



# **Mid Humber Gap**

## **Municipal Class Environmental Assessment**

# **Public Consultation Summary**

### **Round Two: June 2022**

# Contents

- What We Heard Overview ..... 3
- Notification and Communications ..... 4
- Activities ..... 4
- Stakeholder Advisory Group #2, February 3, 2022..... 5
  - Presentation..... 5
  - Key topics ..... 5
- Virtual Public Meeting #2 May 17, 2022 ..... 5
  - Introduction and Presentation ..... 5
  - Question and Comment Highlights ..... 5
- Feedback Form Results..... 6
- Appendices..... 9
  - Appendix 1: Stakeholder Advisory Group #2, February 3, 2022 ..... 9
    - SAG Representatives: ..... 9
    - Questions/Comments and Staff Responses..... 9
  - Appendix 2: Virtual Public Meeting #2 May 17, 2022..... 14
    - Project Staff/ Panelists ..... 14
    - Question Answer Period..... 14

The City of Toronto, in partnership with Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), has completed its second round of public consultation which shared the evaluated options and identified a preferred trail alignment (in-valley) to close the existing gap in the Humber River Trail (HRT) network. Members of the public were engaged to provide feedback and have their questions answered. Consistent with the first round of consultation, a variety of public engagement opportunities were provided to for public feedback including:

- Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting #2 (community and organizational representatives listed in Appendix #1)
- individual stakeholder meetings with landowners
- virtual public meeting #2
- online feedback form
- tracking of phone and email correspondence

Stakeholder and public feedback has been reviewed by the Project Team and incorporated, where feasible, into the conceptual design of the preferred trail alignment. Following a staff report to the Infrastructure & Environment Committee (IEC) on July 7, 2022 and then, Toronto City Council on July 19/20, 2022, the remaining phase of the Mid Humber Gap MCEA will involve finalizing the alignment and preliminary design of the preferred trail alignment and the preparation of a Final Study Report, which will be made available for public and stakeholder review through a Notice of Completion to be issued in the summer/fall of 2022.

This report summarizes the public communications sent out and feedback received leading up to and after the second virtual public meeting.

## **What We Heard Overview**

Consistent with the first round of public consultation, public response was very supportive of connecting the Mid Humber Gap and forming a continuous multi-use trail, with Concept 1A in-valley selected as the preferred trail alignment. Concept 1A in-valley was supported overall from most of the Stakeholder Advisory Group members, through public meeting comments, online feedback form results and email and phone correspondence. Concerns continue to be shared by property owners within the project area with regards to potential impacts associated with Concept 1A in-valley alignment including: trail user safety, sustainability of the trail, flooding, trespassing, and vandalism. Popular feedback topics also included:

- Majority of support for the Concept 1A as the preferred trail alignment due to best user experience (i.e. continuous multi-use trail, safer, accessible, moderate trail slope) along the iconic Humber River in a beautiful and natural setting.
- Acknowledgment of the long-term active transportation and community benefits (e.g., recreation, mental health, safety).
- Concern about impacts to private property (e.g. personal safety, trespassing, vandalism) and the natural environment (e.g., flood risk and slope stability) and preference for Concept 2A or 3A

## Notification and Communications

Public communications were used to promote awareness of the consultation process, collect broad perspectives, and engage stakeholders and the public on the potential trail alignments to close this 800 m gap in the Humber River Trail:

- 10,040 flyers delivered by Canada Post (April 25, 2022) for the virtual public meeting to the project study area bounded by: Highway 401 (north); generally Lawrence Avenue (south); Islington Avenue (west); and Elm Street/Langside Avenue (east)
- Email invitation to SAG members, stakeholder list, and local Councillors, MPP and MPs
- Indigenous engagement with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Six Nations of the Grand River (Both Six Nations Elected Council and Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council), and Huron-Wendat Nation
- Paid advertisement in Etobicoke Guardian (May 5, May 12)
- Project webpage: [toronto.ca/midhumbergap](https://toronto.ca/midhumbergap)

