

November 22, 2006

Ms. Hayley Berlin  
Projects Officer  
Ministry of the Environment  
Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
Phone: 416-314-7106  
Fax: 416-314-8452

Dear Ms. Berlin;

I am writing you to add my comments on the Terms of Reference for the GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station.

They are as follows:

- Page 1, INTRODUCTION: Get rid of "alternatives both within and outside of the Georgetown South Corridor" and change it to "all possible routes and methods".  
- If the EA is seriously considering all other routes and methods then why specifically single out the Georgetown South Corridor.
- Page 3, 1.1.3, (b) - "growth that builds on community priorities"  
- these need to be not just kept in mind but put up high in the criteria
- (d) "for the co-ordination of growth policies among all level of government"  
- the city, province or federal were not at any of the PLC meetings.
- Page 4, 1.1.3 - "to create complete communities"  
-not to divide as this train would.
- Page 7, 1.15 -the Places to Grow Act, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, etc. were never mentioned in our meetings. The reason and source for this train idea was asked many times with no answer and with a lot of time wasted in our PLC meetings. We were asking in good faith but now I believe their unwillingness to answer was just a stall tactic so the meetings ended up accomplishing much less than they did.
- Page 9, 1.1.6, 2nd paragraph - "the service was to be of minimum cost to the public"  
-At \$20 a pop? I don't think so.
- Third paragraph - "After the first phase of public participation"  
- they have basically summed up all the meetings, talks, letters etc. from when we first found out about this to when they agreed to switch to an Individual EA.
- Page 10, 1.2, 2nd paragraph - "The ToR sets out the minimum requirements"

- isn't that another word for scoping? The maximum covered is what we really want?
- Page 14, 2.2, Third paragraph - "major markets for these services are visitors (tourism and convention travel) and daily downtown business travelers as well as workers within the LBPIA area."
  - Is there data saying the workers would be using this train? They aren't really the ones that will use it so why mention them. Only people going to Union Station will use the ARL and that will not be the workers from the airport.
- Fourth paragraph - "to complement existing public transit services, including establishing connections among the various transportation systems."
  - This should be part of the criteria
- Page 15, Table 2-1: An additional table should say how many of these cities have subways first or at least in addition to the Airport Rail Transit Service.
- Page 17, 4.1, 2nd last paragraph
  - why mention the number of on-site employees and all the stuff around the airport? Are they claiming they will use the ARL?
- Page 18, 2nd paragraph - "Both watersheds are highly urbanized within the study area."
  - We have parks up and down the Humber that runs through Weston. Deer have been spotted around the golf course.
- Page 18, 4th paragraph - "The study area features many diverse neighbourhoods...."
  - that include century old homes, Heritage Conservation Districts,
- Page 18, 4.2.1, "To generate and assess these two types of alternatives, the EA will involve two phases. The first phase will focus on the purpose and rationale of the undertaking, the identification and assessing of Planning Alternatives and selection of the preferred Planning Alternative."
  - this clearly states that they are not taking into account environmental issues when accomplishing phase 1. There will be no consideration of the heritage homes, the deer near the tracks or the noise of all the trains
- Page 19, 4.2.2, "opportunities to avoid or minimize impacts will be integrated wherever feasible"
  - the phrase "wherever feasible" should not be included.
- Page 25, Table 5-1, Regional air quality
  - assessment of pollutant loading over a determined period of time.
- Page 26, Table 5-1, Potential impact to existing and future land use....
  - mentions the "Places to Grow" again. When did this all of a sudden become the Bible? It was not mentioned in any of the previous meetings
- Displacement of Built Heritage Features.....
  - disrupted include shaken to its foundations?
- Page 29, Table 6-1, Cultural Environment
  - includes old homes, riverstone walls and bridges?. What about the total fabric of the town being split in two.
- Page 38, 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> last paragraph

- “Specific focus was placed on the purpose of the study, range of alternatives and proposed method of evaluating alternatives” – all items we made them focus on in the PLC meetings.
- Page 39, Public Meetings – no mention of problems with date changes, not letting all of the PLC members know of meetings, bad notes taken, initial meetings cancelled, etc.

I have been involved in this project from when we first heard about it and all along GO Transit and SNC Lavelin have tried one sneaky trick after another; from sending out wrong dates for meetings to changing what they say is needed to having meetings that purposely don't deal with the issue.

In the beginning GO said that the extra tracks were only needed to accommodate the ARL link. Now they are saying that the GO expansion requires more tracks too. Which is it? This question should be mentioned in the ToR so that it is known what is needed.

The most worrisome aspect of this Terms of Reference is the plan to take into account environmental issues only after they have chosen the Planning Alternative. How can it be called an Environmental Assessment if they don't take into account the environment?

I would sincerely ask you to take into account my comments in the best interest of my community and all the communities up and down the line.

Thank you,

Cherri Hurst  
Weston Resident

c.c. Ismants Hausmanis

Mike Sullivan, Weston Community Coalition

N.B. A copy was not sent to the other proponent as they have not been present at the PLC meetings.