



# Meeting Notes

Project: Lakeshore TPAP EA

Subject: CVC Meeting 1: Introduction and Project Scoping

Date: Tuesday, June 01, 2021

Location: Hosted via WebEx

Attendees: City of Mississauga Project Team

Gino Dela Cruz  
Jerry Che

HDR

Nico Malfara  
Angie Ning  
Maryam Tagh Bostani  
Tara Erwin  
Brittany Zhang  
Sepideh Khorshid  
Soheil Kashi

Matrix Solutions

Dave Van Vilet  
Robyn Leppington  
Roger Phillips

Credit Valley Conservation (CVC)

George Golding  
Jakub Kilis  
Lori Cook

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Lakeshore TPAP & EA: CVC Meeting 1 (Project Introduction/Scoping). The purpose of the meeting was to inform CVC staff of the scope, objectives, and timelines of the Lakeshore TPAP & EA project as well as to introduce the environmental studies and processes to be undertaken. A presentation was given by staff from HDR and Matrix Solutions, followed by a general comments/discussion session.

**Item**

**1. Introductions**

- Meeting attendees went around and gave self-introductions.

**2. Project Overview and Background**

- Nico gave an overview on project history, connections to past studies, and scope of each of the 3 project parts as well as the timeline of the project.
- Nico introduced all the watercourses in the vicinity of the study area.

**3. Environmental Studies Scope**

- Robyn introduced the scope of the environmental studies, including a description of the study area of each of the 3-part project as well as the field surveys to be conducted.
- Robyn highlighted the work involved in the tree inventory process.
- Robyn introduced the study area and scope of the Phase 1 ESA for each of the 3 project parts.
- Dave introduced the scope of work involved in completing the Climate Change & Sustainability Assessment for Part A of the project.
- Dave continued to outline the work to be undertaken for the Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment for each of the project parts.



- 
- Dave highlighted the outstanding data that is required to support the completion of the environmental studies.

---

#### 4. Stormwater/Drainage Scope

- Sepideh outlined the scope of the work involved in completing the Stormwater Drainage Assessment for each of the 3 parts of the project
- Sepideh then outlined the outstanding data that still need to be acquired to support the stormwater drainage assessment process.

---

#### 5. Next Steps

- Nico introduced the upcoming items as part of the project, which included completing field work for Parts A and C, documenting existing conditions, receiving necessary data from the CVC, Virtual Open House 1, and Part A Impact Assessment and Mitigation.

---

#### 6. Discussion

- Jakub asked the following questions:
  1. How does HDR plan to document the technical studies?
    - Nico replied that the final environmental assessment reports will be separate, but as of now, the structure has not be finalized, we are open to CVC's suggestions/preferences.
    - Jakub replied that CVC would prefer the studies to be done separately in 3 parts, but the CVC team (Jakub, Lori, and George) would all be reviewing the studies for each part to ensure consistency in information.
  2. Is the intent to conduct a reconstruction of Lakeshore Rd or just add to the existing infrastructure?
    - Nico replied that this is dependent upon the Environmental Assessments findings and is too early to comment on.
- George and Lori had no comments at the moment.
- HDR to provide presentation and data request to CVC following the meeting.
- Jakub to provide contact information for data request.

---

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com](mailto:nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



# Meeting Notes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: TRCA Meeting 1: Introduction and Project Scoping

Date: Monday, June 14, 2021

Location: Hosted via Microsoft Teams

Attendees: HDR  
Nico Malfara  
Brittany Zhang  
Sepideh Khorshid  
Soheil Kashi

City of Mississauga Project Team  
Gino Dela Cruz

Matrix Solutions  
Robyn Leppington  
Amy Nicoll

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)  
Jason Solnik  
Shirin Varzgani  
Suzanne Bevan  
Jairo Morelli  
Dilnasaw Chekol

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Lakeshore Transportation Studies: TRCA Meeting 1 (Project Introduction/Scoping). The purpose of the meeting was to inform TRCA staff of the scope, objectives, and timelines of the Lakeshore Transportation Studies project as well as to introduce the environmental studies and processes to be undertaken. A presentation was given by staff from HDR and Matrix Solutions, followed by a general comments/discussion session.

## Item

1. **Introductions**
  - a. Meeting attendees went around and gave self-introductions.
2. **Project Overview and Background**
  - a. Nico gave an overview on project history, connections to past studies, and scope of each of the 3 project parts as well as the timeline of the project.
  - b. Nico introduced all the watercourses in the vicinity of the study area.
3. **2019 Transportation Master Plan TRCA Comments**
  - a. Nico gave an overview of TRCA's previous comments, mainly regarding the potential effects of the project on Etobicoke Creek. The project team noted that the 2019 TMP preliminary recommendation for no widening for BRT lanes is being carried forward; however, will be reviewed and reconfirmed as part of the TPAP.
  - b. TRCA (Jason) asked whether there will be widening to accommodate cycling infrastructure.
  - c. Nico replied that this is yet to be confirmed.
4. **Environmental Studies Scope**
  - a. Robyn introduced the scope of the environmental studies, including a description of the study area of each of the 3-part project as well as the field surveys to be conducted.

- b. Jason commented that if a TOR is to be submitted, a SWA also needs to be submitted for clarification.
- c. Robyn replied that the proper steps will be followed if a formal TOR is required.
- d. Robyn highlighted the work involved in the tree inventory process and the arborist report to be produced.
- e. Robyn introduced the study area and scope of the Phase 1 ESA for each of the 3 project parts.
- f. Robyn introduced the scope of work involved in completing the Climate Change & Sustainability Assessment for Part A of the project and continued to outline the work to be undertaken for the Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment for each of the project parts.
- g. Robyn highlighted the outstanding data that is required to support the completion of the environmental studies.

---

5. **Stormwater/Drainage Scope**

- a. Sepideh outlined the scope of the work involved in completing the Stormwater Drainage Assessment for each of the 3 parts of the project.
- b. Sepideh then outlined the outstanding data that still need to be acquired to support the stormwater drainage assessment process.

---

6. **Next Steps**

- a. Nico introduced the upcoming items as part of the project, which included completing field work for Parts A and C, documenting existing conditions, receiving necessary data from the TRCA, Virtual Open House 1, and Part A Impact Assessment and Mitigation.

---

7. **Discussion**

- a. Suzanne mentioned that the TRCA owns several properties close to Etobicoke Creek, and that consultation with another department will be needed if any construction is planned on those properties.
- b. Shirin mentioned that some data can be found on the TRCA website.
- c. Robyn asked if a TOR needs to be formally submitted or does the scope presented in this presentation suffice as a TOR.
- d. Jason replied that the presentation is sufficient and TRCA agrees on the scope.
- e. Nico and Gino to discuss separately on whether to submit a formal TOR and will circulate back to TRCA and Matrix Solutions if required.
- f. Shirin will be the TRCA point of contact and will oversee all correspondence.

---

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com](mailto:nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



# Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: City of Toronto Introductory Meeting

Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Location: Webex

Attendees:	<b>HDR</b> Nico Malfara Nick Shaw	<b>City of Mississauga</b> Gino Dela Cruz Jerry Che	<b>City of Toronto</b> Stella Gustavson Josh Bassett
------------	---	---	--

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Introductory Meeting between the HDR and City of Mississauga project team and the City of Toronto.

