

---

## **APPENDIX G**

### **Responses to Public and Interest Group Comments During Pre-Submission Review of the Terms of Reference**

---

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Could we please be more specific about what exactly are the capacity and operating restrictions? For example, what conversations have been had with CP and what was the outcome of those conversations, regarding the junction issues. If the junction issues are solved by a grade separation, what scheduling issues specifically are there on the existing tracks?</p>	<p>The capacity restriction of the West Toronto crossing of the CPR track is being removed by others, however capacity restrictions associated with the single track Weston Subdivision and the potential solutions are the subject of this study. This is CP's main freight track to the north. The issue of sharing of track space and the various restrictions will be discussed and documented in the EA. CP expropriated approximately 20 feet in the 60's to build yard tracks which are now abandoned. The issue of moving the CP tracks westerly into this space will be considered during the EA study</p>	<p>Y Page: 12</p>
<p>The plan is not just for expanded rush hour capacity, but for all-day service. What is the current utilization of the mid-day services? What additional rush hour capacity is planned? What are the forecasts for each of the next 5, 15 and 25 years.</p>	<p>Currently GO operate 6 peak period trains (one direction) and 4 inbound and 3 outbound non peak period trains (bi directional). The current service capacity during the peak period is at least 30% below the existing demand with the result that there is standing room only on many of the peak period trains. GO Transit's current plan is to double the current peak capacity in the near term (next 5 years) by both lengthening trains and adding additional infrastructure. They also plan to provide hourly service in the off-peak Forecast numbers were developed during the original Class EA and will be included as part of the technical background and future conditions in the IEA study. The graphs of proposed future demand and existing utilization of mid day and peak services from previous background work can be provided in the ToR.</p>	<p>Y Page: 13 Exhibit 2-1</p>
<p>As discussed at the last PLC, we don't accept bald statements of fact without the studies to back them up. What other major cities -what technology do they use - do they have commuter connections as well as air-rail links. What increases in tourism or business have they experienced as a result of the investment? Etc.</p>	<p>As an example express rail services are provided from downtown London U.K. to Heathrow, Gatwick, and Stanstead Airports leaving every 15 minutes with journey times of 15 min, 30 min and 45 min respectfully. Some examples like this can be included in the ToR but as examples only.</p>	<p>Y Page: 15 Table 2-1</p>
<p>Please include the background studies names and conclusions.</p>	<p>Information will be documented in the IEA study. We can include the list of background studies leading to the Air Rail Link as well as the estimated passenger demands from those studies.</p>	<p>Y Page: 6 (Section 1.1.4 and 1.1.5)</p>
<p>Please be specific - What other major urban centres? What services do they have.</p>	<p>We can add examples in the ToR Information will also be documented in the IEA study.</p>	<p>Y Page: 15 Table 2-1</p>
<p>The word 'express' has implications that 'rapid' does not. Once again we request that this word be replaced throughout the document with 'rapid'.</p>	<p>"Express" transportation has been replaced by "rapid" transportation throughout the document except where "express" has been used to describe the previous studies as part of background/history.</p>	<p>Y Change reflected through-out</p>
<p>I'm not sure how a river is a cultural environment feature. Please explain.</p>	<p>From a heritage and archaeological potential perspective major waterways are also considered cultural features as aboriginal peoples</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	and earlier settlers often used these features as transportation routes. As such, the potential for archaeological finds tend to be higher (i.e. camp sites, village sites etc) Comment noted. This will be added.	Y Page: 17 Section 4.1
<p>The airport itself, and the downtown core, are prominent features of the study, with their own economic and social environments.</p> <p>We have serious difficulties with this presumption. Current information will not be used throughout the study process. Rather, current information will only be gathered once a preferred alternative is selected. Thus, the alternative selection will be based on potentially inaccurate information. The choice of corridor is the single most important aspect of this study. It is the reason the study is happening. It is being given short shift by using only general or proxy data for this portion. By way of example, proxy data is apparently such measures as multiplying the number of dwellings by the frequency of trains to get a 'sense' of the nuisance of the trains. Such data is seriously flawed, if it compares new neighbourhoods to old, houses of significantly differing ages, or construction. So merely proxying the effects could provide seriously inaccurate results. The suggestion that corrections could take place later, would not provide for such an outcome as there would be no proxy reference to refer back to.</p>	<p>This is a standard and accepted approach to EA Planning. As the study progresses additional detail and impact assessment is undertaken. It should be noted that secondary source information includes current land-use and environmental information as well as recent air photography. Limited field investigations will also be undertaken to verify the accuracy of this data. The ToR will be updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The use of 'proxy' measures at the Planning Alternatives phase is considered to be appropriate to provide an indication of potential nuisance effects to examine the various corridors. It is recognized that impacts to specific properties will not be identified at this stage however the analysis should be sufficient to indicate the number of features potentially affected. Detailed modeling will be undertaken during the Alternative Design stage to identify specific impacts and investigate mitigation. To better reflect the significance of potential nuisance effects ranges will be added (i.e. number of residences between 0-30m, 30-70, 70-300m) to replace the single 300 m ranges under "Social-Economic Environment"</p> <p>The relationship between transportation infrastructure and property values is mixed. The research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). Given the lack of a clear relationship we are proposing to examine the nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible. This approach is consistent with virtually all EA completed for transportation infrastructure in Ontario.</p>	<p>Y Page: 25, Table 5-1 Criteria -Socio-economic Environment</p>
<p>Clearly one of the fears in Weston is the significant reductions in property value as a result of the intensification of this rail corridor, both by GO and by ARL. Mitigation measures must therefore include financial compensation for homeowners whose property values will drop. This will have the added effect of making the choice of corridor have a mitigation cost which is more realistic, and more easily compared.</p>		

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Is there a 4th alternative, of expansion of service only in rush hours? If the ridership is only present in rush hours, does full day service make sense? Is it GO's prediction that the all-day service will attract significant ridership and if so where are those studies?</p>	<p>Additional peak and off peak services are currently proposed but the option of only making improvements in the peak can be documented in the IEA.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Please provide the technical rationale for more than one additional track for GO. The previous study did not indicate more than one new track, and only in certain areas.</p>	<p>This section is intended to broadly indicate the types of improvements that may be required for this alternative. The specific details of the required improvements will be identified as part of the EA. Based on the previous work, one (1) mainline track exists from north of St. Clair through to the connection with the CN's Halton Subdivision, one (1) additional track is required to provide for "enhanced" GO Transit's service to 2021 and a second (2<sup>nd</sup>) track may be required to support GO Transit's "full service" expansion to 2031. However, this investigation is part of the new study and will be restudied and documented in the IEA.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>We have been advised that merely expanding GO service would not require grade separations. This makes sense, as the Weston grade separations occur in a section where speeds are limited and frequency is such that grade separation is not necessary.</p>	<p>This section is intended to broadly indicate the types of improvements that may be required for this alternative. The specific details of the required improvements will be identified as part of the EA.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Again, the previous study did not indicate necessary widening of structures. The difficulty this presents is clearly understanding the minimal GO needs versus those needs presented by the ARL.</p>	<p>This section is intended to broadly indicate the types of improvements that may be required for this alternative. The specific details of the required improvements will be identified as part of the EA.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>As indicated, we expect the study to examine both the provision of a rail-based link along one lane of the gardiner and 427, as well as the provision of a rail-based seamless connection utilizing the lakeshore GO line and a to be build rail line up the 427 corridor.</p>	<p>The seamless link along the GO Lakeshore corridor and up 427 has been added to the ToR</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>We expect this to include a partly underground subway alternative, with direct interchange to Bloor line.</p>	<p>We will look at the most effective option to provide the service with optional passenger connections (stations) including the Bloor line as indicated in the ToR</p>	<p>Y Page: 21 Section 5.1.2</p>
<p>We also expect to examine the possibility of connecting the GO line at Kipling with this Hydro Corridor as a GO or private service along this corridor.</p>	<p>The Hydro corridor is one of the optional corridors being considered and is listed in the ToR</p>	<p>Y Page: 21 Section 5.1.2</p>
<p>I would like to better understand how the trade-offs will be made between cost and the environment. This is the first indication of this issue, but my comments apply throughout the document where cost is raised as an issue. What values will be placed on environmental concerns? how will those values be determined, and by whom. For example, if alternative A poisons 3000 fish per year, and costs \$3 Million to implement, but option B only</p>	<p>The rationale and logic change behind the comparison of the advantages and disadvantages leading to the selection of a preferred alternative will be clearly documented and explained in the EA Report (as well as through the various meetings that will be held during the process). The evaluation process will include an assessment of the significance of the potential effects that may be caused by the various</p>	<p>Y Page: 30 Section 6.2</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>poisons 1000 fish per year but costs \$4 Million to implement, how do we decide? Isn't the cost merely a matter of political will, not of environmental significance? If the minimal adverse effect to the environment is achievable while the purpose is met, isn't cost a matter left to the politicians? I don't believe the study should be forced to compromise the environment for the protection of someone else's budget. If the cost was human lives, would we put a value on it, and add it to the cost of the study?</p>	<p>alternatives. This assessment will be undertaken by the various project team specialists in order to determine the magnitude and significance of effects. The wording in Section 6.2 will be modified to better reflect this concept. Consideration will be given to eliminating the term 'trade-off' to enhance clarity.</p> <p>The Project Team is of the opinion that cost is a valid criterion to include in the evaluation as it is important to understand whether an alternative is affordable and able to be implemented. It should be recognized that many of the alternatives under consideration would require the expenditure of public funds. This should be included in the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>The final suggestion of putting costs to all potential effects has been noted. Pure cost-benefit evaluation methods are rarely (if ever) used in Environmental Assessment Planning in Ontario. The primary reason for this is it is difficult to convert all impacts to a dollar value. For this reason we have chosen to use a Reasoned Argument Approach where the evaluation of alternatives and 'trade-offs' made by the Project Team will be clearly documented and explained throughout the planning process. It should be noted that stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on this process. It should also be noted that the Ontario Minister of the Environment is the ultimate decision maker. If an individual, group or agency disagrees with the rationale behind the decision making process, they have the right to submit their comments to the Minister and explain why they feel the Project Team made the wrong 'trade-offs'. The ultimate decision rests with the Minister of the Environment.</p>	
<p>While I don't disagree with the families of corridors, I think we need to examine all possibilities, including rail north then west (Bradford to Finch, for example) and Rail West then north.</p>	<p>Cost to construct new rail in various parallel corridors will be similar. We discussed the option of going across the Finch Hydro corridor at our PLC and there was common agreement that this option would fall out in any early evaluation because of its additional length and travel time. Having said that we can list all possible options and consider this alternative during the first step of the evaluation process to determine whether this alternative is reasonable.</p>	<p>Y Page: 21 Section 5.1.2</p>
<p>Shouldn't item 1 be the cost to the environment, and the remaining items follow (my comments re cost above still apply). If, in the pre-screening process one choice is clearly more environmentally costly, should the study ignore that?</p>	<p>The objective of the first step of the evaluation process is to determine whether an alternative is reasonable. It is recognized that first step does not include an examination of potential environmental effects. However the rationale for this approach is that if an alternative does not address the purpose of the study to a meaningful degree at a reasonable cost it would not be considered a reasonable</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>alternative no matter how high or low the potential environmental effects were. Potential environmental effects will be considered in the second step of the process as well as during the evaluation of Design Alternatives.</p>	<p>alternative no matter how high or low the potential environmental effects were. Potential environmental effects will be considered in the second step of the process as well as during the evaluation of Design Alternatives.</p>	
<p>There are a number of factors missing. Economic cost of reductions in property values. Economic cost of lost business to local businesses as a result of potential road and traffic pattern disruption. Socio-economic cost to communities as a result of degradation of community. For example, the direct result of noise, vibration and air quality will create a reduction in property value for residents immediately abutting the rail corridor. However, long term, if the business and socio-economic fabric of the community is irreparably damaged, the losses will spread farther into the entire community, and these costs need to be weighed. Living near a set of businesses is a different socio-economic reality than living near a set of boarded-up businesses.</p>	<p>See the previous response related to cost-benefit analysis. See the previous response related to property values. This also relates to potential business effects. The effect on road and traffic pattern disruption has been included in the proposed criteria. Potential Impacts to Access will be changed to Potential Impacts to Community Access. Under the "Measure" for this "Criteria" the first sentence will be changed to "Assessment of impacts on residents and businesses of potential road closures or diversions." The next "Criteria" item in the table will be changed to "Potential Impacts to Existing and Future Land Use and Economic Development"</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Table 5-1, Criteria - Socio-economic Environment</p>
<p>Here we disagree. The quality and age of the structures being compared is but one reason why a proxy system will not yield a proper comparison.</p>	<p>The use of 'proxy' indicators at the Planning Alternatives phase is considered to be appropriate to provide an indication of potential nuisance effects to examine the various corridors. It will assist us in screening the alternatives. Detailed modeling will be undertaken during the design alternatives stage to identify specific impacts and investigate mitigation. To better reflect the significance of potential nuisance effects ranges will be added (i.e. number of residences between 0-30m, 30-70, 70-300m)</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Table 5-1 Criteria -Socio-economic Environment</p>
<p>This should include a study of other forms of culture - art, entertainment, etc, which may be lost or gained by the project.</p>	<p>The value of art and entertainment is highly subjective, but it can usually be assessed in terms of other typical indicators such as direct impacts (displacement, proximity/nuisance effects) to existing or planned land use (business operations, recreational amenities, institutional/cultural centres). This will be done in the detailed analysis.</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Table 5-1 Criteria for Evaluation</p>
<p>Again my comments - what will drive the cost/benefit analysis when it comes to the potential damage to the environment - how much is each fish or frog (or human life) worth, or is that something that should be left to others to decide?</p>	<p>See the previous response related to evaluation method and cost-benefit analysis.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Please explain what is meant by 'trade-offs'. Is there a cost trade-off? Does the government have a cost per life figure that you will use? Will municipal plans trump government guidelines or cost? (EG, if the municipality says no road closures but the cost of keeping roads open isn't in the budget provided by the province, what happens?)</p>	<p>See the previous response related to evaluation method.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Again, please explain trade-offs. Does this mean that some fish are worth</p>	<p>See the previous response related to evaluation method and cost-</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>more than others? Does this mean that there is a trade-off of cost versus the environment?                      Who decides on the 'relative significance' of the impacts and how are they valued. Should not these values be clearly spelled out in the Terms of Reference? Is it not a fundamental part of understanding what the process will be to pre-establish reference points for these kinds of items. Again, I come back to, quantitative evaluations need to be determined, and we need to compare apples to apples. If there is a value that GO will place on the environment or portions thereof, as a part of the 'trade-off' rationale, we should know what it is as part of these terms of reference. To do otherwise means we are buying a pig in a poke. GO could, after the fact, determine its value systems, and apply them and it would be clear, and understandable, but not necessarily reasonable to us.</p>	<p>benefit analysis.                      The assessment of impacts will be undertaken by the various project team specialists in order to determine the magnitude and significance of effects. This assessment will be clearly documented. The rationale and logic change behind the comparison of the advantages and disadvantages leading to the selection of a preferred alternative. The wording in Section 6.2 will be modified to better reflect this concept. Consideration will be given to eliminating the term 'trade-off' to enhance clarity.                      See the previous response related to cost-benefit analysis.</p>	<p>Y                      Page: 30, Section 6.2</p>
<p>Again, a pig in a poke. We need to know what specific criteria and measures GO intends to apply at this stage, so we have an opportunity to comment and be consulted on the development of those criteria and measures, and ensure they are reasonable.</p>	<p>See the previous response related to evaluation method.</p>	<p>Y                      Page: 25 Table 5-1 Criteria for Evaluation</p>
<p>Where is the effect on individual property values?                      How does GO identify who are stakeholders? Apparently the Toronto Board of Trade has been identified by GO as a stakeholder. What is the rationale?                      How will it be applied to others?</p>	<p>See the previous response related to property values.                      Everyone who has an interest or will be potentially positively or adversely effected by the project is a stakeholder. Any individual or group can participate and provide input to the study through the attendance of public meetings and submission of comments and suggestions to the Project Team.                      The Toronto Board of Trade has been contacted as an umbrella group speaking for many businesses in Toronto.</p>	<p>N                      N</p>
<p>It was suggested that the makeup of the PLC would change throughout the study to reflect changing scopes. How will this happen? Why is this not reflected in this section?</p>	<p>We said that the make-up <b>might</b> change once a preferred corridor is selected. At the ToR stage we have attempted to get representation for the entire study and as certain corridors fall off people representing those areas might no longer be interested in participating. The ToR will be modified to reflect this.</p>	<p>Y                      Page: 36 2<sup>nd</sup> para</p>
<p>How will this be accomplished?</p>	<p>Potential environmental effects for all stages will be identified. Construction effects of a project are often significantly different from operational effects. An example of this is impacts to fisheries. Often during construction potential effects are related to sediment and erosion control as a result of soil disturbances of construction activities and direct effects for in water construction (i.e. pier construction/culvert extensions). During the operational stage potential effects tend focus on drainage and stormwater runoff issues (i.e. quality and quantity).</p>	<p>N</p>

Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
 Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
 Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

Responses to Comments - General Public

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>How will this be accomplished? What does GO consider to be cumulative effects - Long term pollution? long term socio-economic damage? Etc.</p>	<p>Cumulative effects assessment will be included in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) Screening Report. Section 16 (1) (a) of CEAA requires a screening report to include 'the environmental effects of the project, including the environmental effects of malfunctions or accidents that may occur in connection with the project and any cumulative environmental effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects or activities that have been or will be carried out'.</p> <p>In simpler terms this means explaining the potential effects of other known projects or activities on factor areas. An example of this would be a new highway may impact the fringe 1ha of a 20ha woodlot. A private development may be planned and approved that will impact the remaining 19ha of the woodlot. CEAA requires that these issues related to other projects be identified in a Screening Report.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>What will be the consequences of failures? Whose jurisdiction will it be to enforce those failures? What will bind the proponent? For example, if the EA requires that the proponent only operate between the hours of 6 am and midnight, and the proponent decides to run 24 hours, what happens? Who forces them to do what? On what authority? What penalties are provided for noncompliance?</p>	<p>All Conditions of Approval imposed on a proponent by the Ontario Minister of the Environment are considered binding. The penalties for offences are outlined in Section 38 of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. The Ontario Minister of the Environment is responsible for enforcement. We have provided the specific wording of this Section for your information.</p> <p><b>38. Every person, whether as principal or agent, or an employee of either of them, who contravenes any provision of this Act or the regulations or fails to comply with an order or a term or condition of an approval issued or given under this Act is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable on a first conviction to a fine of not more than \$10,000 and on a subsequent conviction to a fine of not more than \$25,000 for every day or part thereof upon which the offence occurs or continues. R.S.O. 1990, c. E.18, s. 38.</b></p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Writing to request inclusion of name on mailing list.</p>	<p>Name has been added to the mailing list</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>As a homeowner living directly adjacent to the rail line, I am also requesting an informed response regarding information I have received about this proposed project. I was told a large concrete wall will be built along the tracks, and the effect of the high vibrations from the express trains will crumble the mortar in the walls of our Edwardian houses. What will this</p>	<p>At this point in the process, we are developing the Terms of Reference to guide the subsequent Environmental Assessment. A preferred alternative has not been identified yet. We will have not identified a preferred alternative at this point in time. Specific design plans, impact assessment and mitigation measures (eg noise walls</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>do to the <b>quality of life</b> in the junction, where many people have recently bought and renovated homes, thereby improving the economic viability of the area?</p>	<p>etc.) will be identified as part of the study.</p>	
<p>The rail line has provided our neighbourhood with a much needed green space which counteracts the low air quality caused by the local rubber factory and abattoir. I am concerned this rail link (along with the increasing amount of commuter traffic in the junction area) is indicative of the city leaders' prioritizing the quality of living for city residents as secondary to the needs of commuters living outside the city.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that you are concerned with potential negative impacts associated with potential improvements in the rail corridor, such as air quality degradation with the removal of green space. These nuisance effects will be examined as part of the EA Study. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	N
<p>Toronto needs homeowners! Will our community concerns be considered?</p>	<p>Comments and concerns expressed by the local community are encouraged and accepted throughout the process, and will be reviewed and responded to, as appropriate. Where ever it is warranted, input will be integrated into the Terms of Reference, and the evaluation of alternatives.</p>	N
<p>When was info of the June 19<sup>th</sup> meeting posted on-line? I have been on the web site for the past week, almost daily, but didn't notice the time &amp; location details. I popped on this evening (when the meeting was taking place) and noticed the time and location were finally posted. I would have liked to have gone. I sort of feel that this should have been posted at least 3 or 4 weeks out. If it was, please forgive me, as I did try to find it. This is going to really affect me. I also posted 2 questions on-line, but have not yet received any responses.</p>	<p>We apologize for the delay of the response to your questions. All meeting summaries will be posted the project website when available.</p>	N
<p>I would like more information please, as there is a lot I don't know and understand. I live on the Milton line, right near Strachan. Will trains be going by frequently?</p>	<p>A preferred alternative has not been identified yet. As such, we are not able to answer you questions regarding the frequency of trains at this time. We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	<p>As the study processes and a preferred alternative has been selected we will be able to provide you additional details. We will add you to our mailing list to ensure you are kept informed of the study's progress.</p>	
<p>I am worried this will affect my property values (I saved for years and just bought my first place).</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern regarding potential impacts to property values as a result of potential improvements in the rail corridor. The research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	N
<p>I am feeling that our voices are not being heard. Can someone please help me out? If you are not the individual to speak with, could I trouble you to point me in the right direction?</p>	<p>You can provide input at any point during this study. Stay tuned to the project website for upcoming public meetings, and updated project information at: <a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca">http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca</a></p> <p>You can also provide input to the study through our website. We will respond to your questions as soon as possible.</p>	N
<p>As a resident of King West, I wanted to express my concern regarding the detrimental effect that the proposed Air Rail Link will have on my neighbourhood.</p> <p>I now face the GO train tracks, and I have of view from my window of the GO train going by in the morning and afternoon, but infrequently, and only</p>	<p>We are currently in the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. One of the options is a "do nothing" option which appears to be the one you prefer. The Terms of Reference phase will</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>at select periods, which does not bother us at all. However, having a frequent train running directly behind my house, in full view of my window, is really very upsetting. Can you imagine trying to talk with a friend, BBQ, read, or enjoy a calm moment as a train goes by every 10 minutes, or every 30 minutes, all day? I implore you to empathize with our situation and imagine how it would feel to be in our shoes. Not only will it decrease my quality of life, but it will also serve to decrease property value.</p> <p>Without any promise of accommodations that will be made to residents in our situation, in the way of hiding the unsightly view and sounds (i.e. trees and a sound barrier), I'm sure you can see how this would be very upsetting.</p> <p>Is there anything I can do to help stop the plan or make my voice heard more so that I know that the city and developers will help out residents when the development occurs?</p>	<p>identify the variety of options we would be studying for each of these projects.</p> <p>You can participate in this study by attending one of three forthcoming Public Information Centres (PIC), see attached notification, and making your voice heard. You can also provide input to the study through our website at: <a href="http://www.georgetowndpearsonstudy.ca">http://www.georgetowndpearsonstudy.ca</a></p> <p>The website also contains summaries of our Public Liaison Committee meetings where you can view some of the alternatives being proposed.</p> <p>The first PIC meeting is tonight at Metro Hall 3<sup>rd</sup> floor rooms 308-309.</p>	
<p>I was in the public section of the meeting on June 18<sup>th</sup> 2006.</p> <p>I asked one of the questions on page 18 of the June 8, 2006 PLC.</p> <p>It was the follow up question: "if only one project is possible between the ARL and GO, which would go forward?". The response that night was that GO would go forward.</p> <p>Why has the response been changed to "I don't think it will come out like that. There would not be one factor that rules something out."</p> <p>Who changed the answer? Was it GO or the person recording that night?</p> <p>My question was if the EA only allowed so much vibration or pollution for only project which would be chosen?</p>	<p>MRC has provided some clarity to me in terms of your questions and the responses at the June 8<sup>th</sup> PLC meeting. I will make the adjustments to the draft summary as Dennis has suggested and listed below (if you do not object). If you still think the answers are incorrect, please let know and we will find a solution.</p> <p>Question: if the EA only allowed so much vibration ro pollution for only one project which would be chosen? Response: I don't think it will come out like that. There would not be one factor that rules something out.</p> <p>Follow-up Question: if only one project is possible between the ARL and GO, which would go forward? Response: Assuming that there was EA approval, GO expansion would proceed no matter what other decisions are made.</p>	N
<p>Please respond before the meeting at the Prayer Palace on the 21<sup>st</sup>.</p> <p>IBI Group represents the owner of approximately 45 acres of land known as the King Liberty Village, a former brownfield site that is being transformed into vibrant/new mixed use community, generally located on the north west quadrant of Strachan Avenue and King Street West.</p> <p>As part of the on-going GO Georgetown/Weston public consultation process (consisting of PLC meetings and PICs) the owner was wondering if it would be possible to incorporate a discussion/ presentation of locating a</p>	<p>We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>future GO station adjacent to their lands at an upcoming PLC or PIC meeting.</p>	<p>alternatives. As we have not begun the process of generating and evaluating alternatives it is too early in the process to discuss potential station locations. We will take your offer of a joint presentation into consideration, and notify you of future consultation events.</p>	
<p>Thanks for having the meeting at the Faith Sanctuary regarding the Georgetown Pearson Study, and listening to our suggestions and concerns. I was wondering if you could post the new Draft of the ToR on your website. I would think it would be up by now since according to the 4 page flyer that was distributed at the meeting it mentioned "Copies of the draft ToR available and on the project website at..." (page 4 under Section 6). I was there again today and I could even find the old draft of the ToR.</p>	<p>The draft Terms of Reference is available on the project website under "Reports and Publications". We regret that you weren't able to access the file in June, however, we are still accepting comments and input on this document.</p>	N
<p>Also, even though we didn't get a chance to hear the entire presentation, could you post the entire presentation that you would have given that day so that we can be better prepared for the next meeting in September? Power point format would be good, pdf format would be better.</p>	<p>The entire presentation from the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting is posted on the project website under "Reports and Publications",</p>	N
<p>Do you have the contact for the facilitator, Robb Ogilvie? I wanted to rate the meeting, but I didn't get a chance to submit the form at the end of the meeting.</p>	<p>You can reach our facilitator, Robb Ogilvie to rate the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, at <a href="mailto:mobal@ils.net">mobal@ils.net</a> or through mail at: Ogilvie, Ogilvie &amp; Company 508 Pefferlaw Road Pefferlaw, Ontario L0E 1N0 Tel: (705) 437-4271 Fax: (705) 437-2546 Toll Free: 1(866) 386-6225 <a href="http://www.mobilizers.com">www.mobilizers.com</a></p>	N
<p>We have been following this project closely and would appreciate if you could email the preliminary route... the preliminary study map on your website is not very clear.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in our project.  Please note that we are only in the Terms of Reference stage of this project and are identifying possible route alternatives to study in the forthcoming Environmental Assessment. We do NOT have any preliminary routes at this time.  If you visit our website and click on the link below, you will be directed to a Powerpoint Presentation and on slide 26 you will see a map of the potential route alternatives we will be examining. Other slides describe in more detail the route alternatives: <a href="http://www.georgetowntpearsonstudy.ca/rptPub.asp">http://www.georgetowntpearsonstudy.ca/rptPub.asp</a></p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>As for our disagreement with whether GO can add more trains or not, it my/our understanding that GO was given approval for expansion a number of years ago but it was not done. Now, the GO expansion is so tightly tied to the ARL that the lines are blurred. Here is a quote from a letter that was written:</p> <p>“Second, the proposed funding arrangements for the Air-Rail Link will see GO Transit paying for the installation of much of the infrastructure needed for the link, far more infrastructure than is necessary for the GO Transit Georgetown corridor.” To many of us, this is interpreted to mean that GO is being forced to act as the proponent for the ARL project as a trade-off to getting their expansion. Are we wrong to interpret it this way because that is what we have been told?</p> <p>I have another meeting tonight and will not be able to attend. Could you please ensure that I get a copy of the consultation minutes for tonight's meeting?</p> <p>I know you will eventually get tired of me but I still think that the lakeshore line hooked up to a rail line up the 427 to the airport is the way to go.</p> <p>I feel a strong opposition to this proposed Air-Rail link, since I am the Principal of the elementary school whose property is adjacent to the current railroad tracks. We have to deal with many trains on a daily basis. There are many reasons, too numerous to mention here, why additional trains would not be advantageous to my school community.</p>	<p>There is only a single track in the Georgetown South corridor today and this will not accommodate the future requirements for GO as well as CN and VIA. GO had completed an earlier study in 1994 but it was never submitted for approval due to lack of available funding. This study is only in the Terms of Reference stage now. When the technical study gets underway the long term infrastructure required to serve GO Transit will be considered. This includes the requirements to share track with CN freight and VIA.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I have another meeting tonight and will not be able to attend. Could you please ensure that I get a copy of the consultation minutes for tonight's meeting?</p> <p>I know you will eventually get tired of me but I still think that the lakeshore line hooked up to a rail line up the 427 to the airport is the way to go.</p>	<p>The facilitators summary of the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting is now available on the project website at: <a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca/rptPub.asp">http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca/rptPub.asp</a></p> <p>We note your preference for the Lakeshore line hooked up to a rail line up the 427 to the airport. This alternative is included in the Terms of Reference as one of the “Planning Alternatives” considered for the Airport Transportation Link.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I feel a strong opposition to this proposed Air-Rail link, since I am the Principal of the elementary school whose property is adjacent to the current railroad tracks. We have to deal with many trains on a daily basis. There are many reasons, too numerous to mention here, why additional trains would not be advantageous to my school community.</p>	<p>We note your concern with respect to trains near your elementary school. Please be aware that we are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives</p> <p>One of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others. Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>I would like to be kept informed of any further meetings or information sessions. Please add my name and e-mail address to your distribution list.</p>	<p>will be examined during the study.</p>	
<p>This letter is to formally advise that the members of the Weston Community Coalition, along with other representatives, will not agree that there has been proper public consultation in the development of the Terms of Reference for the combination Air-Rail Link/Georgetown GO expansion project. As a result, we are asking the ministry to appoint a mediator pursuant to article 6(5) of the act, to attempt to resolve issues between the parties.</p>	<p>We have added your name to our project mailing list, and will forward you information on upcoming consultation events as the Environmental Assessment moves forward.</p>	N
<p>As you know, this a large and complex Environmental Assessment. GO Transit will be studying all possible alternatives for a transit link between Pearson Airport and Union Station. At the same time, and as a part of the same EA, GO will be studying the expansion of GO service along the Georgetown Corridor. Some of the infrastructure requirements along that corridor are only necessary if the transit link is built along that corridor.</p> <p>GO Transit has therefore expanded the scope of the public consultation to include a geographic area from Eastern Mississauga, north into Brampton, east to approximately Yonge St, and south to Lake Ontario.</p> <p>At issue between the Weston Community Coalition and GO Transit are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who is being consulted with</li> <li>• Poor communications with participants (whether through incompetence or deliberate actions, I do not know)</li> <li>• Failure to respond to questions and concerns in the course of consultation</li> <li>• Confusing and misleading statements both verbal and written</li> <li>• Deliberately short timeframes for discussion and dialogue</li> </ul> <p>Herewith is a fuller description of the events which have led us to make this request.</p>		N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Structural Issues</p> <p>GO Transit was asked by representatives of the community to form a Public Liaison Committee approximately 14 months ago. That request was initially rebuffed, but once the public notice of the study was published we were advised that GO would be forming such a committee. However, the composition of this committee was a serious issue between the parties. GO Transit advised that they would be inviting public representatives from a wide geographic area, and specifically inviting representatives of the Toronto Board of Trade, the Toronto Tourism Commission, and the Toronto Hoteliers Association to be part of the Public Liaison Committee. Their representatives expressed a wish to limit the number of public representatives at the table to 20 or less. Most of their invitees have never shown up. However, when other community representatives asked to be part of this committee, including councilors, school board trustees, and Historical Society representatives, they were refused. One of the reasons given was that Weston had too many participants already. However, the Expansion itself is only along the Weston subdivision, and it therefore makes sense that participation from Weston be heavier for that part of the study. In any event, the other invitees are not attending. The last meeting had 6 or 7 representatives of the public. The public gallery outnumbered the committee by a wide margin.</p>	<p>The Public Liaison Committee (PLC) has been formed to provide an additional forum for the Project Team to obtain input from residents, businesses and other stakeholders and to ensure public views are given serious and respectful consideration. The Project Team feels that it is important to have representation from the broader study area as alternatives outside the Georgetown Corridor are being considered.</p> <p>The Project Team has made efforts to get full representation out to each meeting and has been accommodating to the Weston Community in terms of membership. Two Historical Societies representing Weston issues requested to be added to the PLC. The Project Team suggested that it would be appropriate for the groups to select one member to sit on the committee. With regards to the participation for City Councilors and School Trustees, it has been noted that the PLC is not a political committee and that it is not appropriate for elected officials to be members. Elected officials have never been excluded from attending as observers, and like all observers they have been given the opportunities to share their views at the end of the meetings.