| I.D. | Dated | Event/ Source | Issues and Comments Received |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | January 8, 2013 | Comment of the NoC (via email) | Consider adopting a two column format in order to improve notice readability. |
| 2 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider providing studies completed as part of the EA to CLC members for review. |
| 3 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | The new LWC Project Study Area is reasonable. |
| 4 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Ensure that the water circulation modelling is based on current conditions and the proposed Alternatives. |
| 5 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Happy to know that the studies are taking into consideration changing Lake Ontario water levels.  |
| 6 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Ensure that the proposed LWC Project does not increase the occurrence of flooding up-stream in Serson Creek. |
| 7 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider introducing only native (Carolinian) species in the LWC park.  |
| 8 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Ensure the proposed islands will not preclude the use of non-motorized vessels (canoe, kayak, etc) due to high waves and strong under toe. |
| 9 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider limiting the use of motor-powered vessels in the proposed wetland areas. |
| 10 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider introducing pathways on the ‘hook’ portion of the Alternatives. |
| 11 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider developing cross-sections for each of the five Alternatives under consideration. |
| 12 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Ensure that the park is designed to be used year round. |
| 13 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | The five Alternatives presented are reasonable and make sense with the exception of introducing revetments. |
| 14 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider circulation before and after precedent images of other waterfront parks. Port Union would be a good example. |
| 15 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Consider using numeric scoring as part of the evaluation of Alternatives. |
| 16 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Include 3D visuals to get a better sense of what is being proposed. |
| 17 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Provide the drawings of the five proposed Alternatives to the CLC for review. |
| 18 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Concern regarding navigation hazards introduced by the islands. |
| 19 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | The evaluation approach seems reasonable and appropriate.  |
| 20 | January 14, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | The Alternatives reflect the CLC’s and the public’s input. |
| 21 | January 22, 2013 | CLC Meeting #1 | Pleased with the consultation process. |
| 22 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Based on what is being proposed, what will happen at the interface of Applewood Creek and the Lake Ontario?  |
| 23 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | What is the current construction of the shoreline near the water treatment plant? |
| 24 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Are you proposing to replace the existing armour stone with more armor stone?  |
| 25 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the impact of the OPG land piers on the shoreline. |
| 26 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Differences in construction costs between the five Alternatives. |
| 27 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | The Alternatives are reasonable, with the exception of the Revetment Alternative. |
| 28 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the aesthetics of the islands. |
| 29 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider algae growth in the embayment area. |
| 30 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider opportunities for including more sand in the terrestrial area. |
| 31 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the safety of trail users in the design. |
| 32 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the impacts the Alternatives will have further down shore. |
| 33 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider public safety if allowing boat access into the embayment area. |
| 34 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the water quality in the embayment area. |
| 35 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider the public experience, including recreational opportunities in the park. |
| 36 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider allowing swimming in the embayment area. |
| 37 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider water currents associated with the Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives. |
| 38 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider flooding concerns associated with the Alternatives. |
| 39 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider incorporating parking, restaurant, and washroom facilities. |
| 40 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Provide a more precise definition of what is meant by ‘beach’. |
| 41 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Provide more detail with respect to trail size.  |
| 42 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Provide more details on public recreation opportunities. The public experience is also an important consideration in addition to the environment and ecological habitat. |
| 43 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider a hybrid of the embayment and the Island Alternatives (Island Beach A, Island Beach B, Island Beach C with) a break through option to alleviate algae growth concerns.  |
| 44 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider opportunities to maximize views into the water and into the land. |
| 45 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider an indicator to measure fiscal viability of each Alternative. |
| 46 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider an indicator to measure how much time people are spending in the park. |
| 47 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure the extent to which the Alternatives provide recreational opportunities. |
| 48 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure the infrastructure required to support transportation requirements. |
| 49 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure active recreation opportunities. |