## Agenda Items:

	Topic	Presenter
1	Introductions	Nico Malfara
2	Project Overview	
3	2019 TMP Recommendations and City of Toronto Comments	
4	Lakeshore Transportation Studies Scope	
5	Data Request	
6	Next Steps	

## Action Items or Decisions Made:

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	City of Toronto advised City of Mississauga during the drafting of the 2019 TMP that they have no plans to extend streetcar routes beyond the west border before 2041 but are open to further discussion.	N/A	N/A
2	City of Toronto provided platform dimensions for future proofing.	N/A	N/A
3	City of Toronto (Stella G) noted that there is a need to establish a Communications and Review Protocol consistent with other Mississauga projects that have City of Toronto interests.  City of Toronto and the TTC are typically consulted together.	City of Toronto (Josh B/Stella G)	July 7, 2021 (if possible)



	City of Toronto (Josh B/Stella G) to coordinate staff representation and prepare list of contacts and reviewers for Technical Advisory Committee and Working Group Meetings to be provided to City of Mississauga.		
4	MiWay has platforms at Long Branch Station and should be considered along with future plans for Long Branch.	N/A	N/A
5	City of Toronto (Stella G) suggested holding a TAC meeting before the end of July to ensure good attendance.  HDR (Nico M) noted that the first TAC will be an overview of existing conditions, study outline, and evaluation criteria	HDR (Nico M) to schedule TAC meeting and send invitation to City of Toronto.	N/A

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com](mailto:nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



# Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: MECP Introductory Meeting

Date: Thursday, August 12, 2021

Location: Webex

Attendees: HDR  
Andrew Shea  
Nico Malfara  
Brittany Zhang

MECP  
Cindy Batista  
Jordan Hughes

City of Mississauga  
Gino Dela Cruz

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Lakeshore Transportation Studies- MECP Introductory Meeting. A copy of the presentation material from the meeting is attached.

## Agenda Items:

	Topic	Presenter
1	<p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the Lakeshore Bus Rapid Transit Study's background, study area, scope and timeline, and gave a broad description of the other 2 Studies that are a part of the collective Lakeshore Transportation Studies.</li> <li>- Introduced the various technical studies currently underway as well as topics and findings to be presented at Public Information Centre #1.</li> <li>- Introduced consultation activities undertaken as part of the 2019 TMP and common feedbacks received.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
2	<p><b>Public and Stakeholder Consultation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Listed past and upcoming public and stakeholder consultation activities.</li> <li>- Noted that a, online per-TPAP Public Information Centre is planned for September, with notices being distributed in two weeks.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
3	<p><b>Lakeshore Bus Rapid Transit Study (BRT) Study:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the preferred cross-section and features to be included in the preliminary design for the BRT Study.</li> <li>- The recommended concept resulting from the Master Plan study was to widen Lakeshore Road to accommodate a new median busway, with additional cycle tracks and improved sidewalks/boulevards on both sides of the road.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
4	<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	Nico Malfara (HDR)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Cindy Batista (MECP):</b> Are you planning on taking 120 days after issuing the Notice of Commencement? It is recommended that the City and HDR share draft EPR and technical studies with MECP for review.</li> <li>- <b>Nico Malfara (HDR):</b> Yes, we have allocated time for MECP to review documents. We will share the draft EPR before commencing the TPAP process. Aiming to send the documents in fall/winter. Will update the MECP on when the documents will be available.</li> <li>- <b>Cindy Batista (MECP):</b> HDR needs to provide MECP with a letter to the director that confirms the Indigenous communities to be consulted before issuing the Notice of Commencement.</li> <li>- <b>Nico Malfara (HDR):</b> We will prepare you a letter with a list of Indigenous communities ASAP. Will the review process of the letter affect the project timeline? Will it delay the consultation process?</li> <li>- <b>Cindy Batista (MECP):</b> Unlikely, seeing that it normally takes less than 2 weeks to review, HDR and the City can continue with consultation activities in the meantime. A formal letter from Director is needed before TPAP commencement.</li> <li>- <b>Gino Dela Cruz (City of Mississauga):</b> How long does MECP take to review the draft documents?</li> <li>- <b>Cindy (MECP):</b> Depending on staff availability, MECP aims to provide initial comments within 30 days. Will offer a better sense of review timeline after receiving notice of when to begin review. MECP requests at least two-weeks of advance notice of the submission of the draft EPR in order to allow them to plan/schedule for the review with internal reviewers.</li> </ul>	
	<p><b>Next Steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HDR to send letter to Director and update MECP on when draft EPR and technical studies will be ready for review</li> </ul>	

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	HDR to submit formal letter indicating Indigenous communities to MECP <i>[Post-meeting note: the request letter was submitted to MECP on August 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021]</i>	Brittany Zhang (HDR)	Aug 13, 2021
2	HDR to notify MECP of when draft EPR and Technical Studies would become available for review	Brittany Zhang (HDR)	Nov/Dec, 2021

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise nico.malfaro@hdrinc.com within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.





Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: New Credit River Active Transportation Bridge Study Introduction

Date: Tuesday, October 05, 2021

Location: Webex

Attendees:	<b>HDR:</b> Angie Ning Brittany Zhang Maryam Tagh Bostani Nico Malfara	<b>City of Mississauga:</b> Gino Dela Cruz
		<b>Metrolinx:</b> Tony To Harrison Rong Kevin Chan

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the New Credit River Active Transportation Bridge Study Introduction meeting.

**Agenda Items:**

	Topic	Presenter
1	<p><b>Introduction and Project Overview</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the overall scope and timelines of the Lakeshore Transportation Studies (LTS) and key findings from the 2019 Transportation Master Plan (TMP)</li> <li>- Introduced the various technical studies underway to support the LTS</li> <li>- Introduced Active Transportation (AT) Bridge study area and study objectives</li> <li>- Introduced the background and decision-making process from the 2019 TMP that resulted in choosing the location of the AT bridge to be carried forward</li> <li>- Introduced key stakeholders</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
2	<p><b>Existing Conditions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the existing and proposed active transportation network within the proximity of the study area</li> <li>- Introduced significant environmental and cultural heritage features within the proximity of the study area</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
3	<p><b>Preferred Bridge Cross Section and Alignment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the preferred width and cross-section of the proposed AT bridge</li> <li>- Introduced 4 alternative bridge designs and the strengths and weaknesses of each</li> <li>- Alternatives 1 and 2 are proposed to be screened out while alternatives 3 and 4 will be carried forward for further analysis</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Introduced the layout of the two alignment options to be carried forward for alternatives 3 and 4 as well as the significant impacts of each.</li></ul>	
4	<p><b>Questions and Discussion</b></p> <p>Tony To (Metrolinx):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What were the key factors in establishing the Queen St crossing as preferred?</li></ul> <p>Nico Malfara (HDR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- As determined through the 2019 TMP, this option offers the best overall network connectivity, especially connecting Mississauga Rd to GO station, with limited impacts to sensitive features in the area</li></ul> <p>Tony To (Metrolinx):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Metrolinx' preference is to have the AT bridge completely separate from Metrolinx' right of way (ROW) due to concerns regarding future expansion. Metrolinx to confirm if there'd there would be a 4<sup>th</sup> track added to the existing ROW.</li><li>- Metrolinx prefers Alignment 1 seeing that Alignment 2 limits Metrolinx' flexibility for ROW changes in the future</li></ul> <p>Kevin Chan (Metrolinx):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What is the study timeline?</li></ul> <p>Gino Dela Cruz (City of Mississauga)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- This is a priority project so it would be completed as soon as possible</li></ul> <p>Nico Malfara (HDR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- List of questions for Metrolinx:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Available drawings for the older double track truss over credit river (superstructure or substructure)? How old is the bridge?</li><li>2. Confirm existing GO bridge cannot be expanded any further than existing?</li><li>3. Are there any plans for upcoming replacement of that bridge?</li><li>4. Are there any concerns with having the active transportation facilities within the Metrolinx rail ROW? Is this a fatal flaw? Should it be screened out now?</li><li>5. Are there any plans for the Port Credit GO Station west parking lot?</li><li>6. Will the at-grade rail crossing of the Lakeshore West Line and Stavebank be grade separated? Is there a timeline?</li></ol></li></ul> <p>Tony To (Metrolinx):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. To check if Metrolinx has drawings for the older truss bridge.</li><li>2. Metrolinx confirms that the GO bridge cannot be expanded and that the ROW is reserved for heavy rail operations.</li></ol> <p>Kevin Chan (Metrolinx):</p>	