</p> <p>As you have pointed out, the attendance at each of the PLC meetings has not included representatives from <i>all</i> of the community/neighbourhood groups. We have attempted to have full attendance at these meetings, however, we do recognize the challenges that individual members have given their personal time commitments.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Communication Issues</p> <p>A number of participants have complained on several occasions that they were not getting any notice of these meetings. One participant on the Committee was never invited to the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, found out about the third by accident and attended, re-advised them of her contact information at that meeting, and yet was again not contacted about the fourth meeting. The councillor for the York-South Weston Ward has had serious difficulty getting notices. Contact to several other members has been sporadic. As we are not in contact with the bulk of the public representatives who were originally invited, we have no way of knowing if their lack of attendance is a result of poor communications, but given the problems we are aware of it is likely that these problems continued.</p>	<p>There were some early communication issues as the Public Liaison Committee was being formed.</p> <p>All PLC members are now notified of the meetings via e-mail and through the website. A date is normally agreed upon for the next meeting at the prior meeting.</p> <p>The Project Team can look to have a draft agenda circulated to the committee members and posted on the website prior to each PLC meeting.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Another problem is GO's insistence that members of the public get their information from a website. Weston and Mount Dennis are poor communities, generally, and a majority of the residents do not have ready access to the internet, nor can they download huge files and print them. When GO conducted the Public Information Centre at the end of June, we specifically asked in advance of those centres that copies of the draft Terms of Reference be given to the public at the meeting. We understood GO to be agreeing with that request. GO now denies they did. In any event, there were not enough copies to go around at the PIC. GO advised at the PIC that people could get copies from their website. When some members of the public complained that they did not have access, GO finally agreed to send copies to any member of the public who registered with them at the meeting. However, it was impossible for many at the meeting to comment on the Terms of Reference at the meeting, without the opportunity to see it. Not all registered, so not all will get to see the document.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your point that all residents of Weston may not have access to the internet. The intention of the Project website is to make information available to the general public. Internet access, while not universal, is available in most public libraries, and covers a much broader area than local newspaper notifications. All newspaper notifications made reference to the study website address.</p> <p>Regarding your concern that members of the public were not able to review the Terms of Reference, please note that this document was made available through a number of methods and in hard copy and electronic format.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft Terms of Reference was available for anyone who requested it at the June meetings.</li> <li>• Copies of the draft Terms of Reference were available at the following libraries as of July 7<sup>th</sup>: Weston, Mount Dennis, Rexdale, Blackcreek and the Central Toronto Reference library.</li> <li>• The draft Terms of Reference was mailed to all persons on the project mailing list prior to the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> <li>• The draft Terms of Reference was available for anyone who requested it at the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> </ul> <p>With respect to the comment that the Project Team agreed to provide copies to all attending the June Public Meetings it should be noted that this issues came up at PLC Meeting #3 (See Page 17 of the minutes of that meeting). The Project Team's response was that a summary of the Terms of Reference would be provided and we were</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	<p>under the impression that the PLC felt this was an appropriate approach. The presentation slides were intended to be this summary.</p>	
<p>GO also has not made it easy to find the website. It was not published as part of the newspaper ad advising of the meetings, and the documents are not obvious on the site itself. It is not on the GO Transit website, and there is not link from that website to the project website, which has a long and difficult name (<a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca">www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca</a>). Google searches using air-rail link, Union Pearson, or Blue 22 do not find this site. Finally, many of the documents on the website are enormous pdf files, of 6 MB for only 21 pages. Individuals with slow connections will have difficulty downloading these files, and those with slow computers will have difficulty seeing these files.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the website was inadvertently left out of the notices for the June public meeting and we apologize for that error. However the website was noted on the initial newspaper advertisements, the newsletter and the material handed out at the June Public Meetings. In addition, the website was identified on the advertisements for the September follow-up meeting. GO Transit has also provided a link to the project website from the main GO Transit website.</p> <p>With regards to file sizes on the website, the largest files that we could find were the "Halcrow Group's Final Report to Transport Canada, "Air Rail Link from Lester B. Pearson International Airport to Union Station, Revenue and Ridership Study," May 2002" (approximately 5 MB) and "IBJ Group's Final Report to Transport Canada, "Rapid Transit Access to Lester B. Pearson International Airport," February 1999" (approximately 2.2 MB). These reports were added at the request of the PLC. File sizes are larger because these are not GO Transit documents and we had to scan them to place them on the website.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Process Issues</p> <p>For the first meeting of the PLC, the suspicion of members of this committee was that it was pro forma, and that the plan was to avoid real consultation in this forum. At the very first meeting, I expressed serious concern that the process (which had scheduled only 4 hours for meetings of this Committee) would never actually permit any such consultation. The agendas have been very heavy on process issues and very light on any actual consultation on the content of the terms of reference. The only issues discussed in any detail were the description of the project and the array of potential alternatives to be studied and those were really only discussed at the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> meetings. We were only given copies of a draft terms of reference 48 hours in advance of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, but managed to read it and prepare my comments and questions. When I asked to discuss the terms of reference in more detail at the third meeting (which was the last scheduled meeting), I was advised to put my issues in writing for discussion at the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. I did that. At the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, their agenda was process issues only, and had no time for discussion by the group on the terms of reference. The agenda had also been shortened by ½ hour from what had been advertised. When I attempted to discuss the Terms of Reference and my written comments and questions, I was asked to limit it to my single most important issue. I was also advised that none of the project team could properly respond as they had never read my questions or comments, despite the fact that I had sent it a full three weeks in advance of the meeting. When I asked for an additional meeting of the PLC to discuss these questions and concerns, I was very clearly told no. I left the meeting being uncertain as to how or when or even if a discussion on these important matters will take place. We were only advised that there would be responses to the comments.</p>	<p>We do agree that the first PLC meeting was 'heavy on process issues'. However, the Independent Facilitator felt it was important to spend time discussing the format, mandate and structure of the PLC. Having said that, the primarily focus of consultation during the ToR Stage are process issues (i.e. purpose of the study, the range and types of alternatives to be considered, the process to generate and evaluate alternatives and the way to consult stakeholders during the process).</p> <p>We had an extensive discussion of the study purpose at PLC #1 that has resulted in modifications to the ToR. The focus of PLC #2 was range and types of alternatives. Once again this resulted in significant discussions and modifications to the ToR. PLC #3 focused on the evaluation process and a preliminary outline of the ToRs. Once again changes were made to the Draft ToR that was released to the broader public in advance of the June Public Meetings. We acknowledge that the members of the PLC were not given longer than 48 hours prior to the PLC #3 to review the evaluation discussion paper and preliminary outline of the ToR, however we felt that the presentation and subsequent discussion was valuable and noted that comments and questions on the document are welcome at any point.</p> <p>We agree that PLC #4 did not function efficiently. To address this, we met with you to discuss your comments in detail on July 17 and arranged an additional PLC meeting for July 31. At both of those meetings we provided responses to your questions and comments and discussed ways to incorporate some of your suggestions into the version of the ToR that will be submitted to MOE.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>The Weston Public Information Centre was to solicit comments from the general public on the Terms of Reference. As I mentioned before, GO failed to provide copies to all who attended. When this oversight was pointed out, they advised that it was available on the website, and after some prodding, that they would mail it to persons who had registered, who would then be able to comment after the fact, but would certainly not be able to ask any questions of the proponent in a public meeting. By fortune, and not design, the meetings ran long, and GO agreed to hold another PIC in Weston in September. The notice for that meeting on their website lists it as Thursday, September 13, 2006. September 13 is a Wednesday. In addition, they have advised us that the public only has until August 11 to comment on the Terms of Reference. The mailing of the Terms of Reference document will apparently contain instructions to that effect. This effectively nullifies the September PIC, as members of the public will not come to comment if they have been told the comment period is over.</p>	<p>See previous response regarding distribution of the draft ToR at the June Meeting.</p> <p>With regards to your comment regarding when comments on the draft ToR will be considered our letter stated:</p> <p><i>"We would appreciate your comments on the draft Terms of Reference by August 11, 2006. This will allow the Project Team to address most of the substantial comments from the public and agencies in a timely fashion. Any additional comments arising from the September public meeting will also be considered before we complete our final Terms of Reference document."</i></p> <p><i>The continuation of the June 21st, 2006 meeting will be held on September 13, 2006 at the Faith Sanctuary (1901 Jane Street) starting at 6:30 pm. Following this session, we will review and consider any additional comments received, complete the Terms of Reference and then submit it to the Ontario Minister of the Environment for a decision on approval. As part of the approval process the Minister will initiate an additional (30 calendar day) public and agency review of the document prior to making a decision. This will provide another opportunity for public input."</i></p> <p>Although comments regarding the draft Terms of Reference were encouraged by August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006, any comments/input at the September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting and a week following the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting will also be considered and addressed (to ensure those attending the meeting have time to comment).</p> <p>We apologize that the website advertised the public meeting as Thursday September 13<sup>th</sup> instead of Wednesday September 13<sup>th</sup>. The newspaper notice advertised the correct date as well as the letters that were sent.</p> <p>At PLC # 3 we distributed a Preliminary Outline of the Terms of Reference. This document was revised based on the comments that were received at the meeting and reissued to the broader public as the draft Terms of Reference. Our intent to do this is clearly noted on Page 16 of the minutes of PLC #3.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The draft Terms of Reference document which was distributed at the meeting was changed from the preliminary draft which was discussed by those of us on the PLC. We were scrambling at the PIC to try and figure out what had changed. We have asked on several occasions that the changes be identified in a document, but to date we have not had such a 'redlined' document for our perusal.</p>	<p>At PLC # 3 we distributed a Preliminary Outline of the Terms of Reference. This document was revised based on the comments that were received at the meeting and reissued to the broader public as the draft Terms of Reference. Our intent to do this is clearly noted on Page 16 of the minutes of PLC #3.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Quoting from the GeorgetownPearsonStudy website on the topic of public consultation –</p> <p>Public input is vital to the success of this study. The sharing of community perspectives strengthens the Individual Environmental Assessment process by helping the project team make the best recommendations.</p> <p>The team understands that people want real opportunities to be heard and to influence the study and its outcome.</p> <p>To help maximize public input, the project team commits to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Getting the word out — providing information to help foster discussion and promote meaningful participation;</li> <li>- Creating reasonable access — providing structured (e.g., public meetings, workshops) and less formal opportunities (e.g., input by e-mail) that allow for widespread public involvement;</li> <li>- Considering all input — assessing ideas on their merits, and respecting the diversity of views;</li> <li>- Being accountable — sharing consultation summaries and project reports, and acknowledging receipt of all correspondence and written submissions;</li> <li>- Acting with purpose — being clear about the intended outcome of a consultation opportunity and its role in the overall project and decision-making process;</li> <li>- Promoting a cooperative consultation environment — demonstrating respect for open dialogue and due process;</li> <li>- Maintaining project integrity — adhering to the requirements of the IEA process and ensuring an efficient approach that considers scheduling and financial realities.</li> </ul> <p>It would appear that these words are not necessarily to be adhered to, particularly ‘discussion’, participation, and ‘consultation’. We will not be having any discussion on our concerns about most of the Terms of</p>	<p>We acknowledge your frustration with the time allotted for public consultation events. However, at the PLC and public meetings there is always an opportunity after the meeting is adjourned to discuss specific issues with members of the Project Team. In addition, while public consultation is focused at these meetings, comments and discussions regarding the draft Terms of Reference are encouraged at any point during the process.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Reference document itself, participation has been deliberately limited, and consultation seems to mean that we can make comments but not enter into any meaningful dialogue on those comments.</p> <p>We understand and accept that the process of 'consultation' with the public does not imply that the decisions about the Terms of Reference are made jointly. However, when one engages in consultation, one expects a verbal dialogue, answers to questions, and acknowledgement that the comments are heard and understood. We have had precious little of that so far.</p>		
<p>The track record so far does not bode well for the consultation process if and when the Terms of Reference are approved by your ministry and the actual study begins. GO has indicated that it intends to continue with a Public Liaison committee in that stage. I do not want to continue to participate in a sham. We therefore need your help to right this matter, and for that I believe we will need the services of a third party.</p> <p>We therefore urge you to appoint a mediator now, before the Terms of Reference is finally submitted to the minister for her approval, in order to ensure that consultation as required by the act takes place on the Terms of Reference itself.</p>	<p>We welcome your input into how the Proponent can improve consultation with the Public Liaison Committee, and how the role and purpose of the PLC can be developed as the EA progresses.</p>	N
<p>I was of the understanding that this meeting may have been postponed due to the results of the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting and was waiting to hear back from your organization.</p> <p>I am still awaiting the protocol for such notifications. If sent out by e-mail is there any confirmation that people have received such messages, and what is the level of advance notice and reminders. As stated in a previous e-mail, most such committees are sent a notice and a reminder via e-mail.</p> <p>Considering that some of the e-mails intended for myself were sent to an incorrect e-mail address, would it not be prudent protocol to request an RSVP (i.e. reply) in e-mail notifications and then to telephone those that</p>	<p>All PLC members are notified of the meetings via e-mail and through the website. When e-mail notification is sent a reply is usually requested. We are now following up on e-mails by telephone as a reminder of the meetings.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>have failed to RSVP or regret for such meeting.</p> <p>I am also awaiting the minutes and other notes of meeting #4.</p> <p>Most committees that I serve on provide an e-mail notification within 7 days that includes a proposed agenda and a reminder within 2 business days that includes a (close to final) agenda.</p> <p>What is the protocol for notification of these meetings? And when and where will meeting #5 be held as such information is NOT available at <a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca/PubConsult.asp#cfocus">http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca/PubConsult.asp#cfocus</a></p>	<p>All PLC members are notified of the meetings via e-mail and through the website. A date is normally agreed upon for the next meeting at the prior meeting.</p> <p>The next meeting for the PLC meeting is still to be determined. A specific date was not agreed upon at the meeting due to the fact that the Public Information Centre meeting on June 21<sup>st</sup> will be continued on September 13<sup>th</sup>, pushing back the schedule for the draft Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The Project Team can look to have a draft agenda circulated to the committee members and posted on the website prior to each PLC meeting.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>At the July 5<sup>th</sup> PLC meeting it was mentioned that the ToR was being mailed out to the public for everyone on the two lists. Are you able to give the PLC the specific date, numbers, etc. I believe ToRs were also to be left at the Weston &amp;/or other libraries, is there an update on that. Also have the ads been revised to include the website &amp; if so when will the ads be in the papers advising the general public of the August 11<sup>th</sup> comment deadline.</p>	<p>The Terms of Reference, along with the summaries of the 3 public meetings, were mailed (and in some cases, e-mailed) to those that attended one of the three meetings. The mail-out to those that attended the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting in Weston occurred on July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2006. The project team had a total of 282 attendees that signed it to the public meeting. Attendees at the June 19<sup>th</sup> and June 22<sup>nd</sup> meetings totaled 30 people.</p> <p>Copies of the draft Terms of Reference were also available at the following libraries as of July 7<sup>th</sup>: Weston, Mount Dennis, Rexdale, Blackcreek and the Central Toronto Reference library.</p> <p>Ads explaining that the public review period for the draft Terms of Reference has been extended to August 11<sup>th</sup> 2006, and the announcement of the extension of the June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting for September 13<sup>th</sup>, were published in the Toronto Star on July 20<sup>th</sup> 2006, the Metro on July 21<sup>st</sup>, and will appear in various local newspapers in the study area over the next two days. All ads make reference to the study website.</p> <p>Although the project team would appreciate any comments regarding the draft Terms of Reference by August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006, any comments/input at the September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting and a week following the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting will be considered and addressed as well (to ensure those attending the meeting have time</p>	<p>N</p>

Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

Responses to Comments - General Public

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>I have submitted some comments for the TOR.</p> <p>Will I get confirmation of my comments? Will my comments be attached to the TOR as is? Will my questions and comments be compiled with all the other comments? Hoping to see the study being approved and eventually a link being built to the airport similar to those which exist in almost all major cities.</p>	<p>to comment).</p> <p>As always, all information relating to the study can be accessed on the website at: <a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca">www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca</a></p> <p>All comments submitted will be included in the summary of comments without attribution. Your comments will be considered and included with all other comments</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I would appreciate if you could provide the status of Bloor-Dundas station in the proposed current plans, i.e. is the existing GO station proposed to be upgraded connecting it to the subway station or is it proposed to be relocated.</p>	<p>We note your support for a link to the airport.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Basically, we're interested in the connections between the fort and the areas to the north that at one time were part of the Garrison Common. By connections we mean streets for motor vehicles and paths for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as visual links. The mid-19th century history of the Garrison Common is full of documented encroachments by the railways, which the Board of Ordnance was powerless to stop. Earlier suggestions to bring all the railways from the west into the city along a common corridor were forgotten in a land rush as each company saw to its own interests. As a result, the area was cut up into many railway-bounded parcels, although it was not obvious how badly so long as the lands were given over to a few large industrial and institutional uses. Now, 150 years later, as these lands are redeveloped for higher-density residential and commercial uses, FoFY thinks a better balance must be struck between the technical requirements of the railways to deliver public services and the amenity and convenience of the adjacent neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Please be aware that we are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives</p> <p>As we have not begun the process of generating and evaluating alternatives it is too early in the process to discuss potential station locations.</p> <p>We acknowledge your comment regarding maintaining connections in the study area. After reviewing your input, we will include the following additions to the Terms of Reference:</p> <p>Under Section 5.2.1 ("GO Transit Improvements") we will modify the third bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The degree to which the alternative impacts other road, <b><i>cyclist</i></b> and pedestrian facilities <b><i>and connections</i></b>.</li> </ul> <p>Under Section 5.2.2 ("Air Transportation Link") we will add the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>Potential impact to existing cyclist, or pedestrian trails</i></b> – to the measures under "Potential Impacts to Recreational Facilities including schools"</li> <li><b><i>Potential impact to local visual connections (views and vistas)</i></b> – to the measure under "Displacement of Built</li> </ul>	<p>N</p>
		<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 24 Section 5.2.1 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet and Page: 26 Section 5.2.2 Table 5-1</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Strachan Avenue is a case in point. There is no doubt it will be a challenge to find how it can serve as the only north-south street linking the lakeshore to King between Bathurst and Dufferin, while providing in conjunction with Wellington badly needed access to the Liberty lands on the east. The solution put forward in the earlier Class EA to put a jog in Strachan south of King flew in the face of Toronto's experience with the jog in Dufferin at Queen, which it has been trying to eliminate at considerable cost. It may be a better course would be a road tunnel, but if that were to pass also under the Toronto-Hamilton rail corridor, it would have to start dropping within the Fort York National Historic site which includes the road and areas east and west of Strachan south of that corridor. We would have a substantial interest in any such proposal.</p>	<p>Heritage Features and Cultural Landscapes"</p> <p>Please note that we are only in the Terms of Reference stage and are identifying possible alternatives to be examined as part of the study. These issues will be examined as the study progresses.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>As for the pedestrian and cycling paths that will be increasingly vital for local off-road movements within the west downtown, it has been a long-accepted tenet of land planning for Fort York that there would be a 'landbridge' connecting the open area west of the fort with the parks north of Wellington. This structure is envisioned as being more substantial than the usual rail overpass, with approaches and grades that make it handicapped-accessible. It would function as a hub for the projected Railpath along the Georgetown corridor, the Martin Goodman Trail on the Lakeshore, and the northern linear park along the rail corridor between Bathurst and York Street.</p>		<p>N</p>
<p>Please accept this as my formal submission on the Terms of Reference for the Georgetown Pearson link. I sent a comment last week, please disregard that submission and replace with this one.</p> <p>I would also appreciate you confirming receipt as I had trouble sending the original.</p>	<p>We note your preference for the Lakeshore line hooked up to a rail line up the 427 to the airport. This alternative is included in the Terms of Reference as one of the "Planning Alternatives" (Planning Alternative "vii") considered for the Airport Transportation Link.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I believe the best alternative for all concerned is the Lakeshore Line Alternative – as a full rail alternative, not just a bus alternative.</p> <p>If the link was to run on the existing Lakeshore line, a rail extension could be added up Highway 427, (in the middle of the existing Highway). The Highway is wide enough to accommodate the two tracks that would be needed for a North South run and it could be easily built with little or no disruption to the flow of traffic.</p>		<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>This alternative would accomplish the goals of the study. There would be little disruption to commuters, residents, and the public at large. There would be no requirement to create bus lanes; passengers could board at both locations without the need to transfer to another vehicle. The trains would not disrupt residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>I believe that this alternative would satisfy all stakeholders without damaging neighbourhoods that are in need of revitalization. It would begin the process of improving transit in the West-end of Toronto – and if properly planned, could be linked to a Rapid Transit line or Subway line in the future.</p>		N
<p>I am however concerned that once again the FACILITATOR'S SUMMARY has misrepresented, omitted, or possibly even censored some of what was said at the meeting. The most notable instance of this sort of thing took place in the 2005 meeting at the FAITH SANCTUARY when more than twenty minutes of discussion was not transcribed (from about the moment Stephan Mehr brought up the topic of a trench, to the time in which the next point of the presentation was addressed).</p>	<p>These changes have been incorporated into the comment/response table prepared from the facilitator's summary.</p>	N
<p>I do want to try to set the record straight on my own comments; the first of which can be found near the bottom of page 12 of the June 21st 2006 SUMMARY.</p> <p>The wording should read as follows:  GO Transit is a commuter rail service authority for the Province of Ontario (Government of Ontario Transit). They are a publicly funded entity and yet they seem to be acting as an agent for SNC Lavalin (a private enterprise). Whose needs are being served? It does not seem to be the public. This is not a just a Weston issue, as the proponents would like the public at large to think it is. Weston is a part of Toronto, and this is an issue that effects Toronto as a whole (and the province and country for that matter since it involves public funding). In light of this, on whose behalf is the study being conducted? In other words which arm of which government has ordered that the study be undertaken, or is it the private operator, SNC Lavalin, quietly driving the study from the background?</p>	<p>These changes have been incorporated into the facilitator's summary.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p><i>My follow-up comment on page 12 should read as follows:</i></p> <p>If you are undertaking both studies then you are acting as an agent for SNC. That is the same thing – it is a matter of semantics.</p>	<p>These changes have been incorporated into the facilitator’s summary.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>My follow-up comment to Dennis’ response near the top of page 13 should read as follows:</p> <p><i>I think they can be separated. I just don’t think GO wants to separate them.</i></p>	<p>These changes have been incorporated into the facilitator’s summary.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>My question/comment near the bottom of page 27 should read as follows:</p> <p>I feel it is important to mention to the audience that the tourism official at the last PLC meeting seemed to regard the speed of service from downtown to the airport as the most important thing to the public. –that and getting more tourists downtown were the only issues he felt that mattered. This is serving one small market, and not the city as a whole. Are we going to become like some popular resort destinations with luxury service within the resort area, and an impoverished neglected populous kept out of site beyond that resort’s perimeter. Why isn’t the Mayor at these meetings? Where is the transparency? At least twice he has stated on TV that this is a done deal and we should get used to it. Mayor Miller seems to forget that he is Mayor of all of Toronto and not just the downtown core.</p> <p>We were promised transparency and a full and proper environment assessment, but where is the cost to the environment and peoples’ lives included in this process. There is the Humber River that is recognized as a national Heritage River that is not mentioned in costs. We have what is likely the oldest surviving railway bridge in this province under threat – a historic structure that saw its first use in 1856. Where in your assessment do you recognize the threats to people’s homes and health from the fumes, noise and vibrations?</p> <p>‘Cost’ appears several times in the Terms of Reference as an overarching factor in this study. Public dollars are referred to several times. There will also be environmental costs, both to the natural environment, but also to the economic environment of Weston, should it be chosen. How will GO Transit assess those costs –the loss of property values, the loss of business values, the loss of neighbourhoods cultural and historic identity as</p>	<p>These changes have been incorporated into the facilitator’s summary.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>part of this study. We are one of the least supported areas of the city of Toronto in the form of available social and transit services –a fact documented by city hall, and yet not acted upon. This is also recognized as having become one of the highest crime areas in the city. You keep telling us about the benefits that this ARL can bring, but you won't tell us how it will be of benefit, or who it will benefit. As far as the people that live and work in this area are concerned, what benefit can it bring? A community needs hope in the future or it dies, and you have yet to show us any reason for hope. You seem to have forgotten that you and the government work for us. Our taxes pay for your livelihood.</p>		
<p><i>Beyond the corrections listed above, I should also include a few other points for inclusion. I'm probably wasting my time since this EA and PLC seems to be nothing more than a public relations smokescreen, but for the record my additional comments/questions are as follows:</i></p> <p>Considering the fact that members of the public are being asked to sign in, and they are asked to state their name when they get up to address the panel, why are those names not included in the published summaries? Is the purpose of not including names in the published summaries done for the purpose of obscuring matters, or so as to remove any concrete means of holding individuals to account for statements they have made?</p>	<p>The names of those who attended the public meetings are not included in the public documentation, in accordance with the <i>Freedom of Information and Privacy Act</i>.</p>	N
<p>There appears to be some censorship taking place in the production of these summaries. For example at the first PLC I attended I made the observation that the Public Liaison Committee didn't appear to have power to do anything more than make comments, ask questions and offer advise. To clarify my point I drew an analogy to Premier Harris' decision to amalgamate Toronto, despite a public vote not to amalgamate. In other words you can have your vote, but you are going to amalgamate. While my point was documented correctly in a broad sense, and the response, affirming my concerns, the analogy was completely absent. This has not been the only occasion where something like this has happened, and as some of us noted at the previous PIC in 2005, at least 20 continuous minutes of discussion went completely undocumented at the event (not after the fact, in that instance).</p>	<p>We apologize that we didn't capture all of your comments during the PLC meeting. The records are intended to capture the proceedings without censorship or edits.</p> <p>Feel free at any point to contact the facilitator regarding the recorded summary of proceedings, to include missed comments for inclusion.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Why was OGILVIE, OGILVIE &amp; COMPANY granted permission to photograph (and possibly document members of the public through other means) and yet members of the public were told they could not audio-record the meetings to check on the accuracy of the published summaries? This is a double standard on the part of GO Transit, or its consultant, and does not change matters retroactively because the Facilitator agreed to refrain from the use of the photos used during the meeting on the 21st June 2006 after this point was raised by a member of the audience.</p>	<p>Permission was not requested or granted for the facilitator to take pictures for his own record of the meeting. When the presence of the photographer was questioned, as noted the photography ceased. As you know, this was a public meeting and anyone, including the press, could have taken pictures.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p>Is Blue 22 really Green 22, as GO Transit are trying to assert that the public money committed to the ARL is going towards GO Transit projects? When was GO Transit given the mandate to build rail lines (the tracks for the separate purpose ARL is not an upgrade to the CN rail line), and how can they, a provincial tenant on CN's tracks, build a railway line, since they are a commuter service (albeit by name they are a Transit service)? Is not the building of railways a federal matter?</p>	<p>Building infrastructure (i.e. railroad tracks), for a regional commuter rail service falls under GO Transit's mandate. CN Railway owns the corridor but GO Transit must provide any additional tracks required for GO Transit service.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p>Why is SNC not at any of these PLC meetings. Likewise, why is the Mayor not present, nor CN, nor CPR, nor the T.T.C. at any of these meetings? Is this simply more evidence that, as David Miller has said, more than once on TV(alone) that this is "a done deal"? The corporate stakeholders would appear to think so by their noticeable absence.</p>	<p>SNC Lavalin attended a number of PLC and Public meetings as an observer. The TTC and the City of Toronto have been invited to all these meetings and have attended numerous meetings as observers. The TTC, City of Toronto, CPR, and CN participate in this study as members of the Technical Advisory Group.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p>Considering the disturbing increase in the number of derailments in Canada in recent years, it seems ill advised to run a high speed train through heavily populated areas (such as along the Georgetown corridor). The risk already exists with the trains we have at present, without the addition of an ARL. Even if the proponents aren't interested in the welfare of the residents who live along the corridor (or other corridors), how do they expect the ARL to travel if a derailment occurs (on the existing rail lines, let alone their own proposed line, sandwiched between the two others)? An accident on any of the tracks along such a narrow corridor, must affect the other lines and the trains that travel on them.</p>	<p>With respect to your concerns regarding public safety, there are inherent dangers in all forms of transportation. All efforts will be made to design the safest possible alternative for the preferred alternative when selected.