| 50 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure interpretive activity opportunities. |
| 51 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure the extent to which Alternatives might prevent odours from reaching the park.  |
| 52 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure the extent to which the Alternatives attract undesirable species (e.g. cormorants) that may degrade aesthetics. |
| 53 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure public health and safety. |
| 54 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure the extent to which the Alternatives provide view corridors toward the lake and other key vistas. |
| 55 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider criteria to measure ‘universal accessibility’. |
| 56 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Island Beach B and Island Beach C Alternatives are generally preferred. |
| 57 | January 22, 2013 | PIC#1 | The Revetment Alternative does not seem reasonable given the project objectives. |
| 58 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Evaluation approach is reasonable. It is a good an exciting process. |
| 59 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | The evaluation objectives being used are good. |
| 60 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Provide the cost of constructing and maintaining the LWC park for each Alternative being considered. |
| 61 | January 22, 2013 | PIC #1 | Consider providing information in advance so as to be able to digest information and provide informed feedback. |
| 62 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | Will the two wetlands both be permanently open to Lake Ontario or is it the intent to have a more fluctuating situation where they open and close depending on water levels, wave action etc. like Rattray Marsh? |
| 63 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | For the Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives, will the fill to create the islands all come from the Hanlan project or will some of it have to be "purchased"? |
| 64 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | The Island Beach C Alternative shows a beach going much further east than any of the others. Is there a reason why the Headland Beach, Island Beach A, and Island Beach B Alternatives could not have the beach to the east of the "bulges"? |
| 65 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | Is it feasible to have beaches on the east and/or lake side of the "hooks" in the Island Beach B and Island Beach C Alternatives? |
| 66 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | Are the islands associated with Island Beach A, Island Beach B, and Island Beach C Alternatives for fish habitat only, or are they needed to protect the beach?  |
| 67 | February 4th, 2013 | Post PIC#1 (email) | It has been suggested that there be an additional Alternative which would be a modification of the Island Beach B Alternative. Namely that there be a gap in the easterly "hook" to allow a better circulation of water in and out of the "harbour" or "bay". Do you know if someone is working on this?  |
| 68 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Were the criteria used to evaluate the Alternatives weighted? |
| 69 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | The evaluation process and methodology is understandable and adequate. |
| 70 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | What will the natural beach look like? |
| 71 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | What percentage of the way from Etobicoke Creek to the first island would this transition occur? |
| 72 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | How high will the revetment be and will it obstruct views? |
| 73 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Consider not obstructing any critical views. |
| 74 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Consider undertaking a critical analysis of views to ensure key views that represent the highest percentage of viewscapes are preserved.  |
| 75 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | In general there are no objections to the Preferred Alternative Island C, but consider views carefully. |
| 76 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Why did the Island Beach C Alternative outperform the Island Beach B Alternative in terms of access? The Island Beach B Alternative has a long peninsula that allows privacy and access to the water. |
| 77 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Will there be an opportunity to re-evaluate the Alternatives if during the refinement stage we learn new information? |
| 78 | March 19, 2013 | CLC#2 | Island C provides great access for canoeing and kayaking. |
| 79 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider conducting a wave study. |
| 80 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | All five project Alternatives are directly adjacent to the OPG land and the City of Toronto. Consider consulting both organizations about the proposal. |
| 81 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider incorporating landscaping to screen the G.E. Booth WWTF from public view. |
| 82 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider the accumulation of organic materials along the shoreline.  |
| 83 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Ensure that the trails in the proposed park accommodate multiple users. |
| 84 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | In general, PIC participants agreed with the evaluation outcomes and in particular, the Preferred Alternative Island C. |
| 85 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | PIC participants highlighted the following positive elements of the Preferred Alternative Island C: (i) abundance of natural linkages; (ii) re-naturalization of the shoreline; (iii) creation of amenity space for the public; (iv) aesthetics of the proposed configuration with three islands. |
| 86 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider giving more emphasis to the preservation of existing beaches. |
| 87 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider access to the project land area over the next several years and during construction. |
| 88 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider the human element in the park in addition to naturalization. |
| 89 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider mosquito proliferation due to proposed wetlands. |
| 90 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider accessibility to the park to ensure everyone can enjoy it. |
