

**East Don Trail Project
Environmental Assessment**

**Community Liaison Committee Meeting #6
Notes**

Tuesday June 10, 2014
Flemingdon Park Library, Community Room #2
29 St. Dennis Drive, Toronto
6:00 – 9:00 pm

Meeting Chair: Adele Freeman

Note Taker: Natalie Seniuk

ATTENDANCE	
Name	Affiliation
Jennifer Hyland	City of Toronto
Scott Laver	City of Toronto
Violetta Tkazcuk	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Lisa Turnbull	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Rob Amos	Aquafor Beech Ltd.
Paika Sharma	Aquafor Beech Ltd.
John Routh	Friends of the Don East
Paula Davies	Todmorden Mills Wildflower Preserve
Charles Chaffey	Toronto Field Naturalists
Anne Marie Leger	Toronto Ornithological Club
Regrets: Munjeera Jefford (Action for Neighbourhood Change/Hub, Victoria Village), Ronald Kluger (Bike 25), John Taranu (Cycle Toronto), Terry West (Don Mills Residents Inc.), Andy Wickens (Don Watershed Regeneration Council), Louis Fliss (Flemingdon Health Centre), Chris Winsor (Resident Ward 29), Nancy Smith Lea (Toronto Centre for Active Transportation), George Bizios (Victoria Village Community Association), Jon Riddell (Woodbine Gardens Homeowners Association), David Moore (Wynford Concorde Residents Group), Mike Jones (Walk Toronto)	

WELCOME AND OPENING COMMENTS

The Chair, Adele Freeman (AF or The Chair) – Director of Watershed Management Division at Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) - welcomed everyone to Community Liaison Committee (CLC) Meeting #6. AF informed CLC Members that Lisa Turnbull (LT) – Project Manager at TRCA – would be recording key comments throughout the duration of the meeting, and that Natalie Seniuk - (NS) – Project Manager with TRCA – would be recording meeting notes. New attendees introduced themselves to the group.

The Chair provided an overview of the materials provided as part of CLC Meeting #6, including: PowerPoint Presentation, Agenda, and Handouts to be completed by CLC Members.

The Chair handed the meeting over to Violetta Tkaczuk (VT) – Project Manager at TRCA- for the presentation.

HOUSEKEEPING AND UPDATES

VT reviewed the agenda for CLC Meeting #5 including the intended purpose of the meeting which was to provide an update about where we are in the process and, to receive feedback and input from members regarding the evaluation of the design concepts as prepared by the project team.

Confirmation of CLC Meeting #5 Notes

VT asked CLC members if there were any changes or corrections required to the Meeting Notes from CLC #5. Participants did not have any comments. The CLC #5 Meeting Notes were accepted as presented.

Project Updates

VT explained that some additional comments were provided by CLC members after CLC Meeting #5, and that the project team was working on responding to these. The team would try to provide these responses before the public event taking place on June 24. They would be provided in the CLC Dropbox Folder.

VT provided an update regarding the project process and timelines, information regarding the third public event which is taking place on June 24 from 5:30 to 8:30 pm at the Victoria Village Hub, and the preferred trail alignment from Phase 2 that was moved forward to Phase 3.

OVERVIEW OF DESIGN CONCEPTS FOR PREFERRED TRAIL ALIGNMENT

Overview of preferred alignment

VT provided an overview of the preferred trail alignment that was selected at the end of Phase 2, and moved forward to Phase 3.

In Phase 2, trail alignments were evaluated in three defined areas. The evaluation process resulted in a preferred alternative for each area. The following is an overview of results and key considerations for each of the areas examined in Phase 2:

- Area 1, had three different alignments. Forest Trail A was ranked the highest and was moved forward to Phase 3.
- Area 2, was the biggest concern. River Walk scored the highest however, as the land is currently not available and the land will not become available during the EA the second highest scoring option was moved forward, which was Hillside.
- Area 3, Access Route B came out the highest and was moved forward to Phase 3.

The preferred alternative for each area was combined to form the overall preferred trail alignment.

CLC Comment

In Area 3 at Access Route B, the temporary culvert bridge structure was removed last week.

Project Team Response

We were aware that this culvert would be eventually removed. This was always meant as a temporary structure so will be replaced with a new bridge.

CLC Question

Are there any plans to remediate the spot where the temporary bridge was located as it is now compacted gravel.