	<p>5. The GO station parking lot is half owned by Metrolinx and half leased by the City; it will remain as parking seeing that parking will be limited in the foreseeable future; but would be interested in making improvements to the AT network given that Metrolinx works with the City to carefully plan it out.</p> <p>Tony To (Metrolinx):</p> <p>6. Stavebank has been identified as a priority to undergo crossing enhancements under the Whistle Cessation initiative. This may or may not involve a grade separation. Tony to speak with Metrolinx about project timeline.</p>	
	<p><b>Evaluation Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the evaluation criteria to be used to assess the alternative solutions.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced upcoming major project deliverables and public/stakeholder consultation activities.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	Confirm if Metrolinx has plans to add a 4 <sup>th</sup> track to the existing ROW	Tony To (Metrolinx)	Oct 26. 2021
2	Check for drawings for older truss bridge	Tony To (Metrolinx)	Oct 26. 2021
3	Confirm timelines for Stavebank crossing enhancements	Tony To (Metrolinx)	Oct 26. 2021
4	Confirm if Metrolinx consents to the City and HDR proceeding with Alignment 1 (Front/Queen)	Tony To (Metrolinx)	Oct 26. 2021

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com](mailto:Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: Peel Region Project Coordination

Date: Oct 15, 2021

Location: Webex

Attendees: **HDR:**  
Andrew Shea (AS)  
Tara Erwin (TE)  
Brittany Zhang (BZ)

**City of Mississauga:**  
Gino Dela Cruz (GDC)  
Jerry Che (JC)

**Peel Region:**  
Italia Ponce Vanelli (IPV)

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Lakeshore Transportation Studies Water/Wastewater meeting.

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	IPV provided an overview of the Region's water projects in the Port Credit area, noting that the study area for some key projects will overlap with the transportation improvements proposed under the Lakeshore TPAP (Part A) and EA (Part B) studies.	N/A	
2	The timing of the projects was discussed. The Region has a number of projects in the area, all scheduled for implementation in the next few years. The City advised that Part A of the Lakeshore Transportation Studies (between East Avenue and Etobicoke Creek) will proceed first, with construction starting in 2024, and completion by late 2027 per funding commitments. Part B (Oakville border to East Avenue) is not currently funded and does not have a schedule for implementation.	N/A	
3	In order to facilitate an assessment of potential coordination of the water/road projects, the Region of Peel and City of Mississauga will independently prepare a summary of their proposed projects in the study area, and associated schedules.	Peel / Mississauga	ASAP
4	HDR requested any available information for existing conditions for the study area, including base mapping (survey, utilities, etc) and preliminary designs for proposed water works and utility relocations, to ensure that they are adequately reflected in the	HDR	ASAP



	development of the City's Lakeshore Road transportation improvements. The City will also share any available information from their studies to assist in the development of the design for water/wastewater improvements. HDR will create a spreadsheet documenting the data/information requests and transfers between the City and Peel Region.		
5	The City and HDR will review the water/wastewater infrastructure plans when available to inform their roadway designs and identify opportunities to coordinate the projects.	City/HDR	Dependent on availability of information

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com](mailto:Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



# Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: Active Transportation (AT) Bridge Study: Royal Canadian Legion Meeting 1

Date: March 4, 2022

Location: Virtual Meeting (Teams)

Attendees: **HDR:**

Angie Ning  
Brittany Zhang  
Maryam Tagh Bostani  
Nico Malfara

**City of Mississauga:**

Councillor Stephen Dasko  
Angie Dell  
Gino Dela Cruz

**Royal Canadian Legion:**

Norm Lacasse  
Jim Camilleri

**Independent Facilitator:**

Sue Cumming

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Active Transportation (AT) Bridge Study discussion with the Royal Canadian Legion.

## Agenda Items:

	Topic	Presenter
1	<b>Agenda and meeting purpose:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the purpose of the meeting as well as the items to be discussed</li> </ul>	Sue
2	<b>Introduction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced Study timelines and key outcomes from the 2019 Transportation Masterplan (TMP) process</li> <li>- Outlined key area characteristics</li> </ul>	Nico (HDR)
3	<b>Design process:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduced the dimensions of the preferred bridge cross-section</li> <li>- Introduced the screening process of four alternative bridge types and two alternative bridge alignments</li> <li>- Introduced the two bridge types that were further evaluated and the alignment that was selected</li> <li>- Presented the conceptual plan and profile of the two bridge types</li> </ul>	Nico (HDR)
4	<b>Design evaluation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outlined the key findings of the evaluation process for the Truss bridge and the Signature Bridge</li> <li>- Presented the preferred bridge type and reasons for this recommendation</li> </ul>	Nico (HDR)



	<p><b>Overview and discussion of impacts to Legion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Outlined the temporary and permanent impacts the proposed AT bridge would have on the Legion's property</li><li>- Outlined the proposed mitigation and compensation measures to reduce the potential impacts</li></ul>	
5	<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p><b>1. Parking impact</b></p> <p>Legion staff expressed concerns over the loss of parking spaces due to the proposed AT Bridge. During events on weekends, the Legion typically hosts 200+ attendees. It was noted that sometimes parking at the nearby school parking lot, on-street parking, and parking spaces on the west side of the river are needed in addition to the Legion's parking lot.</p> <p>The Legion's front yard has a flagpole and commemorative trees that should not be removed or impacted.</p> <p>City staff noted that further into the project, if property is acquired from the Legion, the City would proceed with an appraisal and negotiation to compensate the Legion at a fair market value.</p> <p><b>2. Increased activities</b></p> <p>Legion staff expressed concerns over potential acts of vandalism to the Legion's property as well as to the vehicles of Legion members in the parking lot due to the increased activities and access brought upon by the introduction of the AT bridge.</p> <p>Legion staff also noted the possibility of the general public parking their vehicles in the Legion's parking lot. Legion staff also noted that non-members (i.e., members from other clubs and the public) tend to use the Legion's parking without permission currently.</p> <p>Councillor Dasko asked whether a gate access control system could help to ensure that those using the Legion parking lot are Legion members.</p> <p>Legion noted that they are supportive of the AT bridge project, but oppose the location and impacts it imposes.</p> <p><b>3. Alternative alignment considerations</b></p> <p>Legion staff inquired about the possibility of shifting the alignment of the AT bridge and putting it south of the Legion building, in the space between the Royal Legion and the Mississauga Canoe Club.</p> <p>HDR and City staff indicated that the suggested alignment was considered as part of the 2019 TMP process but was eliminated due to constraints such as significant impacts to the environment (i.e., wider crossing of the river) and existing land uses while not offering as much east-west connectivity, especially to Port Credit GO Station, as the preferred solution.</p>	All



	<p><b>4. Metrolinx right-of-way</b></p> <p>Legion staff noted that Metrolinx vehicles occasionally use the north side of the Legion’s parking lot for maintenance work on the Metrolinx rail bridge.</p>	
--	--	--

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	Coordinate with Metrolinx (MX) regarding their right-of-way, consideration of alternative options for realigning the entry point and location of bridge to limit impact to Legion parking, and rail maintenance and access through the Legion property	HDR	Mar 9, 2022
2	Set up follow up meeting with the Legion to discuss investigation of alternatives with Metrolinx and next steps	HDR	Mar 11, 2022 (pending response from MX)

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [Brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com](mailto:Brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.