| 91 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider including more sand as part of the Preferred Alternative Island C. |
| 92 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider effect on roads and local area due to the transportation of the fill and other construction activities. |
| 93 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider a contingency plan in the event there isn’t sufficient fill generated so that the configuration/land mass of the park can be adapted. |
| 94 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider separating the fill into piles based on quality to ensure that low-quality fill is not mixed with high-quality fill. |
| 95 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Disappointment was expressed by a number of PIC participants about the ‘beach’ component of the Preferred Alternative Island C not being able to support a sandy area.  |
| 96 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider the aesthetics of the islands as part of the Preferred Alternative refinements and ensure that the treatment does not compromise the naturalization of the islands. |
| 97 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | How realistic will beach area utilization be because of the odours from the wastewater treatment plant? |
| 98 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider demonstrating that there will not be stagnation/algae along the shoreline associated with the Preferred Alternative Island C. |
| 99 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | What lake level are the studies predicated on?  |
| 100 | April 3, 2013 | PIC#2 | Consider overflow from the wastewater treatment plant into the proposed naturalized area. |
| 101 | April 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Will the construction plan happen soon? |
| 102 | April 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | When will the construction for the Arsenal Lands begin? |
| 103 | April 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Will the expansion of the Water treatment facility at Promenade Park have an odour to the residence around the surrounding neighbourhoods and the park itself? |
| 104 | April 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I am highly impressed with the quality of communications, on all levels, associated with the project. |
| 105 | April 10, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Is there evidence to refute a comment shared by a Long Branch resident that the beach in question may be the last remaining “Natural beach” in the Toronto Area? |
| 106 | April 15, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Phone Call | Concerned with the loss of sand beach and not clear on the reasons behind this. Request for clarification for reasons for change and request confirmation that community concerns are being listened to. |
| 107 | May 13, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Is it okay if I post your comments to the Preserved Stories website, as a way of updating visitors to the site? |
| 108 | May 13, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Your response affirms my sense that the Mississauga Waterfront Connection EA Project and all other initiatives related to the redevelopment of the Lakeview Area demonstrates an exemplary communications strategy and a strong focus on ensuring that meaningful input from residents is an integral part of the planning process. |
| 109 | June 6, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Can you please give me an estimate of the amount of beach that will be removed? It looks like there is about 30 feet of sand beach to the west of Applewood Creek. How much sand beach will be removed or altered on the east side of that small creek.  |
| 110 | June 8, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I am glad that the Lakeview neighbourhood in Mississauga will get a natural waterfront park but not at the expense of an existing sand beach on the Toronto side. |
| 111 | June 10, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Beach users are unaware of this project. I think it is very important that you inform the beach-using community – ideally with a kiosk in the parking lot on summer weekends. |
| 112 | June 26, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I am having a hard time getting my head around the fact that it can be a good thing that about half of an existing sand beach would be altered for the sake of a man made beach and a walking trail. I would think having a large rock structure (similar to Sam Smith shoreline) jutting out from the water treatment plant would accomplish the same goal without destroying an existing natural environment. I understand that this is actually a compromise from the original preferred plan.I really hope that the disposal of rubble from construction waste is not a key reason why this option has been chosen. |
| 113 | June 24, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I am very surprised and alarmed that the proposals would replace a stretch of sandy beach with a rock beach.What is the reason for this?I would like to strongly register an objection to the loss of sand beach. A sand beach is a precious commodity and much more enjoyable an experience than rocks.There must be a solution that does not require the expense of bringing all these rocks in and eliminating the sand beach. |
| 114 | July 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I understand there will be a public meeting this month to share plans. |
| 115 | July 5, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Concern regarding the loss of all or part of the beaches immediately west of Etobicoke Creek under each of the 5 alternatives.I have not seen the write ups from the public meetings.Please help me understand that we are being listened to and that are concerns are being proactively addressed. |
| 116 | July 13 | Post PIC #2 Email | Is there public access to the sand beach at the Suncor energy site?All I could find was a beach made out of broken adobe clay brick pipe. And there was a wall in the water that looks almost like a traffic median on the 401. I hope that is not what is planned for the beach at Marie Curtis. |
| 117 | July 15 and July 16 | Post PIC #2 Email | The sand beach at the Suncor site is not accessible to the public, as is the long beach at Marie Curtis.I was not expecting to have to look at private property for the sand beach.It is imperative to retain an existing, long, natural sand beach that is available to the public. |
| 118 | June 14 & 15, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: 2013 Mississauga Waterfront Festival at Port Credit Memorial Park | Concern over habitat loss |