## Activities

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, consultation activities were adapted to ensure the health and safety of all community members and to align with public health recommendations. Face-to-face engagement activities were substituted with online and telephone interactions. Public communications to promote the first and second Public Information Centres included flyers delivered to addresses within the study area, email invitations to local councilors and stakeholders. Specific activities included:

- 10 participants at SAG meeting #2
- Two individual stakeholder meetings with landowners
- 89 attendees for a virtual public meeting
- 248 completed online feedback forms
- over 40 emails and phone calls received and logged, 95 in total for both one and two consultation rounds

## **Stakeholder Advisory Group #2, February 3, 2022**

### **Presentation**

The City and TRCA presented to the SAG on Thursday, February 3, 2022, on the Preliminary Preferred Trail Alignments, Evaluation Matrix and Design Considerations for Preferred Alignment. See Appendix #1 for attendee list and meeting minutes.

### **Key topics**

- Private Land Trust and location of trail from individual's homes
- Weston Golf and Country Club (WGCC) and potential safety risks, trail users and flood events and mitigation
- Preferred Trail Alignment and maintenance considerations
- Bike lane considerations for Weston Road and facility options
- Trail accessibility considerations
- Flooding and erosion assessment inquiry
- Construction commencement

## **Virtual Public Meeting #2 May 17, 2022**

### **Introduction and Presentation**

Participants were welcomed to the second Mid Humber Gap Public Information Centre (PIC) meeting. Councillor Frances Nunziata and Councillor Anthony Perruzza provided introductory remarks followed by introductions to the project team representing TRCA, City of Toronto, and R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd. Consultants (meeting panelists listed in Appendix #2).

The presentation covered the Preliminary Preferred Trail Alignments, Technical Studies and Evaluation, Preferred Trail Alignment Concept 1A In-valley and Design Consideration (Trisha Radburn).

### **Question and Comment Highlights**

Following the presentation, participants had the opportunity to provide their comments and/or questions via the WebEx question panel function or raise their hand virtually to speak, whereby the project team panelists provided answers. See Appendix #3 for meeting minutes.

### **Preferred Trail Alignment Concept 1A: in-valley**

- Supported due to best trail user experience, avoiding motor vehicle traffic on Weston Road.
- Positive and huge impact on active transportation use both locally and on a network level for Toronto's west-end neighbourhoods.
- Option conveys holistic approach to the trail design that is attractive, ecologically respectful and practical.
- Eagerly looking forward to this great improvement in the trail system and appreciation for bike friendly changes happening in Toronto.
- Support for associated natural restoration opportunities (e.g. invasive species management and native plantings).
- Enthusiasm for construction and completion of trail connection.

## Other comments and questions

- Questions about why routing the trail on the east side of the Humber River (Concept 2A- hybrid in-valley/on road - opposite side from WGCC) wasn't selected as the preferred alignment.
- Questions about how impacts to private property (e.g. trespassing, vandalism) and the natural environment (e.g., constriction of river flow, flood risk, habitat) will be addressed
- Personal safety concern for trail users as walkway is right beside active play of golf course as well as users that may find themselves trapped in an enclosed area in need of exit route.
- Personal safety concern for golf course members relating to vulnerable members playing either alone or in small groups in a remote area of golf course
- Questions about funding and merit of cost compared to other city recreational funding needs.
- Question about environmental impacts to natural area from trail construction
- Concerns about challenges faced by both pedestrians and cyclists using the existing staircase at Mallaby Park.

## Feedback Form Results

An online feedback form was made available between May 3 and May 31, 2022 and was completed by **248 participants**. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement for the preliminary preferred 1A In-valley trail alignment. Key points and observations are shared below.

### In-valley Preferred Trail Alignment (Concept 1A)

- Respondents strongly agree with: 222 (82%) strongly agree; 26 (10%) somewhat agree; 6 (2%) neutral; 1 somewhat disagree; 5 (2%) strongly disagree; and 10 (4%) don't know

### Supportive Comments: In-valley Preferred Trail Alignment

- Request to keep trail in valley and maintain a continuous trail with more wilderness, natural experience and beauty.
- Safe public enjoyment and community spirit outweigh the cost and private property impacts.
- Avoids stress and conflicts with high volume of motor vehicle traffic on Weston Road.
- Enthusiasm for associated restoration opportunities (e.g. bank stabilization).
- Safest option (keeping trail off road) benefitting most people (minimizing climbing out of valley) mitigating negative impacts to WGCC and private land trust
- Effort to protect environment commended.
- Safety concerns from flying golf balls can be addressed by adequate netting and preventive measures such as golf hole re-positioning to minimize any danger the golf course may present to users of the trail system. Railpath fencing is a great model, it's functional but also visually light and elegant.
- Two bike bridges is certainly a worthwhile use of taxpayer money, and private land impacts acceptable to build a quality public amenity like the Humber River Trail.