**Meeting Minutes**

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: New Credit River Active Transportation Bridge Study- Metrolinx Property Impact Discussion

Date: Thursday, March 24, 2022

Location: Webex

Attendees:	<b><u>HDR:</u></b> Angie Ning Brittany Zhang Maryam Tagh Bostani Nico Malfara	<b><u>City of Mississauga:</u></b> Bill Moffatt Gino Dela Cruz Varghese George	<b><u>Metrolinx:</u></b> Harrison Rong Jeff Luckai Kevin Chan Leah Chishimba Simwanza Niko Barlas Syed Quli
------------	---	---	---

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Metrolinx Right-of-Way meeting.

**Agenda Items:**

	Topic	Presenter
1	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduced the comments made by the Royal Canadian Legion (the Legion) on the original proposed alignment of the AT Bridge regarding parking impacts.</li> <li>Project team introduced the revised proposed alignment of the AT bridge and the potential property impacts of this alignment on Metrolinx’ property.</li> </ul>	Nico Malfara (HDR)
4	<p><b>Questions and Discussion</b></p> <p><b>1. Property impact</b></p> <p>Metrolinx staff asked about how much of Metrolinx’ property would be impacted by the alignment of the AT bridge.</p> <p>Project team responded that the portion of Metrolinx’ property that would be impacted is already used by the Legion as part of their parking lot.</p> <p>Metrolinx staff to confirm internally on the property agreement between the Legion and Metrolinx.</p> <p><b>2. Construction timelines</b></p> <p>Metrolinx staff asked when the AT bridge is planned to be constructed.</p> <p>Project team responded that construction is tentatively planned for 2023/2024, depending on how long the detailed design phase takes.</p>	All



	<p>Metrolinx staff noted that the existing GO rail bridge is scheduled for major rehabilitation in 2023 and the space just south of the rail corridor is to be used for laydown. Additional corridor work is planned a few miles away from the rail bridge as part of the GO Expansion project.</p> <p>The City and Metrolinx will coordinate construction timing.</p>	
--	--	--

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	HDR to share the proposed alignment of the AT bridge and approximate dimensions of property impact	Brittany	ASAP
2	Metrolinx to confirm the property agreement between Metrolinx and the Legion, and inform the project team of findings	Metrolinx	April 8, 2022
3	Metrolinx to confirm if they provide agreement in principle for the City to move forward with the revised design in the Schedule B EA	Metrolinx	April 8, 2022

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com](mailto:Brittany.Zhang@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.



# Meeting Minutes

Project: Lakeshore Transportation Studies

Subject: Active Transportation (AT) Bridge Study: Royal Canadian Legion Meeting 2

Date: August 4, 2022

Location: Virtual Meeting (Teams)

Attendees: **HDR:**

Angie Ning  
Brittany Zhang  
Nico Malfara

**City of Mississauga:**

Gino Dela Cruz

**Royal Canadian Legion:**

Norm Lacasse

**Independent Facilitator:**

Sue Cumming

The following is a summary of the items discussed at the Active Transportation (AT) Bridge Study follow-up discussion with the Royal Canadian Legion.

## Agenda Items:

	Topic	Action
1	<p><b>Project updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project staff gave a summary of the key points of discussion and action items from the first meeting held between the project team and the Royal Canadian Legion (the Legion) on March 4, 2022.</li> <li>Project staff introduced the modified bridge alignment and its potential impacts to the Legion’s property, as well as proposed parking arrangements and other measures to mitigate the property impacts</li> </ul>	<p>Project team to circulate a copy of the presentation to all attendees</p>
2	<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p><b>1. New proposed alignment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Legion was supportive of the modified alignment in principle, provided that parking impacts can be mitigated and pending confirmation from the rest of the Legion board</li> <li>The Legion noted a preference to Parking Zone 3 (5 parallel layby spaces behind the sidewalk on Front Street) to avoid impacts to the Legion’s front yard to supplement parking within the main lot (over other alternatives)</li> <li>The Legion will discuss internally and confirm the preferred parking arrangement with project staff</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Metrolinx’ property:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Legion currently leases a small portion of Metrolinx’ property for parking just south of the Metrolinx fence line</li> <li>Project staff to explore design opportunities that could potentially retain some parking spaces in the leased property</li> </ul>	<p>The Legion to confirm a preferred parking arrangement</p> <p>Project team to explore if access into the leased portion of the Legion’s parking lot is possible to accommodate additional parking spaces</p>



	<p><b>3. Municipal parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Legion owns the land that is currently used for a handful of municipal parking spaces along Front Street, just south of the Legion, adjacent to the rowing club parking spaces</li> <li>The Legion had requested City staff to convert existing spaces to provide at least 2 more accessible parking spots in the municipal parking lot</li> <li>The Legion noted that there are currently trees leaning over several parking spots and advised City staff they believe this is a safety issue the City should address</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Potential property takings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City project team is working to get property value appraisals, and any property takings would be paid out at market value</li> <li>Norm confirmed he would still be the point of contact for further discussions with the Legion moving forward</li> </ul>	<p>The City to explore additional accessible parking spots and overhanging trees concern and provide a response to the Legion</p>
--	---	---

**Action Items or Decisions Made:**

	Action Item or Decision	Person Responsible	Due Date
1	Project team to circulate a copy of the presentation to all attendees	HDR	ASAP
2	The Legion to confirm a preferred parking arrangement	Legion	August 22, 2022
3	Project team to explore if access into the leased portion of the Legion’s parking lot is possible to accommodate additional parking spaces	HDR	ASAP
4	The City to explore additional accessible parking spots and overhanging trees concern and provide a response to the Legion	The City	ASAP
5	Project Team to schedule a subsequent meeting with the Legion to discuss details of property requirements and agreement with the City for construction	The City	Detail Design Phase

If there are any errors or omissions, please advise [Brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com](mailto:Brittany.zhang@hdrinc.com) within ten business days of the issuance of these meeting notes. Meeting notes prepared by HDR.