| 119 | June 14 & 15, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: 2013 Mississauga Waterfront Festival at Port Credit Memorial Park | Concern over unsightly WWTP and the odour that is emitted  |
| 120 | June 14 & 15, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: 2013 Mississauga Waterfront Festival at Port Credit Memorial Park | Concern over loss of sand beach at Marie Curtis Park |
| 121 | June 14 & 15, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: 2013 Mississauga Waterfront Festival at Port Credit Memorial Park | General awareness |
| 122 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | When is the next PIC? |
| 123 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | It is nice to hear that the beach will be kept behind the beach face. |
| 124 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | What is this project? |
| 125 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | How does the LWC Project coordinate with the Marie Curtis Park Master Plan and the Arsenal Lands Master Plan? |
| 126 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | How will the LWC Project be funded? |
| 127 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I do not want this to end up like Colonel Sam Smith Park, with sludge build-up. |
| 128 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | This is a great project – anything that helps animals is good. |
| 129 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Where will access be provided? |
| 130 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Are you still stockpiling fill in the Arsenal Lands? |
| 131 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | How is the information you are presenting today different than the information presented at the last PIC? |
| 132 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | What is happening with the OPG lands? |
| 133 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | How is it being paid for and what is the cost? |
| 134 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | There should also be a display at Marie Curtis Park West. |
| 135 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Concern regarding being unaware of previous consultation activities |
| 136 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Plant milkweeds for butterflies |
| 137 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | The new beach configuration is good. |
| 138 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Will any trees be removed? |
| 139 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | What are the islands for? |
| 140 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | What species of trees will be planted? |
| 141 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Where will the rivers go? |
| 142 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | There should be more information on the Mississauga side. |
| 143 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I did not receive enough information about the project previously. |
| 144 | July 24, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Will there be new parking associated with the project? |
| 145 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Will the cobble beach be safe? |
| 146 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Concern about the loss of sand beach. |
| 147 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Need to consider the remnant sand beach in front of the WWTF. |
| 148 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Need to consider the impacts on windsurfing and kite-boarding. |
| 149 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | The lakebed is sand and your proposal will interrupt the lakebed and the flow of sand. The Project will lead to erosion of the remaining sand beach and future protection works of cobble stone. We will eventually lose the remaining sand beach. |
| 150 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Publicize the project to the City of Toronto and put project information on the City of Toronto website. |
| 151 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Put more signage on the West side of Marie Curtis Park. |
| 152 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Why do you need a new park in this area? The park is underutilized. |
| 153 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Show an overlay of the existing vs. the proposed shorelines. |
| 154 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Put more signs up. |
| 155 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Is it possible to create a trail in front of the WWTF without lake-filling? |
| 156 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Sand is natural. |
| 157 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | There has been no talk of remnant sand beach and there is a need to profile I more in communication material. |
| 158 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Start the public meetings at 7:00 PM as people can’t make it from work if it starts any earlier. Concern regarding public meeting accessibility. |
| 159 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I don’t believe that the wetland won’t dry up. |
| 160 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Consider the contaminants from the OPG site. |
| 161 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | There is no access to waterfront in revetment area. |
| 162 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | The islands are a problem for windsurfers. |
| 163 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I pull my kayak up on the remnant beach and won’t be able to do this with a cobble beach. |
| 164 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Concern regarding removal of trees in Marie Curtis Park |
| 165 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I can’t walk into the water from the sand behind the cobble. |
| 166 | July 27, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | The trail doesn’t go anywhere without the use of OPG lands. |
| 167 | July 27, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Will the next public meeting be accessible by TTC? From what I saw of the proposed project  is that the only public lands that are impacted by the project are Toronto lands-namely Marie Curtis west beach-and I think it only fair that the next E.A. meeting should be in Toronto. |
| 168 | July 27, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Is there someone who needs to give approval for a City of Toronto beach to be disturbed, re-modeled, reconstructed -or whatever the chosen term is. I understand the sand will be left -but if the water is not there it will just grow up with weeds and shrubs in a matter of years. If so-I would like to have that person or committee's contact info. |