- Given the number of people (pedestrians and cyclist, all abilities) who use the Humber River Trail, not having to go up/down stair and deal with traffic on Weston Road is extremely important.
- Further industrialization of the limited green spaces is an ongoing issue, so the work put into this study is at the core of trying to preserve and increase the access to these spaces.
- Path could be future proofed by being somewhat wider. More and more people are using our park paths as the city's population grows. Also, the alignment could be straighter for those using the path to travel around the city by bike.
- The Humber River Recreational Trail is a crown jewel within the Toronto parks system and it's accessible and proximity to the river, flora and fauna should be maximized. An on-road connection, either fully or partially, effectively still results in a "break" or disconnection of the path.
- Keen to have Bike Share expand north and to this area to further allow people to commute via bikes through the HRT. Consider a protected route from the HRT to the Weston Go station (rather than cycle along Lawrence Ave W) which would be amazing in terms of transit options to/from Union/Pearson.
- This will be the only north/south off-road bike lane crossing the 401 in the west part of city which is a critical piece of vision zero cycling infrastructure.
- Convinced that the proposed design treatments will allow the valley to be comfortably and safely shared by golfers and by trail users.
- Concerns about habitat and flooding are no different than in any other location where we have in valley uses already.

### **Concerns: In-valley Preferred Trail Alignment**

- Bike trails are waste of tax payer dollars.
- Cost is not justified and request for cost benefit analysis and recreation dollars need to go to community centres and facilities including opportunities for at-risk and marginalized youth.
- Flood risk too great for spending.
- Massive safety concern as walkway is right beside golf course. Enclosed walkways are a safety issue and non-enclosed walkway will result in people getting hit by golf balls. Plus adding two bridges is not a cost effective solution. Figure out more practical solution.
- Most logical route is to stay on the east side of the river, and create a path at the bottom of the existing cliff. This would be the shortest route, avoid building two bridges and protect the bank of the Humber River below the cliff from further erosion. This would also prevent pedestrian access to the golf course on west side and the potential for golf balls landing on the path. A safety fence would not be very good looking and would be an extra cost.
- Path needs to be very smooth and avoid sharp turns next to bridges with warning signs so people cycling know when to slow down and reduce risk of collisions.

### **Alternative Concept 3A: on-road**

- Cycling on Weston Road is unsafe and cyclists will avoid or ride on sidewalk.

- Exiting valley and riding along Weston Road is terrible and not an option for cycling with kids.
- Navigating up the Mallaby stairs and threading under the railway bridge on Weston Road on a narrow sidewalk really not an accessible option.
- Support grade-separated facility on Weston Road.

### **Other Topics and Suggestions**

- Comments that Humber River is a favourite place in the city.
- Concerns about flooding and methods to inform trail users in advance of any risk.
- Any option is better than what currently exists and lack of access.
- Separate pedestrians and cyclists is needed on multi-use trails.
- Question 1 in survey unclear and not actually a question. Surveys should be tested before sending out.
- Etobicoke needs to create a cycle culture to encourage more people to cycle safely.
- Separating pedestrians and bikes where possible is always preferred. Please don't ask cyclists to dismount. The whole point of going out for a ride is to ride, we often wear shoes unsuited to walking, and we take up more space when walking next to our bikes than we do on them.
- Add better wayfinding signs because HRT is very confusing for cyclists to navigate. I would love for signs showing the distances to Steeles and better signage for where each exit goes to (such as 'Weston UP Station, 400m').
- Finch Avenue from Islington to 400 is a "warzone" right now too due to the cross town construction.



# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Stakeholder Advisory Group #2, February 3, 2022

### SAG Representatives:

Rob Ackermann, Weston Golf and Country Club  
Joanne Acri, Weston Road Runners  
Riccardo Caimano, Walk and Cycle York South-Weston/Cycle TO  
Jason Doolan, Weston Village Resident's Association  
Cheryl Gosling, Humberview Crescent (Residents)  
Alison Menary, Green Neighbours Network  
Neil Park, Etobicoke Historical Society  
Sam Perry, CultureLink Settlement and Community Services  
Krishan Rajasooriar, Toronto District Catholic School Board  
Matthew Zuniga, TRCA Youth Council

### Project Team and local Councillor Representatives:

Caitlin Harrigan, TRCA (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)  
Corey Wells, TRCA  
Lorraine Chadwick, TRCA  
Jennifer Hyland, CoT (City of Toronto)  
Maogosha Pyjor, CoT  
Mark Lowe, CoT  
Jason Bragg, CoT  
Tricia Radburn, R.J. Burnside & Associates Ltd.  
Shawn Cabral, Councillor Nunziata's Office  
Shima Bhana, Councillor Ford's Office

### Questions/Comments and Staff Responses

The meeting included a presentation on the evaluation of the alternatives and selection of the preliminary preferred trail alternative. The team listened to concerns and answered questions.

#### Private Land Trust

- **Q:** Is the plan to align the trail on the land trust parcel as far from the individual homes as possible to minimize the effect on residential properties?
  - **A:** While subject to change during the detailed design phase of the project, the current alignment is proposed away from the private residential properties along Humberview Crescent and could include the installation of fencing to provide additional privacy for the residents. Details on the location and materials for possible fencing options would be determined during the detailed design phase and following negotiations with the private landowners.
- **Q:** What is the timeframe for negotiations regarding the land trust property with the Humberview residents?

- **A:** There is no set timeframe, but the City would certainly like to begin negotiations soon.

### **Weston Golf and Country Club (WGCC)**

- **Q:** Due to the need for adequate safety/barrier enclosures for most of the trail along the west bank, how will potential safety risks to trail users be mitigated during a flood event?
  - **A:** While the southern bridge and elevated boardwalk would include a protective enclosure, both structures are designed to be above more frequent flooding events (above at least the 25-year event). Additionally, there are engineering measures that have been used across the City for other areas of in-valley trail networks to mitigate risk and ensure public safety. As this alignment is still in a preliminary design stage, these measures will be evaluated both at the 30% conceptual design level as part of this MCEA as well as during the detailed design phase of the project and will be guided by completed technical studies.
- **Q:** How does the City plan to enforce trail closure and mitigate the public being in an enclosed cantilevered structure over the Humber and within the floodplain during a potential severe weather event?
  - **A:** TRCA and the City have a significant network of existing trails and bridge crossings within similar ravine settings, where flooding can occur. Design standards would be followed to minimize risk during more frequent flood events, such as ensuring trail and structures are outside and/or above at least the 5-year flood event. Signage and other features could also be included to notify the public. The MCEA and detailed design process will include safety and mitigation measures as needed, based on existing conditions and guided by TRCA/City standards for ravine trail systems.
  - **C:** The WGCC will likely be looking to negotiate a solid barrier between the trail users and patrons to mitigate vandalism, trespassing, and visual/audible disturbances to the course and golfers.

### **Preferred Trail Alignment and Maintenance**

- **Q:** What factors have gone into the cost estimate for the hybrid Option 2A, which includes a cantilevered structure on the east side of the Humber River?
  - **A:** The development of the cost estimate included factors such as additional geotechnical and engineering studies, capital costs for construction, and substantial infrastructure requirements to support the proposed cantilevered boardwalk on the east valley slope.
- **Q:** Can the alignment for Option 2A be repositioned to the top of the east valley slope with a similar acquisition of lands as what is being proposed with Option 1A?

