of alternatives 1-3. Milo Sturm, Shoreplan Engineering, discussed wave and wind modeling. Throughout the presentation, the team answered questions from the CLC, which are listed below.

#### Alternatives 1 and 2

- *Is there any discharge from the treatment plant in this channel for Alternative 3? Yes, it will flow through the channel.*
- *How do we ensure how it will not be contained, and that it flows out through the lake? The study for water quality is ongoing and underway.*
- *How has the potential bridge over Ashbridges Bay influenced the design of the alternatives? There is no influence at all. We have added a terminus to serve as a lookout point within the area. We know Waterfront Toronto has a long-term vision for creating a connection – we also know we are always going to have boats in the area so any design they would look at will have to take this into account.*

#### Feedback and Advice from the CLC on the Alternatives

**Creating a trail for users to get to a lookout.** One participant noted that if you can't get to the lookout without the bridge then it should not be there. If there is public access on that beach, people will go and find a way to have a point – the furthest you can go, becomes the lookout. People will create their own trail/lookout.

**Remove the terminus on the breakwater.** One participant reminded the CLC that there is no bridge or connection for Lake Ontario Park within the scope of this study, that it adds to the cost (the terminus) and that it should be removed completely. There was a strong sentiment from the CLC to remove the terminus, as nothing that could facilitate a bridge should be included in any of the alternatives.

#### Alternative 3 and 4

- *When will the seawall gates be removed? They will be decommissioned when the new outfall is built. Although the City of Toronto is trying to accelerate the implementation of the project, it is currently seven or more years away from construction.*
- *Is there a picture that shows what you would build if the seawall gates were no longer needed? That is a main element of alternative 3 – we need to think about it in two stages, one stage is with the seawall gates, the second stage is once they are removed.*
- *If a wetland is created, is it correct to assume that something was going to happen in front of the gates? The wetland is connected to the CSOs, it is not connected to the gates. There will be a separate sewer to move things to the wetlands, but the gates would still be operating.*

- *If the gates were closed, why would you opt to go to the easterly break wall instead of the western one? Why not move the wetlands further west?* That would essentially be Alternatives 1 and 2. Right now we need to provide ongoing operation of the seawall gates. The only thing that could happen if alternative 3 is preferred, we wouldn't necessarily have to make the channel once the gates are decommissioned.
- *If you built one wall, why do we need the second wall – is that not Toronto Water's issue to manage?* TRCA will be looking at whether the first pieces of work approved would be the headland (to the east) for 2015. The project team needs to start defining the sequencing of construction and we need to work with Toronto Water for best way to do the build out.
- *Why is the wall that will come out from the peninsula 100 m?* It takes us back to previous options from '09 – Sediment transport at that depth is most effective. You can navigate around it and it provides reasonable sediment control.
- *Is the east wall intended to control pollution?* Yes, that wall is built for that purpose. 2020 is the time for the outfall mechanism to be operational.
- *Does that point about deflection of pollution mean that if the seawall gate were removed prior to completion of this project, that in alternative 2 you wouldn't need the eastern section?* Correct – if the gates are closed, we do not need the small east breakwater in Alternative 2. There is possibility that we could show the elements of each Alternative as different colours to define when we phase them, this may help clarify how alternative 2 and 3 will be implemented.

The project team noted that the structures will be 77.5 metres above sea level (2.5 metres above lake level).

### **Feedback on Alternative 3**

**Consider using Lakeshore Park in Etobicoke as an example in an upcoming presentation, perhaps for the PIC.** That wall was built relatively recently, and would provide an illustration of how this might look.

One participant commented that it was much longer than expected. Another participant commented that they liked this alternative, but that this was dependent on how much dredging could be done before hand to help manage it.

## IV. Process Review – Evaluation Methodology and Criteria

Lisa noted that water quality monitoring has to be completed before the evaluation process can go further, as the team needs the preliminary results to help define the scoring range. These results will be available at the next CLC meeting.

*Questions and Answers about the methodology section:*

- *Currently we have 0-3 in the chart, is it changing?* We need to look at this after we have the results of the water quality modeling to see whether this will change. We will have an update on that at the next meeting.
- *Looking at some of the evaluation criteria, will a potential bridge to Lake Ontario Park be part of the decision-making criteria? We want to impact them as much as possible, and we want to get rid of the bridge.* There are planning initiatives out there and we need to state how we may affect them.
- *Regarding the Water Quality modeling, is there anything going to be done at the Lakeshore in terms of assessment?* See slide 33 –There are two points within the basin, one is at the top (north) and the other at the entrance to Coatsworth Cut.
- *Wasn't an EA done for the wetlands? Wouldn't that EA have had to include water quality modeling?* Yes, and we're using the basic info, not reinventing that but then we have to add on the impact of the new alternatives. The Water modeling is about analyzing existing conditions and the implementation of the Wet Weather Flow projects, so there are essentially two outputs from the model.
- *How do we interpret the wave modelling as part of the plan to keep sediment out of the bay?* The waves add to the sediment, so the less waves the less sediment.
- *It was discussed at the last meeting, to do some studies within the Bay about where the problem areas are – were those conducted?* We gathered information from stakeholders about where the problem spots are. The sediment modelling that we are doing includes the Bay. It only deals with sand sediment, it does not include clay. But that will by some degree be addressed by water quality modelling.
- *Is it not better for sediment control with alternative 3?* The differences are very minor.
- *On pages 22 & 23 there is discrepancy with the water lot diagrams; which one is accurate? One is blue, one is red.* The TRCA will have to follow up regarding which water lot diagram is accurate as one map was created internally and the other by the project consultant.