ID	Name	Company / Address	Email	Date Received	Received By	Name of Report	Section and Page #	Comment / Request	Response Date	Response / Action	Action (1- Revised, 2-Noted, 3-Rejected, 4- Clarified by proponent)	Status
1	Sheeva Nakhaie	Fisheries & Oceans Canada	<a href="mailto:DFO.FFHPP-PPPH.MPO2@dfo-mpo.gc.ca">DFO.FFHPP-PPPH.MPO2@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</a>	2022.09.21	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall	<p>Hello Brittany,</p> <p>The Fisheries Act requires that projects avoid causing any harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish and/or fish habitat unless authorized by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. The Fish and Fish Habitat Protection Program of Fisheries and Oceans Canada reviews projects to ensure compliance with the Fisheries Act and the Species at Risk Act. Following the measures to protect fish and fish habitat will help you comply with the Act; these measures can be found at <a href="http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/measures-mesures-eng.html">http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/measures-mesures-eng.html</a>.</p> <p>We request that you visit our website at <a href="https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/reviews-revues/request-review-demande-d-examen-001-eng.html">https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/pnw-ppe/reviews-revues/request-review-demande-d-examen-001-eng.html</a> to determine if DFO needs to review your project. If your project involves in-water work (including water withdrawal or activities to isolate the site from open water), is not in one of the listed exempted waterbody types, does not fall within the standards and codes of practice, cannot meet the measures to protect fish and fish habitat, or if Species At Risk are found within the vicinity of the project, we recommend that you submit a Request for Review to <a href="mailto:FisheriesProtection@dfo-mpo.gc.ca">FisheriesProtection@dfo-mpo.gc.ca</a> before proceeding further. Additionally, if you require an official response from DFO, a Request for Review must be submitted. A Request for Review submission should include a completed form, along with supporting material such as photographs of the existing conditions of the site and drawings of the proposed works.</p> <p>If you are unsure about whether your project requires DFO review, you can seek support from a qualified environmental professional familiar with measures to avoid impacts to fish and fish habitat. It is the proponent's responsibility to meet all requirements of federal, provincial and municipal agencies. The above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18, has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review. Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.</p>	Dec 7. 2022	DFO request for review added as future commitment in PFR and Natural Environemnt report	1	
2	Archaeology program unit	MHSTCI- Archaeology	<a href="mailto:Jessica.Marr@ontario.ca">Jessica.Marr@ontario.ca</a>	2022.09.29	Brittany Zhang	Part C Archaeological report		<p>The above-mentioned report, which has been submitted to this ministry as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18, has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review.</p> <p>Please note that the ministry makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of reports in the register.</p>		N/A		2 closed
3	Eric Lee	City of Mississauga	Eric Lee < <a href="mailto:Eric.Lee@mississauga.ca">Eric.Lee@mississauga.ca</a> >	2022.10.27	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall	<p>Hi Nico,</p> <p>Not sure if this email was sent previously but we did a quick internal circulation of the latest PFR package for Part C and the only comment we received back was regarding the GO station mentioned throughout the document. There is mention of "Long Branch GO" which I believe should be changed to "Port Credit GO".</p> <p>Please take a look and make any necessary revisions.</p>	Dec 7. 2022	Revised		1 closed
4	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub < <a href="mailto:Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca">Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca</a> >	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall	<p>Thank you. CVC staff has had an opportunity to review the draft PFR report and accompanying appendices for the above noted project and offer the following comments for your consideration</p> <p>General</p> <p>1.This review pertains to a first review of the EA materials submitted. Additional comments pertaining to the impacts to existing hazards may be provided when finalized technical studies and design drawings are provided. We acknowledge that the proponent is aware of the required technical studies and these are stated to be in progress.</p> <p>2.We confirm that payment of the invoice for this project has been received. Thank you.</p> <p>3.We will provide additional comment for the detailed design stage of this project upon signoff of the EA comments noted below.</p>	Jan 6. 2022	Comments noted		2 closed

5	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Overall	4.Impact assessments are typically conducted to cover an area of influence of 120m (radially from the proposed area of disturbance) and as such it is unclear as to why the EA's Natural Environmental Assessment was limited to 50m on either side of the bridge. Given that there are highly sensitive features on adjacent lands immediately to the north of the project, please expand the study area to the full 120m limit to ensure that watercourses, PSW's, ESA's and the habitat of SAR are adequately pulled into the study.	Jan 6. 2022	It is acknowledged that a 120 m Area of Influence is standard practice for an Environmental Impact Assessment, but a 120 m AOI was felt to be arbitrarily large for the purpose of this natural environmental assessment. It was assessed during initial determination of scope that the linear buffer provided by the 20 m railway corridor would effectively contain any indirect impacts to the terrestrial environment to areas south of CN property. Additionally, it was noted fairly early in the planning stages that no in-water works were to be proposed. In the absence of works below the high-water line at this location, any potential impacts to the Credit River, including sensitive habitats upstream or downstream of the proposed span, are felt to be captured through analysis of the existing study area. Further, it is anticipated that proposed works will not have an impact on natural features beyond the existing 50 m study area boundary.	4
6	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Table 1	5.Please update Table 1 to show that the MBCA falls under Environment and Climate Change Canada rather than MECP.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated	1
7	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Table 6	6.Please update Table 6 to quantify the size of each ELC community represented within the (expanded) study area.	Jan 6. 2022	ELC areas added to Table 6.	1
8	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Figure 2	7.Please update Figure 2 to include the location of ESA's and PSW's etc.	Jan 6. 2022	Figure 2 already delineates the Credit River Marshes Wetland Complex and Life Science ANSI north of the CN rail line.	4
9	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Overall	8.On many occasions throughout the report, reference is made to a PSW's 120m buffer area – please note/clarify that the 120m is an 'area of interference' and not a buffer (buffers to PSW's are 30m). The 120m is the distance to which the province has identified that development could interfere with the hydrologic function of a PSW. As such further hydrologic studies should be conducted (for the selected alternative) to document how and if dewatering activities will impact the function of local and adjacent groundwater dependant features (e.g., woodlands, wetlands and watercourse) and how this will be mitigated (as appropriate).	Jan 6. 2022	Updated	1
10	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Page 22	9.Page 22, please expand on why the eastern woodland doesn't meet the test for significance given that it is located within 30m of a watercourse, is located within 30m of a PSW and that the rail corridor (which is less than 20m) might not qualify as a break in canopy? Please assess all woodlands and adjacent woodlands pursuant to the Natural Heritage Reference Manual guidelines.	Jan 6. 2022	The woodland east of the Credit River was initially assessed as being smaller than 0.5 ha, which would preclude its inclusion as a Significant Woodland under the Mississauga Official Plan. It is noted that the ELC polygon as delineated under the latest revision is greater than 0.5 ha. The report has been updated to reflect that this ecosite is Significant Woodland.	4
11	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Table 10	10.Please clarify what is meant by utilizing "mature species" in Row 1 Column 5 of Table 10. Restoration with mature specimens is not a best management practice.	Jan 6. 2022	Replaced "mature" with "native".	1
12	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Natural Environment Asses Table 10	11.Please update Table 10 to include any potential dewatering needs.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 9.5 to note that if dewatering is required, dewatering process and impact mitigation, following all applicable policies and guidelines, is to be incorporated into the ESC plan.	1