- **A:** This alignment option was studied at a high-level but not considered as a feasible option due to a number of technical factors, including (but not limited to):
  - Lack of available clearance at the top of the slope for the required setback from the long-term stable top of the slope within a valley and stream corridor.
  - Significant geotechnical engineering challenges requiring comprehensive studies to evaluate slope stabilization structure(s) and potential conflicts with the underground parking garage.
  - Complex land negotiations with three private landowners, as well as a Metrolinx parcel that has uncertain long-term land uses.
  - Steep, heavily forested slopes requiring potentially significant tree canopy removals.
  
- **Q:** Who will be responsible for scheduled and emergency maintenance and debris clean-up for the trail and structures?
  - **A:** Following the implementation of any trail alignment and structures for this project, it will become Parks, Forestry & Recreation Operations team's responsibility to complete ongoing or emergency maintenance and Solid Waste Management Services is responsible garbage collection.
  
- **Q:** Is there a consideration for raising the at-grade sections of the trail and installing a retaining wall to offer protection for trail users in a flood event?
  - **A:** A berm that could potentially raise the trail above flood levels would require a significant amount of fill and may have an opposite effect by reducing the volume of the existing floodplain. The addition of large amounts of fill to alter the existing grade within TRCA's Regulation Limits is avoided as much as possible as it can exacerbate flooding.
  - **C:** TRCA is the regulatory body for any works proposed within ravines. It is in our best interest to propose and approve structures that do not pose a risk to property and public safety. With a vast amount of trail infrastructure located throughout the city of Toronto, located in ravines with similar situations, flooding is a concern that we know we always need to be planning for. Fortunately, we are building on significant experience from successfully implementing similar projects throughout the city's extensive ravine and trail systems. Any preferred option for the Mid Humber Gap will be required to meet or exceed existing safety standards.

## **Bike Lane Considerations**

- **Q:** Regarding Option 3A and the option two-way cycle track on one side of Weston Road, have two separate one-way cycle tracks been explored?

- **A:** Accommodating two one-way cycle tracks would likely require modifications to the existing road/boulevard, either through a partial lane reduction or property acquisition. In addition, a safe crossing from the one-way cycle track facility to the trail would be needed, particularly at the intersection of St. Phillips and Weston Rd. Implementing one-way cycle tracks under the Metrolinx rail structure, given the space constraints, would likely require lane removals.
- **C:** Considering Weston Road is a busy arterial roadway near Hwy 401, lane removals may impact traffic flow including the potential to negatively impact public transit in the area.
- **Q:** Are Options 2A and 3A still on the table as alternatives?
  - **A:** While Option 1A is the preferred option, nothing is off the table until after the Notice of Completion is circulated and the public review period for the MCEA is complete.

### Trail Accessibility

- Several SAG members voiced their preference for Option 1A over Option 2A and 3A, primarily due to the gentler grades proposed for this alignment. Option 1A also provides an in-valley alignment, allowing users to enjoy the ravine and naturalized space.

### Flooding and Erosion

- **Q:** Have the impacts of superstorms and requirements for erosion control been assessed?
  - **A:** As part of the MCEA process, the project team undertakes several studies that look at flood patterns from different storm types (e.g., a 2-year flood to a Hurricane Hazel level event). These studies will help determine the planning and design of the trail system and the level of protection required to ensure they are safe (e.g., scour protection measures for bridge abutments and minimum clearances for bridge decking).
- **Q:** Can you clarify the difference between the 5-year and 25-year floodplain limit and what that implies regarding Option 1A?
  - **A:** The various year storm events are based on the statistical probability of that magnitude storm occurring. For example, a 25-year storm event would have a 4% probability of happening in any given year ( $100\%/25\text{-year}=4\%$ ). In contrast, a 5-year storm would have a 20% chance of happening in any given year. The more frequent 2 and 5-year storms are less impactful than the less frequent 100 and 200-year storm events. The floodplain limits shown in the presentation represent the width the Humber River would be expected to reach during a 5-

year storm event. TRCA has strict requirements for what can be constructed within different floodplain limits.

## **Construction**

- **Q:** Can construction commence and be completed in 2022?
  - **A:** The commencement of construction will depend on completing the MCEA and detailed design phase, acquisition of permits and approvals, and available budget. Given the MCEA process is planned to be completed in early 2022, construction may commence in 2024, and extend over a few years, assuming the budget, permits, and approvals have been secured.