Project Team Response

We will ask Toronto Water. Part of this project will be to replace what we remove but this was part of another project so we will have to check with Toronto Water. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Comment

In Area 3, there are places that were previously disturbed. On the same note as above, we should take this as an opportunity to remediate some of these areas. Some thought should be put into restoring the areas here.

Project Team Response

Whether or not it is this project scope to undertake these efforts, it would be cost effective to have other restoration initiatives undertaken during the construction of the proposed trail. City of Toronto is generally willing, where possible, to build on opportunities like these. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Comment

To build on that further, there are a couple of areas where restoration could be done, including: the construction site near Taylor Massey creek, the restored slope near Parkview Hills, and the valley where the Pan Am trail will go. There is also an opportunity on the north side of Eglinton.

Overview of design concepts and constraints

VT reviewed the major technical constraints: topography, flooding, and trees. Based on constraints the project team developed guiding principles to ensure only viable concepts that meet the project objectives were created and considered. They included:

- Accessibility requirements
- Grades less than 5%
- User needs
- Trail outside of the 2 year flood line
- Minimized impact to the physical and natural environment
- Needs of maintenance vehicles

VT explained that if an alignment option could not meet the majority of the guideline principles than it was not considered as a design concept. In some instances design concepts could not meet all of the guiding principles due to land constraints. How design concept were developed:

1. The preferred Alignment was divided into segments (e.g. crossing to crossing)
2. Existing informal trails guided the placement of the concepts
3. Detailed topography and tree surveys
4. A range of viable Design Concepts were created considering constraints and guiding principles.

VT explained how the design concepts would be presented by Rob Amos (RA), from Aquafor Beech. Typically, two different views were shown in the presentation: a plan view (like a map) and a profile view (or cross-section). VT also explained the symbols presented on the mapping, and which were considered in concepts.

CLC Question

Just saying that the number of trees removed or impacted was considered, doesn't communicate the "core" forest areas that are present within the valley. Should be avoiding these areas or going beside them rather than through them.

Project Team Response

This is something the project team struggled with in terms of describing impacts associated with trees. We did look at preserving high quality trees. In some places, the scoring was very close and for these areas we are looking to the CLC and the public to provide input on other considerations for selection of a design concept. In terms of "core forest" this was considered in Phase 2 when the trail alignments were selected, in Phase 3 we are looking at the impact to individual trees along the trail segments.

CLC Question

Are the grey areas shown on the profiles, cut and fill areas? If so, they may make a major difference in the topography of the area.

Project Team Response

Yes, that is true and this was considered under costs during the evaluation of the design concepts.

CLC Comment

The areas where it says vegetated riprap, that is an area where there might be opportunity to construct hibernacula for snakes. If we follow the right procedures we may be able to provide opportunities in these areas.

Project Team Response

Good idea, noted.

CLC Comment

We have a lot of money coming in for art projects along other trails and in others areas of Toronto. I see this project as an opportunity for bringing in other funding. There are many landmarks in this study area and the bridges could be designed to create landmarks within this area as long as they meet the engineering requirements.

Project Team Response

CLC members were asked to provide any suggestions they may have for areas we could potentially pilot some landmark designs (**ACTION ITEM**).

Evaluation of Design Concepts & Evaluation Criteria

VT reviewed the criteria that were considered in the evaluation of the design concepts.

CLC Question

Is it expected that cyclists will be required to dismount on the bridges and under the underpasses? Recently on the lower don there were signs requesting cyclists to dismount and walk. Site lines are also a concern.

Project Team Response

Right now bridges will be designed to the trail specs. We are not expecting to be asking cyclists to dismount for bridges and tunnels. We will make them wide enough for multiple modes of transportation. Approaches to the bridge will be at a radius that provides adequate site lines. Where we cannot accommodate the radius, we may put signage warning of poor visibility.

CLC Question

What slopes can we expect? We can't expect the trail to be flat in this area but how steep could it be?

Project Team Response

The project team is aiming for a maximum grade of 5% throughout; this number was selected based on the standard that has come out of the City of Toronto's cycling and accessibility guidelines. In some areas there are steeper grades especially in the valley lands were this is unavoidable.

CLC Question

Did you give scores to the type of trees that were impacted?

Project Team Response

Tree type is addressed under the preservation value of the trees, and a preservation value was given to each tree that may be impacted (preservation values are low, medium, and high). Preservation value was assessed by TRCA's foresters and was based on tree size, species and health.

CLC Question

I think the legend on the map showing preservation priority is wrong. It currently reads "tree removal priority" and should read "tree preservation priority".