13	Jakub Killis	CVC	Killis, Jakub <Jakub.Killis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Arborist Report	Overall	12.CVC staff are pleased to see that this project is seeking to replace lost ecosystem services through the use of progressive replacement ratios as related to proposed tree removals (e.g. Table 4, Page 8). That said, in terms of the replacement of woodland trees – given that only trees greater than 10cm dbh were included in the original tree survey, it is recommended that trees 5cm and larger be included in the tally for woodland communities with less than 35% cover as per CVC's Ecosystem Offsetting Guidelines ( <a href="https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/rpt_CVCEcoOffset_FINAL_20200313.pdf">https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/rpt_CVCEcoOffset_FINAL_20200313.pdf</a> ).	Jan 6. 2022	<p>Matrix acknowledges that 5cm DBH shrubs are part of the CVC Ecosystem Offsetting Guidelines. As the tree/shrub community has likely changed in size (DBH) yearly as plants grow since the original tree inventory, an additional survey now would likely include more shrubs/trees that meet the 5cm DBH compared to what originally would have of been present. Rather than an additional survey, additional robust restoration plantings will be added to compensate for the &gt; 5-10cm DBH. This will also consider that the existing tree/shrub community is dominated by Manitoba maple and the restoration planting will be a net positive through the inclusion of a variety of native species, increasing habitat biodiversity and plant selection will incorporate trees/shrubs which provide both habitat and a food source for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Restoration Plan will be updated to reflect the additional native plantings that will be incorporated to offset for the &gt;5-10DBH trees lost, which will be at a 1:3 ratio.</p> <p>Tree replacement went from 524 to 701, reflected in updated Arborist report and Sec 6.3 of the PFR</p>	4
14	Jakub Killis	CVC	Killis, Jakub <Jakub.Killis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Arborist Report	Overall	13.In terms of future circulations as related to the preferred alternative and preferred design: interests lie in submissions demonstrating no impacts to the communities to the north of the railway track (in terms of both form and hydrological function) and in demonstrating no net loss to ecosystem services through the development of a comprehensive restoration/offsetting plan	Jan 6. 2022	A restoration/offsetting plan will be developed during detail design (added to future commitment). No impacts north of the railway track are anticipated per our preferred design.	1
15	Jakub Killis	CVC	Killis, Jakub <Jakub.Killis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Drainage/SW	14.Please quantify the proposed impervious area associated with the trail and walkway associate with the crossing and how this may impact stormwater management on Front St. N.	Jan 6. 2022	<p>The increase in impervious area on Front Street, excluding the parking area, is 237 m2 (10% increase). Runoff from Front Street drains via. storm sewers and outlets directly to the Credit River. This minimal increase in impervious area is not anticipated to impact the stormwater management on Front St. N. However, LID measures in the parking lot are to be investigated in detailed design to provide water quality control. If LID measures are feasible (ie. sufficient clearance to the groundwater table can be achieved), the treated pavement area will exceed the increase in pavement area on Front St. N. and the parking lot.</p> <p>The increase in impervious area associated with the new pedestrian bridge is 1072 m2. Since the pedestrian bridge will drain directly to the Credit River, and it will not be supporting vehicular traffic, it is not anticipated to impact the stormwater management on Front St. N. Due to the nature of the proposed works and the proximity to the Credit River, no additional stormwater management measures are proposed for the pedestrian bridge.</p> <p>See Section 6.8 of the PFR for more info.</p>	4

16	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Drainage/SW 15.Please confirm the drainage area of the adjacent parking lot will remain as existing.	Jan 6. 2022	<p>The existing parking area is 1621 m2 and the proposed parking area is 1842 m2, which is an increase of 221 m2 (14% increase). This minimal increase in impervious area is not anticipated to generate a substantial impact to the volume and peak flow of runoff within the parking area. Furthermore, due to the proximity of the parking lot to the Credit River, additional quantity control measures are not required.</p> <p>During detailed design, LID measures are to be considered in the parking lot to provide water quality control and mitigate the increase in paved area in the parking lot and Front St. N., if sufficient clearance to the groundwater table can be achieved. The feasibility of LID measures, such as permeable pavers in the parking lot, or a bioretention facilities in the landscaped area of the parking lot, are to be investigated.</p> <p>See Section 6.8 of the PFR for more info.</p>	4
17	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall 16.All drawings and reports must be signed and stamped by a registered Professional Engineer / qualified professionals prior to receiving approval from the conservation authority.	Jan 6. 2022	Typically, preliminary engineering drawings are not signed and stamped by a registered Professional Engineer / qualified professionals. Applicable technical reports have been signed by qualified professionals. Final drawings will be provided during detail design and will be signed and stamped by a registered Professional Engineer / qualified professionals.	2
18	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall 17.Please refer to CVC's technical guidelines for watercourse crossing, <a href="https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CVCCrossingGuidelines_2f_20191025.pdf">https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CVCCrossingGuidelines_2f_20191025.pdf</a> and ensure the design is tailored to appropriate criteria in the guideline document.	Jan 6. 2022	<p>Reference is added to the CVC's Technical Guidelines for Watercourse Crossings. Since this crossing is a pedestrian bridge, the criteria of a 0.3 m minimum freeboard under the 100-year storm is added to the hydraulic analysis.</p> <p>See Section 6.8 of the PFR for more info.</p>	1
19	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Drainage/SW 18.Please confirm that the proposed crossing does not impact the existing flood hazard upstream or downstream for the full range of design flow (2-year to 100-year, and regional storm), this confirmation will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide a hydraulic assessment using HEC-RAS modelling for the Credit River. This should provide a proof of concept that from pre- to post- conditions there are no impacts to flood hazard.</li> <li>b. Adverse backwater conditions as a result of the proposed crossing will not be acceptable.</li> <li>c. Assessment must be carried out by a qualified professional.</li> <li>d. Proposed work must not require the addition of fill within the floodplain, unless properly justified. In this case the amount of fill must be minimized, and cut/fill balance calculations must be provided.</li> </ul>	Jan 6. 2022	<p>A hydraulic assessment using HEC-RAS was provided in Section 6.8 and a comparison of pre- and post-conditions is summarized in Table 6-5. The maximum increase in flood levels as a result of construction is bridge is 0.01 m at several upstream cross sections, which can be considered as negligible. The proposed design is not considered to generate a negative impact on flood levels under the full range of storm events.</p> <p>As a future commitment, additional fill within the floodplain will be minimized during detailed design. Cut fill balance calculations will also be provided during detailed design.</p>	4
20	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	geotech 19.Please provide the geotechnical assessment upon completion. The proposed crossing must not negatively impact the existing slopes associated with the channel banks of the Credit River.	Jan 6. 2022	<p>Draft Geotech report included in Appendix C.10.</p> <p>Key findings of geotech report added to Sec 3.8 and 6.6 of the PRF, and Future commitments</p>	1
21	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Drainage/SW 20.Impacts to the existing erosion hazard must be determined through a comparison of flow velocity from pre- to post- conditions. The proposed work must not increase flow velocities in the watercourse and should minimize channel erosion.	Jan 6. 2022	Added to future commitments	1