## Appendix 2: Virtual Public Meeting #2 May 17, 2022

### Project Staff/ Panelists

Councillor Frances Nunziata  
Councillor Anthony Perruzza  
Shawn, Councillor Nunziata's Office  
Trent Jennett, Councillor Ford's Office  
Caitlin, TRCA (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)  
Corey Wells, TRCA  
Lorraine Chadwick, TRCA  
Jennifer Hyland, CoT (City of Toronto)  
Maogosha Pyjor, CoT  
Mark Lowe, CoT  
Mark De Miglio, CoT  
Jason Bragg, CoT  
Tricia Radburn, R.J. Burnside & Associated Ltd.

### Question Answer Period

Meeting participants provided their questions and comments with the following project team responses where applicable and organized by them.

**Q:** Question

**C:** Comment

**A:** Answer

### 1A In-valley Preliminary Preferred Alignment

- **Q:** Is the risk of flooding to the trail mitigated by the Claireville dam?
  - **A:** The Claireville dam is located far north of the project area and would not have the capacity to mitigate any significant flooding in the project area under a severe weather flooding event (e.g., Hurricane Hazel level event).
- **Q:** How long and high above ground is the proposed boardwalk?
  - **A:** The proposed boardwalk places the decking above the 25-year floodplain elevation, though the exact height above ground will be determined in detailed design. The canopy is approximately 4 metres high to allow maintenance vehicle access.
- **Q:** Has funding been approved for 2023?
  - **A:** Upon approval of the project, Parks, Forestry and Recreation and Transportation Services would look at securing funding, both for design and implementation, through capital budgets. Pre-design discussions have already taken place with the capital budget team, who are aware of this project.
- **Q:** If Concept 1A proceeds, will the staircase at Mallaby Park remain?
  - **A:** The staircase will remain in place.

- **C:** Safety barriers for this area were requested when Metrolinx conducted previous work under the rail bridge and should be followed up on regardless of the outcome of this project.
- **Q:** If the majority of Concept 1A is located within the 25-year floodplain, what is the long-term plan to ensure the trail is maintained for future generations?
  - **A:** There are sections of the paved at-grade trail that have to be placed in the 25-year floodplain, but a significant portion of the elevated boardwalk structure is above the limit of the 25-year. It is unlikely that a 25-year storm (or similar frequency) would overtop the entire trail alignment. Maintenance requirements for the longevity of the trail and structures will be considered an essential item during the development of detailed designs and long-term maintenance planning. The City has operational standards for the maintenance of similar ravine trails located throughout the city.
- **C:** As a cyclist who uses the Humber Recreational Trail, Concept 1A is most preferred. This project will benefit both residents and trail users in the future.
- **Q:** Has a geotechnical assessment been completed on the east bank (other than desktop) and will this information be made available? How is it possible that costs for Concept 1A are comparable for the 2A and 3A alignments?
  - **A:** An external geotechnical firm has undertaken an assessment, and that information will be included in the final MCEA report. Concerns with implementing a cantilevered structure on the east bank due to steepness and ongoing active erosion are documented within the assessment. According to the professional opinion of the external and internal geotechnical engineers, implementing the cantilevered structure on the east bank would not be a viable solution due to slope stability, public safety, constructability, and cost concerns.
  - **A:** The detailed evaluation of the preliminary preferred trail alignment concepts considers a wide range of criteria, including financial impacts. Although Concept 1A is not identified as the lowest cost option, it is shown to be the most preferred overall through the evaluation process.
- **Q:** Would maintenance vehicles be able to access the preferred trail alignment?
  - **A:** Current designs permit for maintenance vehicle access.
- **C:** Concept 1A is the best option for avoiding safety concerns on Weston Road and will be a better user experience overall.
- **Q:** Will there be flood mitigation warning signs and/or historic plaques along the project area?
  - **A:** As part of the detailed design process, warning signs and other safety measures will be explored and installed as appropriate. Opportunity for additional signage within the project area (e.g., historic or knowledge sharing) is certainly something to be considered during detailed design and in the future.