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>When David Miller was elected as the Mayor of Toronto (all of Toronto, not just the Toronto Islands, or the downtown core), he stressed the importance of neighbourhoods. He seems to have conveniently forgotten this statement, or perhaps he only meant his pet neighbourhoods. When the island residents complained about the noise coming across from The Docks nightclub he immediately sided with them, however when noise concerns were raised about the ARL he said that we were over-reacting and that noise wouldn't be an issue, without bothering to check his facts. His infamous broom seems to be used more for sweeping things under the rug, or for giving the public the brush off, rather than for cleaning house.</p>	<p>With respect to your concerns regarding noise impacts, please be assured that nuisance effects, particularly noise, will be an important measure in the comparative evaluation of Planning Alternatives (section 5.2.2). Additional noise modeling work will be undertaken to assist in evaluation of Design Alternatives and even more detailed modeling the the investigation of specific mitigation measures once a preferred Design Alternative is selected.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p>In light of the federal governments desire to increase immigration, with Toronto being viewed as the prime destination, how does the federal, provincial, or municipal government think the transit infrastructure can handle the extra populous (especially considering how badly they are managing matters as they stand). The ARL is not a transit solution. It is a bullet train into the heart of this city's hope for growth. If the city is like a body, its neighbourhoods are its limbs and its transit lines are its arteries. The neglecting of either will result in the decay of the body as a whole, and no amount of injecting of resources into the heart of the city will save it from ultimately dying.</p>	<p>The link between Lester B. Pearson airport and Union Station will not necessarily be a "bullet" between the two transportation hubs. In the evaluation of "Planning Alternatives" we will examine the possibility of providing stops along the route. Ultimately, we hope to provide such a link to satisfy existing and projected demands at these hubs to compliment existing public transit services, including establishing connections among the various transportation systems.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p><i>I apologize if I seem to be coming down hard on the transcriptions of the meetings, but it is frustrating to be regularly misquoted (or as some people have had happen both last year and this year, have their comments omitted entirely). That is why I think the meetings should be recorded, and by more than one source, so as to be able to double check for accuracy - either that or make the recording available for comparison). The problem is not with the person, but with the manner in which this process is being conducted. Just as it is ridiculous to expect people to be able to read a 40 page document in ten minutes and then engage in a meaningful conversation about its contents. And that is not taking into account those who didn't even receive the material. For example, was the Weston Library the only Library to receive the ToR, or Facilitator's Summary? If it was, it rather underscores that the proponents have made up their mind that this is the only potential route that is going to be seriously considered. Otherwise how do you expect the public in other areas of the city to enter into the discussion (or is that the point)? Public claims to the contrary, it really looks like this PLC is just going through the motions and as Mike Sullivan has already suggested, we should bring in a mediator.</i></p>	<p>We note your frustrations with respect to the process; however, we feel that transcription is the best approach in this case. The public meetings are intended as a forum for debate and open discussion. If the public is dissatisfied with the record of the proceedings they are more than welcome to request additions/changes to the summary.</p> <p>With respect to the distribution of the Terms of Reference, it was in fact distributed to the Weston, Mount Dennis, Rexdale, Blackcreek and the Central Toronto Reference Library. In addition, it was mailed to all those on the mailing list prior to the September 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p>When the Danforth Ave Bridge was built over the Don River in Toronto decades before a subway system was envisaged for Toronto, the designers of the bridge included a platform for a future subway line. When the Bloor-Danforth subway was constructed, all that had to be done was lay the rails. This foresightful provision for a future subway line has saved millions of dollars and the bridge stands for thoughtful planning in all of Canada, if not beyond. A similar situation exists in the GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor. Provision should be made for people coming from the west of Pearson Airport to access the airport by rail possibly to start with a transfer to the Union Station-Pearson, Blue 22, service at the point the trains leave the main rail corridor.</p> <p>There are very good reasons for including service from the west to the airport without having to go to Union Station to get on the Blue 22 service.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional time it takes to go into Union and back out again from places like the Region of Waterloo, Guelph, Stratford, London makes the train unappealing. We do not expect highway traffic to go downtown to the centre of Toronto before it goes to</li> </ol>	<p>We acknowledge and note your reasoning behind an extension of rail service west from the airport. Please be aware that the "Planning Alternatives" examined will not preclude expansion to the west. Also, a criterion for comparative evaluation will be how the various alternatives provide ancillary benefits of enhancing the local transit network.</p> <p>Also, please be aware that a separate GO Transit EA is considering the expansion requirements for the Georgetown North Corridor, north of this EA study area.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>the airport. We should not design a system so short sighted that it ignores the millions living west of the airport.</p> <p>2. The people from the west of Toronto are dedicated users of Toronto facilities. Ten percent of the fans at a Blue Jay game come from the Region of Waterloo and Guelph. And why shouldn't they. They consist of a population that is 10% of the population of Toronto.</p> <p>3. Highway 401 west of Toronto to the Churchill Parkway is the scene of daily extended traffic delays and getting travelers off 401 is so essential that the North Mainline Municipal Alliance which includes Halton Hills, Waterloo Region, Guelph, Stratford, St. Mary's, and London have hired Dillon Consulting who report that modest improvement in rail service along the rail line London, Waterloo, Toronto, would be used by 500,000 to one million passengers annually.</p> <p>Unfortunatly, the possible one million passengers cannot be augmented by another 20% to 30% of passengers going to the airport and taxpayers will have to make up the difference between a well used service that includes the airport and a less used service that ignores the Pearson Airport.</p> <p>4. Global warming, air pollution, weather disasters, economics of peak oil, and an aging population insist we change our attitude toward how we plan transportation. We need better alternatives to the automobile.</p> <p>What a waste? What an unfortunate example of a lack of Danforth Avenue Bridge planning to not provide for the people from west of Toronto.</p>		
<p>I appreciated the printed information as I was away during the time of the meeting in June, as a resident of Weston am most concerned regarding the expansion of the rail link.</p> <p>As you know, Weston is an old well-established community, where residents appreciate our small town feel while living in close proximity to the downtown.</p> <p>Both myself and my husband grew up in this area, and raised our family here.</p> <p>We are fortunate to have our own means of transportation, but on trips downtown we rely either on the TTC, or the GO train. For the airport we use local taxi service or the airport limo. We are not alone in these choices.</p>	<p>Regarding your concern with health issues, specifically air quality impacts associated with diesel trains, please be aware that air quality will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>Air pollution and noise will both be used as measures to compare the "nuisance effects" of alternatives. Once these potential effects are identified, the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping, etc) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technically and economically feasible. This approach is consistent with virtually all EAs completed for transportation infrastructure in Ontario.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Regarding the expansion of the GO train service, having it available throughout the day on a limited schedule would be helpful, though not necessary – a luxury.</p> <p>We are happy to see express removed from the description, so our community can use the service. Page 30 notes, the natural, social, and economic issues. <b>Our biggest concern, which doesn't appear to be addressed, is the health issues.</b> Lung disease appears to be on the rise, not only amongst the adult population, but also in our children. The increased air pollution with diesel engines in our backyards will surely have a negative effect on our resident's physical health. Not to mention the emotional impact of the noisy diesel engines.</p> <p>The "Do Nothing" approach is not viable. The dollars are available, a forward-looking plan to the future is important as Toronto continues on a world-class city path, which will benefit us all in the future.</p> <p>We await further info at the September meeting. As residents and stakeholders we have many concerns.</p>		
<p>The Georgetown Pearson Study website includes several studies undertaken for Transport Canada. However, several are missing, which will be necessary for the environmental impact assessment portion of the overall study.</p> <p>In addition, there are many pages missing from the Halcrow Study.</p> <p>By way of example, Transport Canada conducted a more refined study of infrastructure requirements, and a study of the environmental impact assessment requirements, as well as studies of safety, and of the compliance of the Budd Railcars with railway standards and specifications.</p> <p>Could you please endeavor to repair the Halcrow Study, and to acquire these other studies for review by the public and the PLC? If Transport Canada has lost or mislaid their copies, I'm sure the co-proponent will have them.</p> <p>It has been over a month since I sent the following corrections and comments to Debbie Clayton, as requested. I have not yet received any confirmation that this information was received. Please acknowledge in writing that you have received this information and that the corrections and comments will be considered and posted on your website as you promised.</p>	<p>Any studies that are available and are pertinent to the conduct of the study will be considered</p> <p>The Halcrow report has been released by Transport Canada under a Freedom of Information request. As such some of the material has been omitted. If during the course of the study it is felt that the missing information is important to the results the information will be requested from Transport Canada</p>	N
		N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p><b>Section One: Summary Corrections</b></p> <p>The first section deals with comments and clarifications as to what I said, what I believed I said or what I intended to say on the final Question, Response and Follow-Up Comment on pages 15 and 16 of your June 21st report.</p> <p>GO ToR PIC#2 – June 21, 2006: Clarifications</p> <p>QUESTION: I would like to point out that there is a lot of misinformation floating about. There are no real numbers for transit trips in and out of the airport. What has been recorded above (on page 9 of the facilitator's notes –“that almost 30% of the trips to the airport use public transit”) has never been published in reports. We now have a 3% number – the 30% number that we keep seeing has no real basis – it is not a real number. It is foolish (and misleading for the proponent) to keep relying on projections rather than facts. If nobody knows how many trips (from the airport to Union Station) are actually taking place. I think the public has a lot of suspended disbelief about this project. I would like the GO project to be severed entirely from the airport link. I think there is a lot of very real fear from all parties in this room that this entire process will be bogged down by the air rail link. I think there is a lot of resentment regarding spending taxpayers' money on air rail link infrastructure that is not required for GO service expansion. A “quick and dirty” train from downtown to the airport has nothing to do with public transit needs. Any responsible proposal for significant public investment in transportation infrastructure to the airport must be done in a Regional context as part of an overall long term plan – and where is that planning? Where are all of the regional studies? To be efficient, it must be integrated with existing and planned regional and</p>	<p>These comments are reflected in the updated facilitator's summary.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>municipal public transportation networks throughout the entire GTA and southern Ontario – you can't do this. I am really embarrassed that this is taking place – shocked and embarrassed. Light Rail Transit (LRT) can work. We are talking about a billion dollars of public money – adding more diesel trains is crazy – sever the EA right now.</p> <p>FOLLOW-UP COMMENT: I have read the reports – you have not answered my question. Piggybacking the additional infrastructure costs of the proposed air rail link on the expanded heavy rail diesel service of GO is a project that cannot be justified to the public. Indiscriminate use of public money for a private project is not acceptable. All trains, subways, LRT, streetcars, and buses must be coordinated with Regional transit planning including this project. You cannot expect the public to invest in and suffer from a P3 project that gives back nothing in return.</p> <p>Debbie, I'm not sure how you want to use these corrections. I realize that you do your best to summarize what was said.</p>		
<p><b>Section Two: Additions - I didn't get a chance to say...</b></p> <p>The following letter is an attempt to explain some of the thoughts and observations I have with regards to the current draft ToR, its purpose, problem statement, process to date and the proposals contained therein. I request that it be added to: "I didn't get a chance to say..."</p> <p>GO ToR PIC#2 – June 21, 2006: Purpose, Problem, Process &amp; Proposal Observations</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concerns regarding affordability of GO Transit service,</p> <p>With respect to your comments regarding the creation of a transportation network or "web", please be aware that the two components to this study will not be stand-alone projects assessed separately from the transportation network. The Terms of Reference emphasizes the importance of connections among local transportation systems. For example, part of the purpose of the Airport Transportation Link is to satisfy existing and projected</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 13 Section 2.1</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>While we respect the services that GO trains provide to outlying commuters who have regular jobs and predictable schedules, please be reminded that in the increasingly freelance or contract based economy, an increasing number of people are working at unpredictable times and locations. Even though we are near a GO station, in the 13 years we have lived in Weston, it has not been convenient or affordable for us to pay \$6.00 each way for GO, \$2.50 each way for TTC and spend 1.5 to 2 hours each way to travel downtown and back.</p> <p>If public transit is to be somewhat successful in alleviating reliance on car travel and its associated infrastructure investments, gridlock productivity losses and greenhouse gas issues, public transit networks must be accessible, affordable and efficient. This implies that any and all public transportation systems throughout the Golden Horseshoe and especially in the more densely populated Greater Toronto Transit Authority (GTTA) area be fully route integrated and fare co-coordinated. Driven by rider numbers and return on investment (ROI) economic development studies, transportation infrastructure investment requires a well planned long term overview of creating a regional public transportation network or “web”.</p> <p>As a responsible contribution to an environmentally sustainable future, where practical, this “web” should utilize proven, clean technology of appropriate scale including Light Rail Transit (LRT) where subways are overkill. For longer distances and higher speeds, exclusive right of ways (ROW) for tracks at grade in existing road, highway, hydro or rail corridors may provide cost-efficient and safe routes. In more densely developed areas, lower speed LRT may be viable on signal co-coordinated surface route (ROW) or need to go underground.</p> <p>This all may sound like a pipe dream to some, but without a vision we will never get anywhere. Without proper long term planning, myopic short term piecemeal investments will always come at a hefty price - inefficiency, short lifecycle, poor return on investment, reduced productivity and a collective waste of everyone’s time and money.</p>	<p>demands at these hubs to compliment existing public transit services, including establishing connections among the various transportation systems.</p> <p>In the final ToR, in addition to “the purpose of GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south corridor is to determine the planned infrastructure improvements required to accommodate forecast GO ridership growth over the next 20-30 years.” We have added “These infrastructure improvements will seek to not only provide additional service within the Georgetown South Corridor, but to re-enforce the overall GO transit network.”</p>	