Project Team Response

You are absolutely right. This will be corrected in the presentation before it is uploaded to the CLC website. A revised copy of the presentation will also be provided in the CLC Dropbox folder. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Question

Have you done any archaeological assessments in the study area? And if so, did you find anything?

Project Team Response

Yes archaeological assessments have been undertaken. To date, a Stage 1 assessment has been completed. The Stage 1 assessment is a desktop exercise that results in a report that describes the cultural history of the site and identifies the potential for archaeological resources within the area. No large discoveries came out of the Stage 1 assessment but because the study area is in a valley system, the recommendation to move forward with a Stage 2 assessment was identified. Once a final trail alignment is confirmed, during detailed design, the Stage 2 assessment will be undertaken and adjustments to the route can be made based on findings. A copy of the Stage 1 assessment report will be provided to CLC members in the Dropbox folder. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Comment

Capital costs should consider fencing and ecological mitigation (e.g. wildlife crossings for snakes, frogs, etc.). Please consider that we should be providing fencing (post and paddle) in sensitive areas (e.g. wetlands) to keep people on the trail.

Project Team Response

The financial cost of ecological mitigations measures have not been considered at this point but we will go back and look at it from that lens. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Question

What's the difference between the trail segment criteria and the crossing criteria?

Project Team Response

Generally speaking, the evaluation criteria are very similar for both, however when it comes to the details, what is assessed under each criteria differs. For example, when looking at grade/slope, for trails switchbacks were assessed while for bridges ramps were assessed. In the natural environment, wetlands were not impacted by bridges and were therefore only assessed along trail segments.

CLC Question

Did you include more than trees when looking at vegetation?

Project Team Response

In Phase 2 additional vegetation information was used as part of the evaluation, including ELC data. In Phase 3 only trees were part of the evaluation. Once we have a preferred design concept, we will be looking at all vegetation and also at mitigation measures.

CLC Question

What is channel planform?

Project Team Response

The channel planform is the view of the channel, or river, from above. It shows how the river bends on the land.

DESIGN CONCEPTS AND EVALUATION

RA explained that the study area was broken down into a number of trail segments (A to M). The presentation looks at 13 trail segments and the differences between the options for each. For example, will the trail be going through a wetland or wooded area, open meadow or beside railway track, etc.? That is all part of Phase 3 of the EA process.

There was a preliminary ranking applied by TRCA, the consultants, and the Technical Advisory Committee. This preliminary ranking is now being presented to the CLC and then the public at public event #3. There are a lot of areas where the scores are close, and the project team is hoping for valuable input from community/public.

RA explained that a higher number indicated a better score, or the recommended alternative. Options with the highest scores will be moved forward to detailed design once the EA is completed.

RA also noted that the presentation only highlighted the differences between the options, and not all of the information regarding evaluation.

Evaluation of Design Concepts**Chair Question**

Trail Segment A - Generally how far are you away from the river in option 1?

Project Team Response

We are outside of the 100 year erosion line. In this segment, we would have at least 5 m of buffer between trail and river where it is closest.

CLC Question

Trail Segment A – what is the vegetation in option 2? Why is it not forest? Was there previous disturbance?

Project Team Response

Trail Segment A is located in a previously heavily disturbed area where there is both forest and open space present. This may not be properly represented in the orthographic images due to the time of year they were taken. There are also a number of sewer lines (trunk sewers) with a number of manholes in this area. The sewer lines would have been open cut through this area, which generally requires clearing of a 10 – 15m wide corridor.

CLC Question

If that is the case, how could option 1 and option 2 score the same if option 1 has historic planting that was undisturbed and option 2 as disturbed areas?

Project Team Response

The scoring was based on the number trees impacted and their preservation value.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment A - were informal trails part of the ranking? Even if you build option 2, people will still use option 1. If you offer the better experience, you have a better chance of closing the lesser experience. So maybe this is a location where we look at being closer to the water.

Project Team Response

Informal existing trails were used as the basis for developing where the design concepts should be, than the project team assessed alternate routes around the informal trails to ensure the best possible route could be implemented. In areas where the preferred design concepts do not follow the existing informal route, the opportunity to decommission the trails may be looked at, depending on the area and situation.

CLC Question

Trail Segment A - How was Toronto Water maintenance considered, because if we pick option 1 then Toronto Water may still go in to bulldoze in the area where option 2 would be.