- **C:** The effort over the last eighteen months by project staff and councillors is greatly appreciated. Concept 1A is the best option for keeping the trail within the Humber valley, providing accessibility to young and old alike with at-grade design, and providing a connection to nature away from the hustle and bustle of Toronto streets.
- **Q:** Very happy to see a recognition by way of the opening Land Acknowledgement but question why concepts that will significantly impact the natural environment during and after construction. What are the expected environmental and cost impacts with Concept 1A?
  - **A:** Potential costs of Concept 1A as per the preliminary design for implementation (not including private property negotiations) have been roughly estimated at \$7.5 million. Construction impacts will be identified and assessed in detail as part of the MCEA and construction plan. All necessary permitting and approvals will also be followed as it pertains to the natural environment. There are ways to build a trail system with less impact by using a well-developed construction methodology for sensitive environments. A couple of high-level examples are:
    - Restricting construction footprint to the trail area, minimizing ingress and egress routes;
    - Following existing informal paths and avoiding vegetation where possible; and
    - Removal of invasive species and improvements to natural habitat with native plantings within the project area.
- **Q:** Will the preferred trail alignment Concept 1A avoid sharp corners and have clear sightlines?
  - **A:** The preferred design will aim to minimize sharp corners and maximize sight lines as much as is technical feasible based on existing site constraints.
- **Q:** Is there any indications of the potential increase in the number of trail users once the necessity of navigation the large staircase at Mallaby Park is removed?
  - **A:** Transportation Services has conducted trail counts along the Humber River; cyclist counts were approximately 600 – 800 per day a number of years ago. Installing counters before and after implementation of the preferred trail alignment may be viable. There are methods available to count non-cyclist users that project staff may consider during the detail design phase.

### 3A On Road Concept and Area

- **C:** The sidewalk on St. Philips and Weston Road is extremely narrow and poses a safety risk to pedestrians, cyclists. Concept 1A is the only usable and safe concept.
- **Q:** Regarding Concept 3A, wouldn't installing a guard rail under the rail bridge make the sidewalk on Weston Road even narrower?
  - **A:** Yes, the existing space is relatively narrow under the rail bridge and there is no room for widening given the location of the piers. If Concept 2A or 3A were to move forward, a safety guardrail would be installed to separate trail users and



- vehicles, which may further reduce the available space. This area has been flagged as a safety concern as part of the detailed evaluation within the MCEA.
- **Q:** Did this MCEA consider an alternative on-road option via Cruickshank Park to Church Street, Rosemount Avenue and Oak Street?
    - **A:** Neighbourhood street options were considered by TRCA and City in the 2019 Feasibility Study, completed before the start of the MCEA. There would be significant challenges exiting the trail at Cruickshank Park and Church Street; users would have to traverse a series of staircases or a narrow steep trail. Routing through the surrounding neighbourhoods would result in a lengthy diversion for users. The intent of this project is to connect directly at Crawford Jones Park and Mallaby Park.
  - **Q:** Is it possible to consider temporary safety measures on Weston Road to address the current situation while the project progresses?
    - **A:** There is currently signage and painted sharrow markings directing users around the trail gap along Weston Road. However, any temporary 'quick build' interim solution would likely require the removal of traffic lanes on Weston Road.
  - **Q:** Was there any alignment evaluated that looked at utilizing the informal path that runs along south of the Hwy 401 bridge?
    - **A:** This informal gravel trail was not considered because expected impacts to the natural environment would have resulted in significant removal of trees and vegetation.
  - **Q:** Has a traffic analysis of Weston Road been completed as part of the MCEA process?
    - **A:** A traffic analysis was completed as part of the MCEA and will be included in the Final Report.
    - **A:** in the context of Transportation Services, we do a regular count program that monitors vehicle volumes that were used as part of the traffic analysis. Other traffic studies have been completed in the area as well.
  - **Q:** Concerning comments about the narrow sidewalk under the rail bridge on Weston Road, numerous areas across the city have similar (if not worse) scenarios. The City has implemented trails close to traffic for many years, and I think we need to look more closely at the on-road option and the associated impacts/costs. Have safety concerns regarding Concept 3A been evaluated thoroughly compared to other areas of the City?
    - **A:** There are a number of on-street cycle tracks throughout the city, but the challenging part of Concept 3A is the shared pathway under the existing rail structure. There are concerns about pedestrians and cyclists sharing a narrow space in an active ROW. The other constraint is that the cycle track will not be uni-directional (one-way); it will be bi-directional (two-way). This raises concerns with vehicles turning in and out of driveways.