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>For significant public transportation infrastructure investments that project well into our children's lifetimes, it is difficult to see the merits in a proposed conventional rail high frequency service from Union Station to the airport: that uses second hand diesel multiple unit (DMU) trains, that provides a projected service to an unknown % of airport users, possibly 40 or 50 passengers per train at over \$20.00 one way, that purports to travel from point 'a' to point 'b' but still requires a transfer station to get into the airport, that must schedule its "high speed" service on tracks shared with publicly operated GO trains, CN freight trains and VIA passenger trains, that may or may not stop elsewhere, according to the dictates of a private consortium who maintain an exclusive right to operate it for decades if they can make a profit.</p> <p>How efficient is that use of public funds? How safe is that? Who can afford that? Who will use that? Who will benefit? Who will suffer? How much pollution does that add to the environment? How destructive and disruptive to residential communities is that? Isn't a DMU primitive technology overkill – just to move a handful of elite passengers around?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Many of these questions will be considered as we determine the costs, impacts and benefits of the various alternatives during the Environmental Assessment.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Somewhat contrary to its own claims ('Identification of the Proponents' on page 8 of the June 21, 2006 Public ToR presentation), we need to be clear about circulating misinformation regarding no public money being spent for the UPAG air rail link. We were informed at previous GO/EA public forums that many of the most costly and destructive road closings and grade separations being proposed were not required for GO service expansion. These publicly funded infrastructure investments were (hidden) costs required by federal regulations governing only the proposed UPAG high speed air rail link component of the EA.</p>	<p>During the Environmental Assessment study capital and operating cost estimates will be made of the various alternatives and this information will be available to the public</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Part of the difficulty with the ToR itself appears to stem from a deficient problem statement that fails to consider the significant infrastructure investment funds required for any rapid airport transportation link, within the greater and wholly relevant context of current and future public transportation needs. In other words, the need for long term affordable, efficient, regionally and municipally coordinated public transportation networks throughout the GTA.</p>	<p>With respect to your comments regarding the problem statement, please refer to Section 2.2 where meeting long-term transportation needs is presented as a priority:</p> <p>"There appear to be opportunities to provide such a link to satisfy existing and projected demands at these hubs to compliment existing public transit services, including establishing connections among various transportation systems."</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Section Three: Suggestions – Other Planning Alternatives</p> <p>The following planning alternative may be seen as a combination or variation on several existing planning alternatives, but differs significantly in its cost implementation and local/intra-city ridership accommodation.</p> <p>GO ToR PIC#2 – June 21, 2006 - Other Planning Alternatives</p> <p>Given the capacity numbers for the Union Pearson rapid transit proposed service to the airport, conventional rail operations are total resource overkill and have very limited ability to be part of local transportation networks.</p> <p>One of the planning alternatives that has been suggested outside of this study but not currently listed on the draft ToR is an LRT line on the CN Weston corridor from Union Station which swings west on Eglinton Avenue and enters Pearson Airport from the south. Other than a comparatively small LRT tunnel under the CP corridor at West Toronto the LRT line for the most part would be built at grade.</p> <p>The same line can continue west of the airport at grade along the Eglinton Avenue / Highway 403 / 407 corridor providing transit services through Mississauga to Oakville and Burlington connecting these municipalities to each other, to the airport and to Toronto.</p> <p>(The Eglinton West LRT line could eventually continue east from the CN Weston corridor although the central Toronto part of the line would likely have to be built underground to somewhere east of Laird Avenue.)</p> <p>Easily amenable to providing additional stops, this tradeoff for a longer trip time creates a broader catchment area for many potential passengers who work at or around the airport, are not airline passengers and are not coming from or going directly to downtown Toronto.</p> <p>It would require a great deal of fortitude, vision, cooperation and openness across various existing agencies for this LRT line to be realized but it would lay a foundation for connectivity to local transportation networks and eventual expansion throughout the GTA.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. You are correct in that your suggestion encompasses elements of a number of options already in the ToR. Transit service through to Mississauga, Oakville and Burlington is, as you know outside of the scope of this study. However, as alternative corridors are investigated and developed during the study, their impact on the overall transportation network will be considered.</p> <p>Elements of your suggestion will be considered when developing the various corridor alternatives. A subway has also been suggested for the Georgetown rail corridor.</p> <p>Additional stops will be considered in the study.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Thanks for the abbreviated comments. We at the Turnberry Residents Association are in agreement with the concerns outlined by Mike Sullivan. Particularly distressing is the objective stated in paragraph 5 on page 7 of the Preliminary EA ToR(June 2006):</p> <p>"... the objective of providing a cost-effective express transportation service from Toronto's downtown core to LBPIA with a minimum cost to the public."</p> <p>Nowhere under 2.2 Purpose of the EXPRESS [my caps] Transportation Link is there the objective to provide benefits for or to prevent adverse effects to the local community in the vicinity of the proposed rail link.</p> <p>Included in the objective must be a clear statement and a will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- to create a PUBLIC transportation link and</li> <li>-- to protect the local community from adverse effects of any rapid (not express) transit link.</li> </ul> <p>Suggested revised objective:</p> <p>... the objective of providing a cost-effective and rapid PUBLIC transportation service from Toronto's downtown core(s) to LBPIA with a minimum cost (including but not limited to natural, social, economic, and cultural costs) to the public.</p>	<p>Please be assured that it is the objective of the Environmental Assessment process to avoid, minimize or prevent adverse environmental effects, including natural, social, economic and cultural features to the extent possible. By subjecting the study to an Individual Environmental Assessment, the proponent is committing to examining a full range of alternatives. These alternatives are list in the draft Terms of Reference Document.</p> <p>The Purpose Statement has been redrafted and the words express, direct and seamless have been removed.</p>	<p>Y Page: 14 Section 2.2</p>
<p>Another concern from paragraph 2, page 2 with a statement that may be misleading, if not totally untrue:</p> <p>1.1 Background Area Context</p> <p>"... In the City of Toronto, land use is predominantly light to medium industrial and some residential. ..."</p> <p>My question: Is that still true today with all the residential development that has taken place recently, especially with in-fill housing replacing industrial in the past five years? Can you provide support documents for this blanket statement?</p>	<p>Comment noted. This section has been revised to read.</p> <p>"In the City of Toronto, land use is residential, as well as a number of light to medium industrial areas. In the City of Mississauga the Rail Corridor goes through mainly an industrial area."</p>	<p>Y Page: 2 Section 1.1.1</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Many of the recently built homes (low rise and condos) have warning clauses attached to the sales agreements:</p> <p>"WARNING: Canadian National Railway Company or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a right-of-way within 300 metres from the land subject hereof. There may be alterations, ..."</p> <p>E.g. The 180 new homes in the Turnberry development north of St Clair Avenue between the rail tracks and Old Weston Rd have been burdened with this warning clause. It's likely that all residential developments within 300 metres of the rail tracks have this clause attached to their sales agreements.</p> <p>Do you have current and accurate figures for the number of residential homes within 300 metres of the proposed rail link? Can these figures be identified and included in the ToR document?</p>	<p>As part of the assessment process, potential nuisance effects will be examined to assist in the selection of a preferred planning alternative. This is outlined in Section 5.2.2 of the Terms of References. As we have not commenced the evaluation process, we have not assessed the number of residential homes within 300 m of any of the potential corridors. We will be developing measures such as this.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Given that the Air-Rail link proposal is targeted primarily to the high end business traveler, the only relevant target market alternative, beside the do nothing option is option #2, "Express bus service between Union Station and the airport using exclusive bus lanes on the Gardner Expressway and Highway 427" and option # 8, "Widen roads/freeways, build new roads/freeways".</p>	<p>All the alternatives listed in 5.1.2 will be considered as part of this study. The evaluation process identified in Section 5.2.2 will be used to identify a preferred Planning Alternative.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The EA process demands real alternatives (relative to the high end market being sought), which in this case means non rapid transit options, given that the public/private sector proposal is defined by a predominantly high-end market target hence alternatives 3-7 as provided to the public at the June 19th meeting should be removed from further consideration in the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>A possible relevant "alternative to" the proposed undertaking would be the inclusion of the island airport in the context of the express bus service proposal.</p>	<p>All the alternatives listed in 5.1.2 will be considered as part of this study. The evaluation process identified in Section 5.2.2 will be used to identify a preferred Planning Alternative. In addition to the primarily purpose (a link from Pearson Airport to Union Station), the study will explore if the alternatives can derive local transportation benefits from both of the proposed services, where feasible, including enhanced local transit connections.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Another longer term possibility could be all air distribution system, involving the island airport, Downsview and Buttonville under the future control of the GTAA for specific domestic and cross-border O-D pairs.</p> <p>The Georgetown rail corridor for the purposes of this EA study (the study area) should include the following railway subdivisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CN's Weston Subdivision (s/d) in it's entirety</li> </ol>	<p>The purpose of this study is not to explore air transportation in the GTA, but to examine alternative transportation links between Pearson Airport and Union Station.</p> <p>All pertinent infrastructure that could be used as a solution in the study area will be considered.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>2. Go Transit's ownership of CP Rail's former Galt s/d between the Union Terminal limit and the junction with the still owned CP Galt s/d, and</p> <p>3. CP Rail's Mactier s/d (roughly between MP 0.0 and MP 4.0 (King street in Weston))</p>		
<p><b>COMBINED EA PROCESS</b></p> <p>It is still not clear how the public interest in inter-regional urban transport is being protected within this EA process given the strong and continued opposition by the Weston community which will gain no direct benefit but will bear all the socio-economic costs of the project and on-going operation from the Air-Rail link service but would benefit directly from the Go Transit expansion.</p> <p>What must be protected at all costs is the proposed Go Transit expansion. If the Province wishes to override the EA process because the AIR-RAIL link is deemed in the public interest then this would raise a number of going forward public policy issues such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If reduction of road congestion is the issue then why are the provincial/federal governments not addressing the wider issue of increasing the public transportation share to/from the airport within the overall catchment area with a commitment of significant funding for both roads and transit?</li> <li>2. Prove how the Air-Rail link proposal significantly reduces peak period highway congestion (i.e. how much of the forecasted anticipated annual rail traffic trips are anticipated to be in the peak AM and PM highway congestion periods)?</li> <li>3. How much of the domestic and transborder O-D traffic that potentially might use the Air-Rail service during the highway peak period times could potentially fly in/out of Toronto Island Airport (assuming volumes would be sufficient to expand current and proposed schedules)?</li> <li>4. Why is it that the Weston community is expected to bear the full brunt of the operation while receiving no direct benefit from the service, whereas, the Island Airport is not being considered given</li> </ol>	<p>The two components of this project are being planned together in recognition that the preferred alternatives could result in infrastructure improvements and service operations within the same corridor. The evaluation methodology outlined in the Terms of Reference is intended to predict impacts, and lead to the selection of a preferred alternative that will avoid, minimize or prevent adverse environmental effects, including natural, social, economic and cultural features to the extent possible.</p> <p>The long term requirements for GO Transit expansion will be paramount when considering the various components of the EA study.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>that the waterfront communities will at least get some direct benefits as well as the same/similar disbenefits as Weston?</p> <p>All these questions are basically political questions that an inappropriate EA design could precipitate.</p>		
<p>ALTERNATIVES TO: AIR-RAIL LINK</p> <p>(a) TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The current proposal is a long way from the initial premise of the February, 1999 Report prepared by IBI for Transport Canada.</p> <p>Consider the following statement on page i of the Executive Summary of that Report in which the following was written. "Given the uncertainties with respect to the construction of the Eglinton West Rapid Transit Line and the desire to provide a high speed connection to the central area, the most feasible way route to the airport is via the existing CN Weston Subdivision railway line. This line passes within two kilometers of the passenger terminals at Pearson Airport."</p> <p>While a subway may be high speed from a transit perspective, it is not of the same quality (both in overall O-D time and quality of amenities) as the proposed Air-Link service. In short it is not high quality in the context of the market niche target inherent in the public/private Air-Link proposal.</p> <p>The May 2002 Halcrow Group Ltd report to Transport Canada defined the target market on page I of the Executive Summary this way. "These forecasts assume that the rail link will be operated and perceived as a high quality, reliable premium service, offering guaranteed travel times comparable or less than those by highway modes to downtown Toronto. To achieve this perception, the rail service (plus its associated facilities) must be of sufficient quality, frequency, and reliability that is able to command premium fares compared with other transit systems in Toronto. In other words, rolling stock, stations, ticketing systems, advertising, operations, access arrangements and feeder services (where provided) each need to reflect <i>up-market and top quality attributes.</i>" (My italics)</p> <p>Further on page xix it is stated, "In these and other attributes, the rail link at LBPIA will need to resemble the characteristics of a Heathrow Express</p>	<p>Various alternatives outside of the Georgetown corridor are being evaluated at the request of the public and as part of a prudent look for alternatives. Some alternatives will be better than others but all have been reviewed by the public for inclusion in this ToR.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>rather than those of existing rail links at most USA airports which are typically part of the city's transit system and where only a minority of rail passengers are air passengers"</p> <p>Clearly then many of the "Alternatives to" outlined in the public meeting handout (marked as Session 3b) are not really potential "Alternatives to" alternatives.</p> <p>These inappropriate "Alternatives to" are outlined specifically below.</p> <p>"3. Rail/bus transit service within the CN Weston corridor with a connection into the airport (several options)"</p> <p>"4. Rapid transit service within the Eglinton corridor"</p> <p>"5 Rapid transit service utilizing the north-south hydro corridor or the Highway 427 corridor between the Kipling Subway Station and the airport"</p> <p>"6" A Georgetown South corridor subway; and"</p> <p>"7 A single technology rapid transit service (i.e. monorail) utilizing the GO Lakeshore and Highway 427 to the Airport"</p> <p>These five "Alternatives to" are possible good transit initiatives that should be part of a suite of connectivity options and improvements for the major employment and settlement areas around the airport. If the Rail-Air project, as well as improved road capacity, was part an omnibus EA, in which these projects, were intended to address congestion then their inclusion would be appropriate but they are not.</p> <p>In many ways this area is the real downtown for the 21st century whereas Union Station and environs was the 19th century hub.</p>		
<p>(b) ROAD EXPANSION ALTERNATIVES</p> <p>The final "Alternative to" – item 8 – states as follows. "Widen roads/freeways and build new roads/freeways"</p> <p>While this "Alternative to" is reasonable there should be further scoping on this in order to determine the study boundaries within which the road congestion from the airport add on to that congestion will be studied.</p> <p>A joint Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) study and Transport Canada study, dated January, 1994 "---examined the need for future</p>	<p>Any proposed transit connection between LBPIA and Union Station will only be one part of the solution to the larger traffic problem both in the vicinity of the airport and in the GTA. No one solution solves all of the problems.</p> <p>During the course of the study we will be able to convert expected transit riders on any alternative one alternative into an estimate of the number of riders who would otherwise have used the road system.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>transportation facilities in the airport area including both the terminals and the surrounding employment areas” (1)</p> <p>“The study concluded that, with existing and foreseen levels of public transit use, there would be a significant shortfall in roadway capacity in the area by the year 2021. To handle the additional persons on transit would require a transit modal split of 35% compared to to-day’s 7%. It went on to assume, therefore, that there would have to be rapid transit facilities (technology not specified, possibly rail or busways) provided in the following corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an east-west link in the Highway 407 corridor;</li> <li>• a second east-west link in the Highway 403/Eglinton Avenue corridor (the Mississauga and the Eglinton West Rapid Transit as planned by Metropolitan Toronto);</li> <li>• a north-south line linking Mississauga and Brampton in either the Hurontario Street or Highway 419 corridors;</li> <li>• a second north-south route in the Airport Road, in the Highway 427 or Highway 27 corridors”</li> </ul> <p>In order to properly assess the effect on road capacity/congestion that will be alleviated by the proposed Rail-Air link, it will be necessary to assume that these new transit improvements are in place. Why? Well the reason is to provide a realistic assessment of the true beneficial impact of the Rail-Air link. Equally this base line can be used to assess the impact of any dedicated busway on the 427/Gardner or 401 routings in the context of reduced road capacity for general traffic. This is a little different than what was developed in the 1994 study and mentioned on page 14 of the IBI study.</p> <p>Because capacity crunches are directly correlated with degraded average trip times, it would not be appropriate to claim that all the forecasted annual Rail-Air traffic will contribute to less peak period road congestion – only that traffic that is forecasted to move in the comparable peak period time periods.</p>		
<p>This Environmental Assessment (EA) process for the Air-Rail Link (ARL) only has a committed operator if it is selected to run along the Georgetown-Weston Corridor. Who will operate the ARL if another corridor is recommended at the end of the EA? And who will fund the other corridor since the funding is only provided in conjunction with the GO Expansion?</p>	<p>In the case of the Airport Transportation Link, if one of the options other than the Airport rail link is chosen, the preferred option will be recommended to the appropriate authority. The appropriate authority would also have to fund that project</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Since the Terms of Reference (ToR) will be used to guide the EA why will property values not be a mitigating factor in deciding a corridor? If SNC-Lavalin does operate along the Georgetown-Weston Corridor it will be doing so for a profit. Why should I as a private land owner lose property value while they make a profit? I believe that property value mitigation must be a component of the ToR.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern regarding potential impacts to property values as a result of potential improvements in the rail corridor. The research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>St. John the Evangelist and H.J. Alexander are two elementary schools which instruct about 1,000 children. They are located along the Georgetown-Weston Corridor. In the ToR I think there should be special reference made as to what will be studied in the EA for both the ARL and the GO Expansion. I would like to suggest that <b>vibration, noise, pollution, and the disruption that will be caused during the possible construction</b> be studied as to the effect it will have on the overall health and learning abilities of young children. I insist that these measures are implemented during the ToR and not be left to be added at a later stage during the EA, because the orchestrators of the EA may not feel that these children deserve any special study requirements.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern regarding potential impacts to schools. Please note that in the Terms of Reference document, under Section 5.2.2 for the Airport Transportation Link, in the comparative evaluation of alternatives, impacts to schools are included under “socio-economic” factor (potential impacts to recreational facilities including schools). Given some of the comments received during our consultation we will modify that criteria so that Schools have their own criteria and measures.</p> <p>Once the completion of the evaluation of Planning Alternatives is complete we will examine design alternatives. As part of this process, we undertake more detailed modeling relating to potential noise, vibration and air quality impacts. This is already included in Section 6.2.1 of the draft EA ToR.</p> <p>Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	<p>N</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expropriation of Private Property (along west side of Weston/Georgetown Rail Corridor from Lawrence Avenue West to Parke Street/Holley Avenue)</li> <li>▪ Design issues/space allotment Expropriation of Public Lands (e.g. Catholic School Board, church property)</li> </ul>	<p>Please be aware that we are currently in the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment. As we have not begun the process of generating and evaluating alternatives, it is too early in the process to address design-related issues, and property requirements. Please continue to be involved as the Environmental Assessment moves forward.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This must not happen in our community (bad development for mass transit, bad for property values).</li> <li>▪ The year is 2006 – wake up and do the right thing for our city and our kids. This benefits very few. "Follow the money" – Deep Throat. How does this help our community???</li> </ul>	<p>We acknowledge your concern regarding potential impacts to property values as a result of potential improvements in the rail corridor.</p> <p>The research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p> <p>Please be assured that it is the objective of the EA process to avoid, minimize or prevent adverse environmental effects, including social, economic and cultural features to the extent possible. By subjecting the study to an Individual Environmental Assessment, the proponent is committing to examining a full range of alternatives. These alternatives are listed in the Terms of Reference Document.</p>	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The 427 route and Eglinton are a better alternative especially using a rapid transit and/or subway which will enable workers at the airport with an inexpensive route to work and decrease the automobile traffic in that area.</li> <li>▪ A more inclusive form of transportation is needed. Blue 22 is for an elite group of people.</li> <li>▪ The Georgetown route is an environmentally sensitive area going through residential areas and the historic town of Weston. The noise, air, and water pollution as well as the vibration would have a huge impact on new and historic houses which will lead to their gradual demise.</li> </ul>	<p>We note your preference for the 427 alternative and Eglinton alternative.</p> <p>We are currently at the Draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south rail corridor, and for the Airport Transportation link from Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport. Please note that one of the purposes of this study is to examine possible infrastructure improvements to provided enhanced GO Transit service in the Georgetown south rail corridor.</p> <p>One of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor. However, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit</p>	N

Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

Responses to Comments - General Public

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	<p>service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others. Potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures will be examined during the study.</p> <p>With respect to your concerns regarding noise, air, and water pollution, as well as vibration, please be assured that as part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I propose that the Georgetown corridor is the shortest line but that the line must be put underground from Eglinton to the 401!</li> <li>▪ Can Go Transit work with a subway to service their riders?</li> </ul>	<p>A subway alternative in the Georgetown Corridor is one of the alternatives being considered.</p> <p>With regard to your question on who will operate a subway service, if the Eglinton or subway option is chosen, it will not be carried forward by GO Transit (it is not their jurisdiction). We will make the recommendation to the appropriate authority.</p>	N
<p>My family doctor is on the other side of the tracks. If I have to take one of my two children I would cross that rail way?</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern regarding impacts to access across the Georgetown South Rail corridor.</p> <p>Under Section 5.2.1 ("GO Transit Improvements") we will modify the third bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The degree to which the alternative impacts other road, and pedestrian facilities <b><u>and connections</u></b>.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that under Section 5.2.2 ("Air Transportation Link") of the Terms of Reference the "Potential Impact to Access" is already included as a criterion to evaluate Alternatives.</p> <p>However, we will also add the following to emphasize pedestrian access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Potential impact to existing cyclist, or pedestrian trails</b> – to the measures under "Potential Impacts to Recreational Facilities including schools"</li> </ul>	<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 24 Section 5.2.1 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet</p> <p>and</p> <p>Page: 26 Section 5.2.2 Table 5-1</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Community concern over the 'Blue 22' has not been recognized. The real estate value will gradually be reduced. Many options exist. Hydro Corridor is the best one.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and we note your preference for the hydro corridor.</p> <p>With respect to your concern for your community, please be assured that comments and concerns expressed by the local community are encouraged and accepted throughout the study process, and will be reviewed and responded to, as appropriate. Where ever it is warranted, input will be integrated into the Terms of Reference, and the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding your concern for property values, the research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics). As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	<p>N</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The airport link should not go through residential community. Improve existing transit. Have a service that will be used by everyone and not just from Union Station to the Airport.</li> </ul>	<p>We are currently at the Draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south rail corridor, and for the Airport Transportation link from Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport. Please note that one of the purposes of this study is to examine possible infrastructure improvements to provided enhanced GO Transit service in the Georgetown south rail corridor.</p> <p>One of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>The scope of the EA should be limited to the expansion in the public transit component alone. From this and previous public meetings, there appears to be no objection on the part of any stakeholder to the public transit component. The question that the EA process should answer is what is the optimal means of achieving this improvement? However, the airport transportation link is of dubious benefit in the eyes of many, and should be subject to its own IEA study that addresses (holistically) the question of cost/benefit, and if there is a net benefit, the optimal means of achieving it.</p>	<p>With respect to your comment regarding the scope of this Individual EA Study, although these projects serve different and distinct purposes and objectives, they are being planned together in recognition that the preferred alternative could result in infrastructure improvements and service operations within the same corridor.</p> <p>One of the major criticisms of the previous Class EA process was that a full range of alternatives for providing service between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport was not explored. As a result of this, GO Transit agreed to initiate a Individual EA Process to ensure that a range of alternatives is explored and a clear rationale for the preferred alternative is provided. GO Transit retained McCormick Rankin Corporation to undertake this study. Please be assured that it is the objective of the Environmental Assessment to examine a full range of alternatives. These alternatives are listed in the draft Terms of Reference Document.</p> <p>Regarding your comment that the IEA study should address the issue of cost/benefit, pure cost-benefit evaluation methods are rarely (if ever) used in Environmental Assessment Planning in Ontario. The primary reason for this is it is difficult to convert all impacts to a dollar value. For this reason we have chosen to use a Reasoned Argument Approach where the evaluation of alternatives and 'trade-offs' made by the Project Team will be clearly documented and explained throughout the planning process. It should be noted that stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on this process. It should also be noted that the Ontario Minister of the Environment is the ultimate decision maker. If an individual, group or agency disagrees with the rationale behind the decision making process, they have the right to submit their comments to the Minister and explain why they feel the Project Team made the wrong 'trade-offs'. The ultimate decision rests with the Minister of the Environment.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>1. Costs tax payers too much, and governmentally not affordable</p>	<p>These corridor improvements are part of the \$385 million federal funding package for GO Transit announced in May 2004. Infrastructure upgrades will facilitate the expanded operation of GO Transit, and benefits to VIA Rail service and CN's freight service. The estimated costs of the recommended solutions will be developed during the progress of this study</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>2. Environmentally not healthy</p>	<p>Please be assured that it is the objective of the Environmental Assessment process to avoid, minimize or prevent adverse environmental effects, including natural, social, economic and cultural features to the extent possible. By subjecting the study to an Individual Environmental Assessment, the proponent is committing to examine a full range of alternatives. These alternatives are listed in the draft Terms of Reference Document.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>2. Not beneficial to the community            3. Noise pollution will be unbearable            4. You don't live in the community and don't care about the community</p>	<p>We are currently at the Draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south rail corridor, and for the Airport Transportation link from Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>Please note that under Section 5.2.1 ("GO Transit Improvements") of the Terms of Reference, the degree to which the alternative impacts communities is listed. As well, under Section 5.2.2 ("Airport Transportation Link"), socio-economic criteria are included for the comparative evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>In addition, comments and concerns expressed by the local community are encouraged and accepted throughout the process, and will be reviewed and responded to, as appropriate. Where ever it is warranted, input will be integrated into the Terms of Reference, and the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding potential noise impacts, please be assured that nuisance effects, particularly noise, will be an important measure in the comparative evaluation of Planning Alternatives (section 5.2.2). Additional noise modeling work will be undertaken to assist in the evaluation of Design Alternatives and even more detailed modeling the investigation of specific mitigation measures once a preferred Design Alternative is selected.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>5. Not enough space for so many train lines</p>	<p>At this point in the process, a preferred alternative has not been identified yet.</p> <p>One of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>By now, it would appear glaringly obvious that the original airport link proposal presents a shamefully quick, cheap, and heartless ('dirty') transportation solution that would in reality only serve a relatively small percentage of select travelers in a relatively small and restricted area. Moreover, this highly questionable service would be at the tremendous and horrible expense of historic and beautiful neighbourhoods. The senseless and heartless damage that would be done would far outweigh the questionable benefits. For the present mayor to originally suggest that this is a "done deal" shows a short-sighted, undemocratic, heartless dictatorial attitude. Fortunately, and not surprisingly, sensible, smart, and considerate alternatives exist that although more expensive and time-consuming, would in the long-term repay themselves many fold. These very viable alternatives would not only enhance a much greater range of the public and the areas but actually enhance and benefit all neighbourhoods involved. Let's stop being short-sighted and selfish and instead let's finally be sensitive and considerate of our present and future generations!</p> <p>Have you considered the impact on the wild life on Weston Golf Course?</p>	<p>examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p> <p>We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. This document also outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>As the study progresses and various alternatives are considered we will be able to provide you additional details. We will add you to our mailing list to ensure you are kept informed of the study's progress.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Thank you for your comment regarding potential impacts to wildlife on the Weston Golf course.</p> <p>Please be assured that impacts to wildlife are considered under the current evaluation criteria listed in the Terms of Reference document</p> <p>At a high strategic level, wildlife is protected under Section 5.2.1 ("GO Transit Improvements"). The fourth bullet point reads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The degree to which the alternative impacts environmental (natural, socio-economic, and cultural) features, functions, systems and communities.</li> </ul> <p>In the Table in Section 5.2.2 ("Airport Transportation Link"), "Potential Impact to Wildlife Corridors" is listed under "Natural Environment" criteria.</p> <p>Environmental factors, including impacts to wildlife, will be considered in the generation and evaluation of planning alternatives as noted in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding potential impacts to wildlife on the Weston Golf course.</p> <p>Please be assured that impacts to wildlife are considered under the current evaluation criteria listed in the Terms of Reference document</p> <p>At a high strategic level, wildlife is protected under Section 5.2.1 ("GO Transit Improvements"). The fourth bullet point reads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The degree to which the alternative impacts environmental (natural, socio-economic, and cultural) features, functions, systems and communities.</li> </ul> <p>In the Table in Section 5.2.2 ("Airport Transportation Link"), "Potential Impact to Wildlife Corridors" is listed under "Natural Environment" criteria.</p> <p>Environmental factors, including impacts to wildlife, will be considered in the generation and evaluation of planning alternatives as noted in</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	Chapter 6 of the draft EA ToR.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Why is it that the primary purpose of the rail is to provide service to the airport and the secondary purpose is to enhance local transportation network?</li> <li>▪ Why it is that public money will be used to build a third track to be used primarily/solely by a private company?</li> <li>▪ These issues NEED to be addressed in the ToR.</li> </ul>	<p>As is noted in the background in the Terms of Reference, transit access to the airport has been studied and considered for many years. There is a market for this service but it is also considered important and noted in the ToR that opportunities to provide access to the adjacent community(s) will also be considered</p> <p>Additional tracks are required in the Georgetown corridor to allow GO Transit to provide "full service" along the Georgetown corridor and to allow for the accommodation of ridership demand over the next 30 years. These tracks will also accommodate CN freight and VIA requirements.</p>	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The underlying assumption in initiating any construction along the existing rail line is that it is necessary to enhance the present facility to transport passengers to and from the airport. This assumption is <u>not</u> a given, it has to be demonstrated.</li> <li>▪ As many have already made plain, it is not that hard to travel to the airport. Does this project (ARL) have its origin in the mind of David Collette? How tenable is it now, nearly a decade later?</li> <li>▪ When the terrain and the demographics of the area are crowded with development, the need is really for intra-neighbourhood public transit, not this capitalist pipe dream.</li> </ul>	<p>We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. This document also outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>One of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p> <p>In addition, the alternatives being examined for the GO Transit Improvements include maintaining the existing level of service,</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (RE: Health Concerns and the Increase of Lung Disease in the General Public) Weston is already surrounded by adverse factors – traffic fumes from 401 and 400 – which have gravely increased. Added diesel fumes from “more than 100 trains/day” [Greg Ashbee from GO Transit regarding freight trains], would severely affect local residents health. Quality of life should be addressed as part of the assessment. Life around the rail corridor would be adversely affected.</li> </ul>	<p>expanding GO bus service, and expanding GO rail service.</p> <p>As the study processes and a preferred alternative has been selected we will be able to provide you additional details. We will add you to our mailing list to ensure you are kept informed of the study's progress.</p>	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This “team” is a throwback to the 1950s or worse – 5 men running the meeting and speaking with a qualified woman taking minutes? Next time put the woman at the main table and have Mike [Bricks] take the notes.</li> </ul>	<p>We acknowledge that you are concerned with potential negative impacts associated with potential improvements in the rail corridor, such as air quality degradation.</p> <p>Nuisance effects (such as air pollution) will be examined as part of the EA Study. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Much generalized information but sparse on specifics – a very poor presentation overall.</li> </ul>	<p>Those present and speaking at the public meeting represent the managing members of the Project Team, and are the most qualified to speak to the environmental planning and assessment process.</p> <p>We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>As the study processes and a preferred alternative has been selected we will be able to provide you additional details.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I feel it will not be safe to raise a family in Weston if your project goes through.</li> </ul>	<p>We are currently at the draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown Weston rail corridor and for the Airport Transportation Link from the Airport to Union Station. The Terms of Reference is a document that provides a framework for undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study. The Terms of Reference outlines the range and types of alternatives to be considered and the process for generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>Also, please be aware that one of the many alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p>	N
<p>Why does the European Union website already have the 'Blue 22' railway on its site for tourists coming to Toronto!??</p>	<p>We are not aware of this and find it odd that website would list a service that does not exist. We did undertake a quick web search could not find reference to this.</p>	N
<p>During the meeting it was mentioned many times that the PLC was formed to gather opinions from the public. I attended 3 of those meetings and many of the selected PLC members never showed up. Also, the meetings that were to be held with city workers were never developed in the PLC meetings. I question if that happened.</p> <p>I bring this up because I feel that the meeting on September 13, 2006 gave the impression to the public who attended that the PLC was made up of 20 members. That is false because the most that ever showed were 12 or 13 and only 6 or 7 members ever had any meaningful input.</p>	<p>The Public Liaison Committee (PLC) has been formed to provide an additional forum for the Project Team to obtain input from residents, businesses and other stakeholders is given serious and respectful consideration. The contact list for the PLC includes representatives of community/ neighbourhood groups and business/tourism interests from within the study. As you have pointed out, the attendance at each of the PLC meetings has not included representatives from all of the community/neighbourhood groups. We have attempted to have full attendance at these meetings, however, we do recognized the challenges that individual members have given their personal time commitments.</p> <p>With regards to input from City of Toronto Staff (including TTC), please note that we have had two meetings with City Staff to discuss the study and ToR. In addition we have received formal comments from City Staff on the draft ToR. These comments will be included in the Consultation Record.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>The facilitator of tonight's public meeting at the Faith Sanctuary Pentecostal Church opened his presentation with an overhead that read "Knowledge of the world is acquired in the world – <u>NOT</u> in a closet". This statement must be the basis of your mandate.</p> <p>By representing McCormick Rankin Corporation as an independent and impartial third party you are charged to conduct your observations, decisions and recommendations without prejudice or favouritism, what so ever, to the benefit of any of the parties involved in this important decision.</p> <p>There is a public perception that the new introduction of a number of alternate routes have been created as "smoke and mirrors" to appease the public's concerns and mislead the public to believe that the <i>Georgetown South Rail Corridor Service Expansion</i> is not the true focus of GO-Transit and SNC-Lavalin and that all alternatives will be given equal consideration.</p> <p>The purpose of tonight's meeting was not to hash out the disagreements that exist between the residents, business owners and supporters of Weston on one side of the line and those of GO Transit and SNC-Lavalin on the other. By now, you should already understand the fears and concerns that have been raised concerning the economic, environmental, public safety and future growth of The Town of Weston if the <i>Blue 22</i> is permitted to proceed.</p> <p>The purpose of tonight's meeting was to evaluate the Terms of Reference (ToR) to be applied to the Environmental Assessment process. I have particular concerns regarding the wording used during the presentation, both verbally and displayed by the overheads and the accompanying printed handout.</p>	<p>One of the major criticisms of the previous Class EA process was that a full range of alternatives for providing service between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport was not explored. As a result of this, GO Transit agreed to initiate a Individual EA Process to ensure that a range of alternatives is explored and a clear rationale for the preferred alternative is provided. GO Transit retained McCormick Rankin Corporation to undertake this study.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