| 169 | July 27, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Is there a way of letting the Toronto public know what is going on?I was actually surprised that people had read the poster at the back of my car and showed up at the presentation because of it. I can't leave my car there all the time-I do have other things to do but walk the beach-so how about something permanent? Maybe permanent signage near the WEST parking lot would be appropriate. The city seems to have large signs about their other project.Also, somewhere on a city website would be good. |
| 170 | July 27, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | How many people from Toronto are on the Community Liaison Committee and is there someone that can be contacted?Thanks again for the efforts that you are making reaching out to the public. |
| 171 | July 29, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | I would like to ask you, when you get to the detailed planning stage of this project, to ensure that the trail be designed to have AMPLE SEPARATION between the walking lane area and the lane designated for bicycles, rollerblading ,skateboarding, etc. as opposed to just a painted line.The pleasure, that should exist when walking, is completely negated when you need to constantly be looking over your shoulder to see if one of aforementioned vehicles is approaching to pass you at relatively high speeds (compared to walking) in case you happen to take a step that is slightly to the side. You need only take a walk on the trail along the Etobicoke Creek to understand and experience this dilemma. As mentioned, AMPLE SEPARATION would be greatly appreciated to solve this situation by allowing walking to again be a pleasant experience. |
| 172 | July 29, 2013 | Post Outreach Email | I was introduced to this project while walking through Marie Curtis Park this weekend.  I noticed in the presentation package that there are several alternatives being considered, one of which proposes to remove a large area of beach (alternative 5).  I am not supportive of this alternative as the beach is very well used.  If the beach is left intact, I am very supportive of the other alternatives which will greatly enhance the waterfront experience. |
| 173 | July 30, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | Let me express my appreciation for your detailed reply and your plan to reduce the loss of beach in response to feedback received during the PICs.As a lake front property owner I can confirm that our experience is consistent with your outline for the movement of sand "in during the summer" and "out during the winter"There is also a correlation between the level of the lake and the accumulation of sandThis is somewhat independent of season and is slightly less correlated than the summer / winter correlation you outlineNonetheless if your project included raising the level of the lake bottom with large flat stones you will be able to extend rather than reduce the beaches.There is justification for raising the level of the lake bottom as it reverses the process of removing lake bottom stone that occurred a century ago.Specifically, if the lake bottom level is raised in front of the G.E. Booth Waste Water Treatment Facility the sandy/pebbly beach could be more than the current 504 meters rather than the suggested 240 meters.Likely this could be achieved without significant disruption to the enjoyment of the park over the next decade. |
| 174 | July 30, 2013 | Post PIC #2 Email | As a lake front property owner who is subject to the visual pollution of the G.E. Booth Waste Water Treatment Facility every day from * from our back yard; and
* from Marie Curtis Park

We would like your plans to include the planting of trees to block the visual pollution of the facility from Marie Curtis Park east and west. |
| 175 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | A windsurfer and kite-surfer expressed concern at the possible loss of beach and encourage the team to maintain as much beach as possible. |
| 176 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | A member of the public thinks the project would take 20 years to build but is fully supportive of coastal engineering explanations of sand on the beaches. |
| 177 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | A member of the public thinks that not enough sand beach will be retained and wants the entire shoreline to be beach, or pockets of beach left behind the islands. Does not believe the coastal studies regarding the need for cobble and not sand |
| 178 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I can see the Waste Water Treatment Facility from my property on Lakefront Promenade. Plant trees to block the view from the east. |
| 179 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | What is happening with Arsenal Lands? |
| 180 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Show the municipal boundaries on the imagery. |
| 181 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Traffic increases on 42nd Street, Dixie and Lakeshore |
| 182 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Ensure that the trail is multi-use |
| 183 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Will the settling ponds be accessible to birders? |
| 184 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Timeframe is ok. |
| 185 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Ensure coordination with Marie Curtis Park and Arsenal Lands Master Plans |
| 186 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | I am on-board with the project |
| 187 | August 5, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Marie Curtis Park | Access routes through OPG is best |
| 188 | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Love the Project |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Great Project |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Looks Good |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Awesome. Sounds Good. Good luck! |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Interested in cycling and getting close to lake and connection through OPG lands. Some concerns over truck traffic. |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Issue is not the public. Community loves this project. Just want to make sure that public transit is considered. |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Nice. Would like to see picnic/BBQ facilities |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | August 10, 2013 | Direct Community Engagement: Lakefront Promenade Park | Love it. Anything that I can do to help to advance this. |