22	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Drainage/SW 21.Please provide technical details on proposed bank or toe protection required as part of the new crossing.	Jan 6. 2022	Currently riprap is proposed. The installation of riprap or other stone erosion protection measures may require in-water or near-water works, which will required additional technical analysis and submissions for CVC permitting. The Fluvial Geomorphology report recommends that a stable rounded riverstone gradation be used as a more natural riprap material, and consistent with CVC guidelines for restoration of natural watercourses. A more detailed analysis to be done during the detailed desgin phase.  Added to future commitments	4	
23	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Fluvial geomorphology assc Overall	22.The location of the bridge piers and abutments should be determined from the fluvial geomorphic analysis and should remain beyond the 100-year local erosion hazard.	Jan 6. 2022	The hyraulic analysis has been done for the bridge to locate abutments. A minimum clearance of 1m during 50-year design flow has been adopted for the subject of bridge crossings.  A local erosion hazard area was mapped in the vicinity of the bridge on the west bank (refer to Section G in the Fluvial Geomorphology Assessment Report). The mapped erosion hazard is related to the expansion of flows downstream of the train bridge and the lack of bank protection in that location. Based on this mapping, the western abutments of the concept design would be expected to be within this erosion hazard area, however a detailed geotechnical investigation has been recommended for detailed design. A 100-year erosion hazard limit was not delineated on the east side of the river as this area is actively managed with bank armouring and is controlled by lake backwatering rather than active lateral migraiton processes.	4	
24	Jakub Killis	CVC	Kilis, Jakub <Jakub.Kilis@cvc.ca>	2022.10.25	Brittany Zhang	Fluvial geomorphology assc Overall	23.Scour assessment must be provided to justify the elevation of the bridge piers and footings. The scour assessment must follow CVC's fluvial geomorphic guidelines, <a href="https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/rpt_scourfactsheet_f_111219.pdf">https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/rpt_scourfactsheet_f_111219.pdf</a>	Jan 6. 2022	Section 5.2.3 Recommendations for Detailed Design of the Fluvial Geomorphology Assessment report recommends that a scour assessment be completed at detailed design following CVC's fluvial geomorphic guidelines.	4	
25	Trevor Bell	MECP	Bell, Trevor (MECP) <Trevor.Bell@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang	General	The ministry has no technical comments or concerns with the project. The following comment is offered for your consideration:  The report indicates that some Indigenous communities were interested in participating in environmental field work, and project staff responded that field work was completed prior to receiving responses from these communities. However, the Natural Environment Assessment in Appendix C.1 indicates that field surveys occurred in June 2021, and the Indigenous communities were not notified about the project until September 2021.  Providing the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the environmental assessment process, especially in ecological field work, is a critical component of consultation with Indigenous communities. Moving forward, please ensure that potentially interested Indigenous	Jan 6. 2022	Noted	2 closed	
26	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	General	1. Noting the ministry change described above, reference to MHSTCI or MTCS can be replaced with MCM in contexts related to future commitments/contacts.	Jan 6. 2022	Revised to MCM where applicable.	1
27	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Overall	2. "Cultural heritage" and "cultural heritage resources" are terms that encompass archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes. For consistency of terminology therefore we recommend that: a. "cultural heritage or archaeological features" and "cultural heritage/archaeology features" be replaced with "cultural heritage resources" in Tables ES-8 and 4-5; b. Section 6.10 and the corresponding paragraph of the Executive Summary, as well as the Cultural Heritage row in Tables ES-11, ES-12, 6-6 and 7-1 be renamed "Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes"; c. in Table 4-4, "Built Heritage Features" be replaced with "Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes" and the reference to "cultural heritage" in the "Do Nothing" field of the same row be changed to the same; and d. in the same table, "Archaeological Features" be replaced with "Archaeological Resources".	Jan 6. 2022	Revised in PFR	1

28	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	3. The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment completed under PIF # P383-0309-2021 and included in Appendix C.7 recommends Stage 2 assessment for portions of the study area, and that the Credit River be screened for marine archaeological potential through the Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential checklist.	Jan 6. 2022	Text added to Section 3.12 and ES.3 pertaining to Stage 2 assessment and Marine Archaeological checklist	1
							Though these recommendations are noted in Section 6.9 of the PFR, the summary of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment provided in sections ES.3 and 3.12 note only that "the majority of the Study area did not have archaeological potential", and only the latter mentions the marine archaeological potential screening recommendation. Given the importance in the archaeological assessment process of a report's recommendations for further investigation, both these descriptions should be revised to explicitly note the recommendation for Stage 2 survey, and the version in the Executive Summary should note the need for marine archaeological potential screening. If there is an editorial desire to avoid lengthening these descriptions, it would be more appropriate to reduce the discussion of registered archaeological sites within 1 km of the study area than to omit mention of recommendations for further assessment.			
29	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	4. Given that the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment recommended screening for marine archaeological potential, the checklist should be completed before the completion of the EA study so that the final version of the PFR can include appropriate commitments to such marine archaeological work as is deemed necessary.	Jan 6. 2022	A Marine Archaeological Potential checklist has been completed and a Marine Archaeological Assessment should be completed once construction impacts to the Credit River have been identified during detailed design.  Marine Archaeological Assessment included in future commitments under Table 7-1  Completed checklist found in Appendix C.9	1
30	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Section 6.10 5. Section 6.10 presents as mitigation measures the recommendations from the Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment. When adopted into the PFR, however, these recommendations should be presented as commitments, using prescriptive or definitive language (e.g. "shall" or "will" instead of "should").	Jan 6. 2022	PFR updated to match the revised CH Report	1
31	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Section 6.10 6. The mitigation measure in Section 6.10 regarding the Port Credit Railway Bridge should specify that the HIA will be submitted to Metrolinx for review, as well as MCM, City of Mississauga heritage staff and other interested parties.	Jan 6. 2022	Specifics of submission to Metrolinx, MCM, City, and others added  PFR updated to match the revised CH Report	1
32	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Section 6.3 and 7. Both in Section 6.10 of the PFR and in Section 6.3, recommendation 5 of the Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment included in Appendix C.8, the mitigation measures related to the Credit River Corridor CHL note that a resource-specific heritage impact assessment (HIA) "may be required" per the City of Mississauga Official Plan and "may be conducted". No rationale is presented for not conducting an HIA, as in the cases of 35 Front Street North and the Old Port Credit CHL. Given that the Cultural Heritage Report was carried out in support of an EA study, it should make firm recommendations for HIA work where necessary for the mitigation of cultural heritage impacts, not merely for purposes of municipal compliance. The PFR itself should then accordingly state what mitigation measures, including HIAs where recommended, will be carried out.	Jan 6. 2022	Language revised to include recommendation to complete HIA, as suggested.  PFR updated to match the revised CH Report	1
33	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Section 6.10 8. We recommend deleting the final bullet in Section 6.10. Reference to "the report" is unclear in this context, and the bullet is taken verbatim from a recommendation in the Cultural Heritage Report where it clearly refers to that document itself. Stakeholder review of the Cultural Heritage Report will ideally be completed by the time the final version of the PFR is circulated. However, it would be appropriate to commit that further studies carried out pursuant to its recommendations, such as resource-specific HIAs, be subject to this sort of stakeholder review.	Jan 6. 2022	Removed final bullet in Section 6.10	1
34	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	Table 6-6 9. In Table 6-6, the Monitoring and Maintenance Considerations field in the Archaeological Impacts row simply says "No archaeological impact potential". While archaeological assessment work will be completed before the start of construction, there remains an unlikely possibility of archaeological resources being encountered during construction, and a commitment for that eventuality should be noted here. Such a commitment could be based on the third and fourth bullets from Section 5.0 of the Stage 1 Archaeological	Jan 6. 2022	Added in clause regarding possibility of archaeological resources that may be encountered during construction in Table 6-8 and Table 7-1	1
35	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	AT Bridge PFR	10. Table 7-1 also says "No archaeological impact potential" in the "Future Commitments, Permits and Approvals" field of the Archaeological Impacts row. This is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report, as noted in Section 6.9 of the PFR. This cell in Table 7-1 should confirm the commitment to carry out the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and any subsequent stages recommended in the Stage 2 report as early as possible in the detail design stage, as well as the marine archaeological assessment if found to be necessary through the completion of the marine archaeological potential checklist	Jan 6. 2022	Added in the future commitments to Table 7-1	1