Project Team Response

Both options would provide similar access to the multiple maintenance holes located within this area, which is generally what Toronto Water needs to access for maintenance.

CLC Question

Trail Segment B – I see four options here, not two.

Project Team Response

The number of segments was based on scale and length of the trail. If there is a compelling reason, the segments could be broken down further and we could mix and match.

CLC Question

Trail Segment B – you are now providing an opportunity on the west side of the river for people to walk up the slope and cross the tracks.

Project Team Response

This will be dealt with through adaptive management. That is a worst case scenario. There may be a way to mitigate that in this area. As suggested earlier, this could be a place to put up fencing to keep people on the trail.

CLC Question

Trail Segment B – What is the cleared area under the I in the work “option 1”? And why can't we put the path through this cleared area?

Project Team Response

That is the wetland and we are trying to avoid it in this area.

Project Team Comment

Trail Segment B – If the top part of this trail segment is so similar, and if the CLC is in agreement, can we select one option for moving forward, and then just make the options for the lower part? If the options in the top part are only 20 metres apart we may be able to address this through detailed design.

CLC members present agreed with this point and it was suggested that the option be removed at the top part.

Project team noted that they would go back and check this section to see if there is anything that differentiates these two areas. If there were no major differences, the options shown in the top part of this segment would be removed in preparation for the public meeting. **(ACTION ITEM)**

Post Meeting Note: The project team reviewed Trail Segment B and determined that the differences did not require two options to be shown. As a result, only one option is shown in the top part of Trail Segment B.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment C - If lighting is not going to be provided on the trail, a light should not be shown in the representative photos. Project team agreed and will remove in preparation for public meeting. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Comments

Trail Segment D – Play up your options in this area. You will have balance whether you are going to break-up wetlands or forests. The idea of having a meadow that is ok for ground nesting birds is a fantasy. Studies show that trails can impact up to 300 m outside of the area.

CLC Question

Trail Segment E – When is the last time Metrolinx approved a level crossing?

Project Team Response

A level crossing was approved along Finch Hydro Corridor Trail, so it is not impossible. Metrolinx does prefer the implementation of a tunnel or bridge crossing structure over an at-grade crossing however.

Chair Question

Was the cost of putting in signals included in the costing of the options?

Project Team Response

Yes, the cost of signals was approximately \$200,000, where a bridge structure was more than \$1 million.

Project Team Comment

Trail Segment F – the project team is looking to the CLC for feedback on this segment as the team struggled with determining a recommended option.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment F – this is a large area with two important types of habitat. The reason we are struggling with this is that the Shared Use option presented in Phase 2 should be the one that was preferred in this area. Why are we not looking at shared use?

Project Team Response

Through the evaluation in Phase 2 River Walk was ranked the highest, followed by Hillside (east of the rail line). We do not have the property to implement River Walk and we do not foresee the City obtaining the Flemington Park Golf Course as part of this EA nor during the term of this EA. Shared Use is on the west side of the rail line and the existing Golf Course is not willing to entertain this option on their property. Metrolinx was also not willing to entertain this within their right of way based on plans for future expansions.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment F – Whatever options we chose we should select one that does the least amount of damage possible so that the trail can be moved to the preferred location and we can remediate the other side. So we should select the option that would be the easiest to remediate.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment F – There are already informal trails in the forest in this area. I think the wetlands are valuable and we should be careful about putting trails through wetlands.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment F – Based on my knowledge of the area this is more of a cattail fen, so it's a low quality wetland.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment F – Boardwalks need maintenance and they get slippery so they can be unsafe. I am leaning toward option 3 (the middle one).

There was general agreement within the group that option 3 was the best to move forward with. Project team was in concurrence.

CLC comment

Trail Segment F – In option 1, instead of boardwalk, you could consider filling it in because the wetland is of low quality. You could combine Option 1 and Option 3 and then create a smaller higher quality wetland.

CLC comment

Trail Segment F – The picture shown is not of Wilket Creek, it is of E.T. Seton Park. **(ACTION ITEM)**

Project Team Comment

Trail Segment F – is height of the Eglinton underpass fixed? Could we lower it to get the built-up trail?

Project Team Response

It is currently shown about as low as it can go.