### **Feedback and Advice from the CLC on the Methodology**

**Allow for fractional increments in the criteria; put one decimal place in that way you can show minor impacts.** The issue with the range is not so much how much one alternative differs from another. If you take water quality as the baseline, the real question is not how much does water quality get affected by one alternative or another.

The scaling has to be correct.

**One participant suggested including a weighting on the criteria, and that the CLC should provide input on the weighting.** In this example, water quality and navigability should have the highest weighting.

*Note: The project team confirmed that it would not put a weight on the criteria, they are going to be weighted equally. The Class EA framework does require a comprehensive evaluation, but does not dictate the methodology.*

**Another participant reinforced the idea of a range in the scoring, and that this is preferable to the idea of weighting.** When you score everything in buckets, it's hard to figure out what the weighting should be. The point of this method is that your scoring should reflect the weight in the score. If it is not as important, should get a lower score.

**The criteria and process should focus on keeping the channel navigable.** The CLC should focus on this objective and not focus on the bridge as it is not in the scope of this project.

**Consider the two pumps used at 50 Point in Grimsby as a potential element in the water circulation solution.**

**The wind that comes out of the North/NorthWest is helpful for sediment control;** it helps move sediment out of the bay.

## V. Next Steps

Lisa Turnbull wrapped up the meeting with a quick overview of next steps. She stated that the consultation process is about a month behind schedule, but that the technical work is still on track. The goal is to have the EA process complete by the end of the year and to file for public comment in 2014. Lisa committed to bringing the evaluation topic back to the CLC at the next meeting, likely in October. As of now, the PIC is slated for late October, and will present the preferred alternative and the impact of the analysis.

Suzannah Kinsella wrapped up the meeting by thanking participants for coming. She let the participants know that a draft of notes from the workshop would be distributed to them for review prior to being finalized.

## VI. Summary of Action Points

1. Date for next CLC and PIC to be confirmed: TRCA
2. Guidance on dredging requests: Members to contact TRCA as needed
3. Slide 16: change 'alternative' to 'criteria': TRCA
4. Consider using Lakeshore Park in Etobicoke as an example in an upcoming presentation, perhaps for the PIC: TRCA
5. Slide 22 & 23 discrepancy with the water lot diagrams: TRCA to resolve

## **VII. Attendees**

### **CLC Members**

Susan Stuart, Balmy Beach Canoe Club

Sarah Box, Friends of the Spit

Nolly Havermoek, Toronto Beaches Lions Club

John Edwards, Toronto Hydroplane & Sailing Club

Beverly Edwards, Toronto Ornithological Club

Robert Hedley, Ashbridges Bay Yacht Club

Rachel Lewis, Navy League of Canada

### **Observers**

Michael Rosenberg

### **TRCA**

Lisa Turnbull

Nancy Gaffney

Laura Stephenson

### **Toronto Water**

Philip Cheung

### **Shoreplan**

Milo Sturm

### **Swerhun | Facilitation & Decision Support**

Suzannah Kinsella

Bianca Wylie



**Ashbridges Bay Erosion and Sediment Control Project Conservation  
Ontario Class Environmental Assessment (EA)  
COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE #2**

Thursday September 5, 2013  
Toronto Beaches Lions Club – 10 Ashbridge's Bay Park Road  
6:30pm – 8:30 pm  
Chair: Suzannah Kinsella, Swerhun Inc.

AGENDA

1. Introductions and Housekeeping Items  
(Suzannah Kinsella, Swerhun Inc.)
2. Review of Minutes from CLC #1  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA)
3. Dredging: 2013 Activities and Follow up to Requests from CLC members  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA)
4. Overview of Cost Benefit Analysis Exercise  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA)
5. Summary of Input Received from Public Information Center #1  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA)
6. Refined Alternatives  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA and Milo Sturm, Shoreplan Engineering)
7. Evaluation of Alternatives
  - a. Evaluation Process
  - b. Finalized Evaluation Criteria
  - c. Preliminary Results of Coastal Modelling  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA and Milo Sturm, Shoreplan Engineering)
8. Next Steps and Proposed Meeting Schedule  
(Lisa Turnbull, TRCA)