36	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Cultural Heritage Report	Glossary	11. The Glossary contains a definition of "Cultural Heritage Resource" attributed to the Jan 6. 2022 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), yet the PPS does not contain a definition for this term. There is a definition for Cultural Heritage Resource offered in several of Ontario's provincial plans; it could be used and attributed to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the provincial plan that applies to the study area.	Jan 6. 2022	Our Cultural Heritage Reports do not refer to the Growth Plan in our glossary because of its specific geographic applicability, and this glossary is intended to be applicable for any EA anywhere. Instead the PPS is more general in its application and a more appropriate document to use in the context of EAs.  For clarification, our report is indicating that the PPS provides definitions for built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources (the components that comprise "cultural heritage resources"), and therefore we think it reasonable to leave this definition as is. Recommendation #5 revised as suggested.	4
37	Dan Minkin	MHSTCI-Cultural Heritage	Minkin, Dan (MCM) <Dan.Minkin@ontario.ca>	2022.10.24	Brittany Zhang	Cultural Heritage Report		12. See comment #7 above. The Cultural Heritage Report's recommendations should not be limited to satisfying municipal requirements, but rather should be aimed at impact mitigation as per the EA process. As such, recommendation 5 should be clear as to whether an HIA is recommended for the Credit River Corridor CHL. While recommendations 4 and 6 provide a rationale for waiving the HIA requirement; as recommendation 5 does not, it would appear that the HIA should be clearly recommended.	Jan 6. 2022	PFR updated to match the revised CH Report	1
38	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	We note that the Credit River Marsh Provincially Significant Wetland and the Credit River Coastal Marsh Regionally Significant ANSI are located adjacent to the study area. MNRF does not currently have concerns related to impacts to these natural heritage features as the active transportation bridge is separated from this feature by an existing bridge and is downstream of the feature. However, if changes are proposed that could impact these features, we could be contacted for further technical advice.	Jan 6. 2022	Noted	2 closed
39	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	In addition, the Credit River supports a warmwater fishery. MNRF can provide the following recommendations to protect fish and fish habitat: • MNRF generally agrees with the suggested timing window of July 15 – March 15 if in water work is necessary. Please note that any in-water works during later summer/early fall also need to take into consideration fish passage during migratory runs.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 9.1 of the Natural Environment report to reflect comment. Natural Environment report updated, no changes needed in the PFR	1
40	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	• It is recommended that the bridge employs a stormwater management system that does not discharge directly into the river and impacts from salt/sand/other de-icing products are mitigated appropriately.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 10 of the Natural Env report to reflect comment.  Table 7-1 of the PFR updated to include as future commitment	1
41	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	• During the project, effective erosion control measures should be erected and maintained to prevent spills/sediment from entering the watercourse. In addition, machinery should not be stored/cleaned/refilled or otherwise maintained within the riparian area.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 9.5 of the Nat Env report to reflect comment.  Table 6-8 of the PFR updated	1
42	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	• The report (table 3-3, page 18) mentions that there is an overgrowth of garlic mustard in both the CUW and FOD and dog-strangling vine in the CUW. It is recommended that invasive species management be integrated into the works through the removal and disposal of invasive species (e.g. garlic mustard, dog-strangling vine) and associated seed banks. MNRF also supports the use of equipment cleaning protocols (e.g. here) to prevent the introduction or spread of invasive species into natural heritage features.	Jan 6. 2022	Equipment cleaning protocols are recommended in Section 9.2 (7B). Added the recommendation for integrated invasive species management during project works (8B).  Table 6-8 of the PFR updated	1
43	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	• According to the Natural Environment Assessment (section 6.2.2), a treed area totalling 1412m <sup>2</sup> will be permanently removed and a total treed area of 2069m <sup>2</sup> will be temporarily removed. Removal of riparian vegetation will likely have impacts on the stability of the banks in this reach of the Credit River. It appears that alternate alignments that remove less vegetation are limited or not available. Where reducing vegetation removal is not possible, it is recommended to implement a restoration plan for the banks that incorporates as much replanting/rehabilitation of native species as feasible.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 9.4 (6D) to include that the restoration plan is to explore bioengineering and slope stability enhancement along the Credit River embankment.  Table 6-8 of the PFR updated	1
44	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang		Overall	Please note, that should the project require: • The relocation of fish outside of the work area, a Licence to Collect Fish for Scientific Purposes under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act will be required.	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 11.1 to reflect comment..  Added in the future commitments to Table 7-1	1

45	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang	Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relocation of wildlife outside of the work area (including amphibians, reptiles, and small mammals), a Wildlife Collector's Authorization under the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act will be required</li> </ul>	Jan 6. 2022	Updated Section 11.1 to reflect comment.	1
46	Iain Quigley	MNRF	Quigley, Iain (MNRF) <Iain.Quigley@ontario.ca>	2022.10.19	Brittany Zhang	Overall	<p>MNRF technical staff have reviewed the report and based on the information provided, there are no permitting requirements under the Public Lands Act as this portion of the riverbed is owned by the City of Mississauga, and no impacts to crown bed are expected. Additionally, no permits are required under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, as no in-water works are anticipated. If changes occur to the project design, you can find out more about MNRF permitting requirements at the links below.</p>	Jan 6. 2022	Added in the future commitments to Table 7-1  Noted that no permits are required under the Public Lands Act. It is assumed this comment was intended to read "no permits are required under the Lakes and Rivers Impvement Act, as no in-water work is anticipated", as no dam works are anticipated, the bridge is to be constructed within the jurisdiction of a conservation authority, and the bridge footings are to be installed above the high-water mark.	4
47	Harrison Rong	Metrolinx	Harrison Rong <Harrison.Rong@metrolinx.com>	2022.11.24	Brittany Zhang	Overall	<p>Good afternoon Brittany,</p> <p>Thanks for following up with us.</p> <p>As mentioned in Section 6.13 of the August 2022 Project File Report, a crane is needed to lift the structure in place and requires the Lakeshore West Rail Corridor to be non-operational. An onboarding meeting will be required between the City of Mississauga, Metrolinx's Capital Infrastructure Coordination Group and Metrolinx's Technical Advisor AECOM, to discuss the project in further detail. It should be noted that any work within 30 feet of Metrolinx's live rail tracks or work that may foul the rail tracks will be subject to our Third Party Process. The Third Party Process is started during the design initiation phase.</p> <p>AECOM will review the design and work plan in conjunction with our internal Metrolinx stakeholders and identify impacts to Metrolinx infrastructure. Once the design review process is complete, AECOM will review the proposed work plan and issue a Metrolinx Work Permit.</p> <p>The approved Work Permit will allow the City of Mississauga to schedule flagging for work within/adjacent to the rail corridor. Depending on the type of work, flagging requests can take up to 8 weeks in advance for work that does not require track closure and up to 8 months in advance for work that requires track closure.</p>	Jan 6. 2022	Added onboarding meeting, and Third party process, and Metrolinx work permit to future commitments	1