Project Team Comment

Trail Segment G - we just had a meeting with Metrolinx that impacts this segment. The switchback alignment (Option 2) was proposed to address the property concerns raised previously with Metrolinx. They are now more open to considering Option 1 which is on their property (but outside of their 30m right of way). We are awaiting final confirmation of their position on this however, it is expected that we will only show one alignment in this area (option 1) if their response is favorable given the extreme technical challenges and overall low ranking of Option 2.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment H – in some of the trail segments, including option 2 of this one, we see you are going to be filling low areas. Some of these areas are high value habitat areas.

CLC Comment

However, in the hydro corridor in this area the habitat value is limited due to the cutting for the corridor.

Project Team Comment

Mountain bikers may prefer option 1 so they can still use the existing mountain bike trail at option 2. If we build option 2 they will end up building something new that will have to be managed.

CLC Question

All of this discussion is required because we cannot get onto the golf course lands?

Project Team Response

Yes, that is the case. We are still leaving options for the future. Phasing of detailed design and construction allow discussions with the golf course to continue and leave options for the future.

CLC Question

Trail Segment I – because of the sightlines and coming toward the at-grade crossing users may not be able to see trains coming. Can we consider advanced warning on the trail so that users can see that there is a train coming through?

Project Team Response

This is a great suggestion for a mitigation measure. Project team will note. **(ACTION ITEM)**

CLC Question

Trail Segment I – Is this alignment impacted by the golf course issue?

Project Team Response

Yes, we are stuck between a rock and hard place here based on many factors including: the golf course, Metrolinx, topography, hydro lines, and tracks, etc. Even if we were on the west side of the river in this area we would still need some method of crossing the rail line here to provide access to the Gatineau corridor however.

CLC Comments

Trail Segment J – no questions or comments by the CLC members present

CLC Question

Trail Segment K – are there informal trails throughout this area?

Project Team Response

Yes, there are.

CLC Question

Trail Segment K – Would either option require future mitigation (erosion) along the meander?

Project Team Response

Option 2 is set at the 100 year limit for erosion so this option would not require mitigation in the near future.

CLC Question

Trail Segment K – How much wiggle room do you have once you get into detailed design? The trail is straight now but we may want to see some movement of the trail for interest.

Project Team Response

There are not any specific constraints to detailed design. The planning process (Environmental Assessment) is a decision making process that looks at balance and level of risk.

As a general observation we try to add as much bending as possible to slow down bikers, while remembering that site lines are also important for cyclists and pedestrians.

Project Team Response

Trail Segment K – Other options were considered here but were ruled out due to floodlines. What the CLC is seeing is the result of this trail being moved out of the flood prone area, and therefore making the option look similar.

CLC Question

Trail Segment K – People are going to go to certain areas for views. should we consider this?

Project Team Response

We may want to consider a lookout in this area (and/or others) to address this need. It will be a matter of identifying all of the other opportunities including lookouts, erosion, restoration, etc. This obviously expands the scope of the project but we may look at a couple of these in detailed design as long as it can be managed within the project budget.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment K – this section provides the closest section to make a future connection to Flemington Park so the trail design should keep that in mind.

CLC Comments

Trail Segment L – no questions or comments by the CLC members present

CLC Comment

Trail Segment M – I think that for any segments where there is a close ranking, a more detailed look at the impact on the natural environment should guide the decision. Second CLC member concurred.

CLC Comment

Trail Segment M – In Option 2 we are further from erosion so our trail will be protected. However, Option 1 has lower impact on trees. We could still justify that erosion is an impact to the natural environment.

Chair Question

People need to walk/ride along these segments of trail, and we now have to put this all back together and think about what the overall experience for the users along the trail. Is it varied enough? Is it too similar? To look at in segments it is hard to see the big picture. Does anyone have comments about that?

CLC Comment

We should try to make it as accessible and possible and do as little damage as possible and it will be great. The valley itself will provide the interest if we show off its features.

CLC Comment

The most contentious bits of this trail design from a cyclists perspective are Trail Segments F, G, and H based on natural area and going through forest. We should think of it as two separate trails; on the south end we have the route for the Pan Am Path; and we have a second route from Wynford Drive to Eglinton. Those two sections could exist on their own quite nicely. And then, we could think of Trail Segments F, G, and H as “future connections”. This could alleviate some of the issues we are having with land ownership and the natural environment.

Project Team Response

Phasing of the detailed design and implementation will be done, one option the team is looking at is to allow for the areas in the north and south that connect to existing trails to be undertaken first. By looking at the central area last in the phasing of work it will allow parks to continue discussions with the golf course.