## Private Property

- **Q:** What happens with land currently owned by others if Concept 1A is approved? Is it appropriated?
  - **A:** The city will continue discussions with the private property owners to try to reach a negotiated agreement for property rights needed. The City would only consider expropriation as a last resort if no agreement could be reached.
- **Q:** As raised at previous meetings, there are concerns around flooding that were not addressed in the presentation. The proposed trail alignment will require installing a pile system on the WGCC property to cantilever the trail, which will impact flooding. Similarly, you will be cantilevering off of a bridge abutment in a space that has previously been blocked by debris material during a flood event. What will be done to mitigate the flood impacts on the proposed infrastructure and surrounding private property in the floodplain?
  - **A:** The planning, design, and permitting of any structure within the floodplains is guided by TRCA policies that ensure risks to property and public health are mitigated. Comprehensive flood modelling and geomorphologic study has been undertaken as part of the MCEA, ensuring that all crossings are carefully sited, sufficiently sized, and appropriately designed. As the project moves into detailed design, further technical studies will be undertaken by professional engineers to ensure proper design and to mitigate flood risk impacts. The preferred alignment and crossings reflect design guidelines and standards utilized for other trail projects in floodplains throughout Toronto. One additional point of clarification is that the boardwalk will not be cantilevered off of the Metrolinx bridge abutment.

### Accessibility

- **Q:** Would all preferred trail alignments be accessible for users utilizing mobility assisted devices?
  - **A:** Each Concept (1A, 2A, and 3A) was evaluated for accessibility as one of the key evaluation criteria (e.g., maintaining shallow grades below 7%). Conceptual designs at the MCEA stage indicate the switchback ramp required for Concepts 2A and 3A would meet grades exceeding 7%. Concept 1A was identified as an accessible option due to minimal grade throughout its length.

### Schedule and Next Steps

- **Q:** When is the earliest construction of the preferred trail alignment can begin?
  - **A:** Following all approvals, including Toronto City Council, Ministry approval for the MCEA, and negotiation with the impacted private landowners, detailed design would likely occur in 2023-2024. This will be a multi-year project with construction tentatively from 2024 to 2026.
- **Q:** What are the risks and constraints moving forward after the MCEA is complete and is there anything the community can do to provide support in pushing this initiative forward?
  - **A:** Currently, people are encouraged to fill in the online survey (deadline May 31, 2022). Following this public engagement meeting, staff will be reporting to the Infrastructure and Environment Committee (IEC) (July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022) and Toronto

City Council (July 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> 2022). Members of the public will have the opportunity to depute the project at the IEC meeting on July 7<sup>th</sup>. A project update will be issued in advance to provide IEC meeting details.

- **Q:** What is the expected timeline for this portion of the trail to be complete and open for public use?
  - **A:** Subject to all permitting and approvals, construction is tentatively scheduled for 2024-2026.

### **Public Consultation**

- **Q:** Will the recording of this presentation be available to the public?
  - **A:** The recording will not be made available and is used to support the development of a meeting summary, which will be provided. The slide presentation will be available on the webpage.
- **Q:** In saying that Concept 1A was chosen as the preferred alignment, are you able to provide a number for the people who responded to the questionnaire survey?
  - **A:** Comments are provided through a number of different avenues (e.g., feedback forms, emails, meetings, etc.). Actual numbers for completed feedback forms from both the first and second round of consultations will be provided as part of the meeting summary.

### **Closing Remarks & Next Steps**

Councillor Nunziata thanked all participants for attending the Mid Humber Gap MCEA public event.

Maogosha Pyjor closed off the meeting by noting additional comments and/or questions can be submitted via the Feedback Form found on the project webpage until May 31, 2022. Other dates to get involved and provide comments include July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022 when staff will report to the Infrastructure and Environment Committee.