CLC Comment

If we go back to Trail Segment B, the bottom end is close to the existing path to Wigmore Park and there is possibility to go through Trail Segment B and then go up to Wigmore and then down the Gatineau Corridor Trail.

Project Team Response

Yes, that is correct however we would then be leaving the valley and coming back into it which does not meet the high level objectives of the project.

CLC Comment

That would avoid the tunneling of the rail line, as well as the contentious Trail Segments G & H.

Project Team Response

Noted.

MITIGATION MEASURES

VT noted that mitigation measures would not be reviewed during the meeting due to time left, but that these would be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.

NEXT STEPS

VT went through the Next Steps for the project.

VT asked if there were any additional questions before the meeting was closed.

The Chair closed the meeting at 9:00 pm.

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM CLC MEETING #6

General Comments

- Need to have some thought on how we can restore some of the previously disturbed areas (Toronto Water bridge an example)
 - Before Parkview Hills (restored slope)
 - Valley before Pan Am Trail
 - North side of Eglinton

Design Concepts

- “Trees” does not capture “core” forest areas
 - Want to avoid fragmentation
- Opportunity for snake hibernacula under bridges (rip rap areas)
- Design of bridges could create “landmarks”
 - Art funds
- Will cyclists be asked to dismount and walk on bridges/tunnels?
 - Will design so this should not have to happen
- Stage 1: Make available to any CLC members interested
- Capital costs need to consider:
 - Fencing
 - Ecological considerations (mitigation)
- Vegetation: are we only looking at trees?
 - Yes, looked at ELC in phase 2 and only looking at trees
 - Will review in mitigation

Segment A

- Vegetation ranking was questioned (they currently score the same) **(ACTION ITEM)**
- Did we consider existing informal trails?
 - Tried to look at existing as a potential alignment
 - Difficulty of closing existing trails
- Need to consider user experience

- People want to go to water and will continue to do so
- Maintenance considerations (sewer)
 - Toronto Water is a user (in evaluation)

Segment B

- Could look at smaller segments and mix and match (those separated by the bridges)
- Segment B is actually four options
 - Have tried to break down into manageable number of segments, however we will consider altering to mix and match the “purple” with the “orange”
- In mitigation, could look at fencing to stop people from heading off trail
 - Evidence that when you build a formal trail, people tend to stay on it
- Could we consider not offering a choice between the tunnel and bridge because they are so close? Under 20 m difference
 - Look at the options after the second bridge

****TRCA will check difference between the two similar routes/alignments**

Segment C

- Lighting for tunnels?
 - Option 2 within erosion area/threshold (this is what the agency consideration point speaks to)

Segment D

- Options break up meadow or forest with trail
 - Trade offs

Segment E – no comments

Segment F

- Should be looking at shared use option in this area so we can avoid the wetland/forest
 - Golf course will not consider shared use
 - Cannot use the Metrolinx right of way
- Some preference for #1 and #3
- Consider that boardwalks need maintenance and can become slippery
- Some comments have members leaning towards #3
- Creative solution: because wetland is low quality, consider a combo of #1 and #3 and restore to a higher quality habitat (potentially fill some areas, etc.)

Segment G

- May be able to drop off orange – in discussions with Metrolinx regarding the purple alignment (on their property but outside their 30m right of way)

Segment H

- Filling of low areas
 - Some of these are valuable wildlife habitat
- Mountain bikers are predominant users in area
 - Many end up using other route

Segment I

- Site lines – for cyclists may want to consider an advanced warning
- Grades – at some point we will have to meet AODA standards (after 20lbs)
 - Need to justify when we can't meet them

Segment J – no comments

Segment K

- Option 2 – outside of erosion area
- Detailed design – straight trail versus meandering – which is safest?
- Sight lines are important
- Need to place trail far enough away from erosion but still consider that people want to have river views (consider where they will want to go)
- We are trying to build the spine – other connections will come down the road
 - Best connection to Flemington Park

Segment L – no comments

Segment M – no comments

General Comments

- Hard to look at user experience when reviewing segment by segment
 - Look at entire area for variety, etc.
- F, G, H are most controversial areas (going through forested area)
 - If you leave these out the other areas will exist independently
- Part of intent with phasing is to see what happens with private property
- Segment B (bottom end) is close to existing path at Wigmore Park
 - Could use this to avoid problematic areas
- Pan Am is currently driving things, however it will be done – this is part of the legacy but not timeline

****For any areas where the ranking is similar, a more detailed look at natural environment impacts needs to be done**