Responses to Comments - General Public

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>1. Frame number 17 of the overhead presentation identifies that the primary <u>purpose</u> of the rail expansion is to <u>provide service to the airport</u>.</p> <p>2. Frame number 16 states <i>"if an alternative does not address the purpose to a meaningful degree at a reasonable cost it would not be considered a reasonable alternative no matter how high or low the potential effects are."</i></p> <p>Many opponents to Blue 22 have previously stated to you, and I will restate to you, that the "<b>purpose</b>" is too narrowly defined. A transit line with a single departure from Union Station and terminating at Lester B. Pearson International Airport will serve only an elite clientele in dedicated locations and will not serve the interests of the communities of the G.T.A. or add benefit to the strained transportation systems of Toronto.</p>	<p>The Purpose Statement has been redrafted and words such as express, direct and seamless have been removed</p> <p>The purpose has been redrafted to read " As such, the purpose of this component of the study is to examine alternatives, both within and outside of the Georgetown South Corridor, in order to identify a preferred alternative to provide a frequent, rapid, reliable transportation connection between two of the busiest and fastest growing transportation hubs in the GTA (Union Station and LBPIA).</p> <p>Although the primary purpose of the study is to identify a preferred alternative to provide a frequent, rapid, reliable transportation connection between Union Station and LBPIA, the opportunity to derive local transportation benefits from the proposed services, where feasible, will also be examined. These opportunities include enhanced local transit connections (e.g., community has previously suggested additional stops) and will be developed when generating and evaluating alternatives.</p> <p>Please be assured that by subjecting the study to an Individual Environmental Assessment, the proponent is committing to examine a full range of alternatives. These alternatives are listed in the draft Terms of Reference Document..</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 14 Section 2.2</p>
<p>3. Both Frame number 16 and Frame number 17 make reference to <i>"The capital cost to implement the alternative" and the necessity to "address the purpose to a meaningful degree and at a reasonable cost"</i> in order to be a considered an alternative.</p> <p>Unfortunately, your panel was unable to define "reasonable cost", nor could they confirm whether a budget and "reasonable cost" had already been established, nor could they identify what parameters that the costs would be measured or compared to in order to establish whether they are "reasonable".</p>	<p>As no assessment has been completed to date on the alternatives, reasonable cost can not be defined. A reasonable cost in this case is relative to the alternatives being considered. (For example, if one alternative is 1 billion, and all the other alternatives are within \$400 to \$600 million, then \$1 billion is likely not a reasonable cost). A clear rationale will be provided as part of the Environmental Assessment Process.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Too often COSTS are identified with PRICE rather than VALUE. I believe that taxpayers have a far greater interest in receiving good value for the tax dollars spent rather than spending the lowest price for inferior products and services. An alternative that costs 30 percent more than the Georgetown South Rail Corridor Expansion is the most "reasonable cost" if it better serves the transportation needs of the people of Toronto and inflicts less</p>	<p>The proposed criteria for the first step of the evaluation process includes a criteria to examine how well the various alternatives provide enhanced benefits to the local transportation network (i.e. the level of other transit (local/intra-city) ridership accommodated).</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>conflict and inconvenience to communities.</p>		
<p>The clauses included in (1), (2) and (3) above would provide McCormick Rankin to very easily eliminate a large number of the alternative routes as "non-viable" after a very quick and shallow review. These clauses will provide the vehicle for the final choice to be massaged back to the original focus of GO Transit and SNC-Lavalin to proceed with the <i>Blue 22</i> line in the Georgetown South Rail Corridor.</p> <p>I request that the clauses with reference to the existing narrow "purpose" and the references to "<u>reasonable cost</u>" be re-evaluated to include the scope that best suits the greater needs of the City of Toronto and that these be eliminated from the Terms of Reference (ToR).</p> <p>Thank you for permitting a form for comments and entering them to become part of the public record.</p>	<p>The Purpose Statement has been redrafted. However, the primary purpose of this component of the study is to examine alternatives, both within and outside of the Georgetown south rail corridor, in order to identify a preferred alternative to provide direct, frequent, rapid, reliable, seamless transportation connection between two of the busiest and fastest growing transportation hubs in the Greater Toronto Area (Union Station and Lester B. Pearson International Airport).</p> <p>The first step of the evaluation process is focused on eliminating those alternatives that are not reasonable relatively quickly. We do recognize that there is the perception that process is designed to eliminate all alternatives, other than options within the Georgetown corridor, at the first step. To address this we have committed to adding the following words to Section 5.2.2 of the ToR. "Although the results of the first step analysis are not known at this time, the Project Team is committed to carrying forward alternatives in more than one of the corridors identified in Section 5.1.2."</p> <p>As note previously the first step of the process also includes a criteria to examine how well the various alternatives provide enhanced benefits to the local transportation network (i.e. the level of other transit (local/intra-city) ridership accommodated).</p> <p>Additional tracks are required in the Georgetown corridor to allow GO Transit to provide "full service" along the Georgetown corridor.</p> <p>"Full service" means that GO Transit can run regular inbound trains that stop at each station on one track and express trains on the second track and provide counter peak service (in the outbound direction) on the third track.</p> <p>We acknowledge your frustration with public transit in the City of Toronto. However, the purpose of this study is not to address all the transportation problems within in the City of Toronto but is to address future capacity deficiencies associated with GO Transit travel demand in the Georgetown Corridor and to explore alternatives for a</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 14 Section 2.2</p> <p>and</p> <p>Page: 25 Section 5.2.2</p>
<p>I was at the meeting last night and I have a question. How does GO benefit from the track expansion if the Georgetown train to the airport goes through?</p>	<p>Additional tracks are required in the Georgetown corridor to allow GO Transit to provide "full service" along the Georgetown corridor.</p> <p>"Full service" means that GO Transit can run regular inbound trains that stop at each station on one track and express trains on the second track and provide counter peak service (in the outbound direction) on the third track.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>I am one of the few people that have lived in Toronto their whole life, born and raised. Since I was a child I have taken the subway and I am embarrassed to say it has hardly changed in the 43 years of my life. The bus routes have decreased as the population has increased, for example the bus that runs down calvington at my parent's house starts later and no</p>	<p>We acknowledge your frustration with public transit in the City of Toronto. However, the purpose of this study is not to address all the transportation problems within in the City of Toronto but is to address future capacity deficiencies associated with GO Transit travel demand in the Georgetown Corridor and to explore alternatives for a</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>longer runs on weekends. I can't understand how this makes any sense as the need for public transportation has increased greatly in the city. The problem causes a chain reaction, making gridlock, traffic, road rage, frustration of being late for work regularly because of breakdowns and incidents. Another issue with public transit is that it runs so infrequently is so unreliable that you MUST have a car when you live in Toronto along with taking public transportation: doubling your transportation cost. For example if you want to visit someone on a holiday, you are out of luck usually with transit. My cousin works at TTC and get a free metropass but must drive to work because there is no bus that runs down commissioner street, let alone on his night shift. GO is not much better. If my boss gives me tickets for a baseball or basketball game I don't take them because the GO does not run down or back at those hours. I would have to drive and get stuck in traffic then pay for parking or take the TTC which entails walking to Lawrence, 20 min on a crowded bus and the 20 minutes on the subway. This is common for many residents of Toronto. If I want to have a drink at dinner downtown and I would like to take the GO downtown, I'm out of luck on the weekend and evening. I just don't go out at all. I was just in New York city and I don't have to tell you how things are there. I was very depressed coming back to this city.</p>	<p>Transportation Link between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport.</p> <p>We are currently at the Draft Terms of Reference phase of an Individual Environmental Assessment Study that will look at a number of options for GO Transit expansion in the Georgetown south rail corridor, and for the Airport Transportation link from Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport. Please note that one of the purposes of this study is to examine possible infrastructure improvements to provided enhanced GO Transit service in the Georgetown south rail corridor.</p>	
<p>You seem to have common sense to me. Why are we wasting money on a study for the Blue 22 that will not work? Can we pick a solution that has common sense and will benefit the city and spend the money studying the environmental effect of a feasible solution instead work pouring money into something the general public in Toronto can NOT benefit from. How many people are getting rich from our tax money, consulting and meeting and studying something that everyone with common sense can see will not work. You could have probably built a new set of track in the Georgetown corridor with the money being spent on the EI. I know the system works this way but other cities seem to do the right thing, why can't we? For example, Chicago has a train that goes to and from the airport but has may stops along the way so the citizens there have access.</p> <p>Like I said, I've lived here my whole life but I am not happy with the system as other Torontonians I talk to. We feel very frustrated. A pathetic public transit system and poor management, no common sense, nobody takes responsibility for themselves and their action with most public utilities and services including schools. The Island bridge made some sense, making another airport available and more access to the island but the</p>	<p>Please be assured that by subjecting the study to an Individual Environmental Assessment, the proponent is committing to examine a full range of alternatives both within and outside the Georgetown south rail corridor. These alternatives are listed in the draft Terms of Reference Document.</p> <p>One of the alternatives being considered for the connection between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport is a rail link in the Georgetown South rail corridor, however, we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>mayor stopped it because his Toronto is only in the downtown area, the rest of Toronto does not exist for him. He only serves the select few from downtown. I hear he is going to line the streets of yorkville with granite for the "stars" when they visit Toronto. Of course they love Toronto, -Mayor <i>Millers Toronto</i> - Maybe it's time to move to another city!                      Sorry this was so long but I am a frustrated Torontonionian. Thanks for reading it. I hope the committee has common sense and will do what is right for Toronto for a change. That would be a pleasant change, like a ray of sunshine in this gloomy city.</p>		
<p>If the original train proposal goes through from Union to the airport without stopping, I really don't think it will be utilized by the general public. Are people going to drag their luggage from their house, hop on the bus, then take the subway to union and pay another 20 dollars to get to the airport. If you have to leave early in the morning, the subway doesn't even run until 6am and on the weekends at 9am, how would the general people get there? If you live in Markham, or Richmond hill, or Georgetown at the moment, you are out of luck with the GO train on the weekend. How do you get to union: get a ride. So why not get a ride right to the airport? Going to Union is not convenient for Toronto. The only ones who will benefit will be the select few who live Downtown or work as executives and travel from downtown. These select few do now represent the majority of people the live, work and pay taxed in this city. We pay taxes but our return for the money is low. If I were to go on a trip, I would have to walk to Lawrence, hop on the bus for 20 min and then the train for another 20 minutes to get to union. Then pay 80 dollars for the 4 of us for a ride to the airport along with the 10 dollars I already spent on the TTC. I am a typical resident of Toronto. This scenario can be applied to someone who lives in Scarborough, on Kennedy Rd. or almost anywhere in the city. With the poor quality of the public transportation system don't you think making many stops along the way on the "blue 22" makes more sense so the people of Toronto can access it from a variety of location in the GTA? Why are we catering to the select few again! There are lots of options like making more subways, mini trains, more frequent trains, running the subway at night, adding more routes and even adding mini buses-running on holidays(not only on major routes but everywhere) so people have the option of not having a car. There are tacks all over the city, why are we not using them? Why are we so behind?</p>	<p>Please be aware that the link between Lester B. Pearson airport and Union Station will not necessarily be a direct link between the two transportation hubs. In the evaluation of "Planning Alternatives" we will examine the possibility of providing stops along the route. Ultimately, we hope to provide such a link to satisfy existing and projected demands at these hubs to compliment existing public transit services, including establishing connections among the various transportation systems.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>It is with chagrin that I write this response as I reflect on yet another public meeting given by a consulting team whose primary agenda is still to provide high speed rail service from Pearson to Union.</p> <p>I'd like to address three areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the presentation by the consultants</li> <li>• the manner of the facilitator</li> <li>• the question/comments from the floor</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation:</b> This was a very long and tedious exercise based on a handout that was far from concise or straight forward despite its intentions. Boxes like the "Go Service Expansion/ Airport Link" at the top of page 4, bordered on unintelligible with arrows pointing in different directions. This would be especially confusing to those for who diagrammatic explanations baffle instead of enlighten. Apart from consultants and civil servants, this means everyone else. The box of "Alternatives", probably one of the most important pieces of information is not labeled at all. It is impossible to discern where routes begin and end, where the stars are with respect to streets, or how many alternatives there are, since all lines are black. Other boxes were complete space wasters, with titles like "Presentation Continuation from June 21 Meeting", "Consultation Plan", "Next Steps". With the triple replication of the hard copy handout, power point and speaker's reading the effect was enervating. Words like, "reasonable and alternative" peppered the speeches making statements vague and evasive. If this is how expeditiously and clearly you inform the public, then your efforts have completely backfired, unless of course all you have to do is say you held a meeting.</p>	<p>One of the major criticisms of the previous Class EA process was that a full range of alternatives for providing service between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport was not explored. As a result of this, GO Transit agreed to initiate an Individual EA Process to ensure that a range of alternatives is explored and a clear rationale for the preferred alternative is provided. As such, the alternative to provide rail service from Union Station to the Airport is an alternative to be considered.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p><b>Presentation:</b> This was a very long and tedious exercise based on a handout that was far from concise or straight forward despite its intentions. Boxes like the "Go Service Expansion/ Airport Link" at the top of page 4, bordered on unintelligible with arrows pointing in different directions. This would be especially confusing to those for who diagrammatic explanations baffle instead of enlighten. Apart from consultants and civil servants, this means everyone else. The box of "Alternatives", probably one of the most important pieces of information is not labeled at all. It is impossible to discern where routes begin and end, where the stars are with respect to streets, or how many alternatives there are, since all lines are black. Other boxes were complete space wasters, with titles like "Presentation Continuation from June 21 Meeting", "Consultation Plan", "Next Steps". With the triple replication of the hard copy handout, power point and speaker's reading the effect was enervating. Words like, "reasonable and alternative" peppered the speeches making statements vague and evasive. If this is how expeditiously and clearly you inform the public, then your efforts have completely backfired, unless of course all you have to do is say you held a meeting.</p>	<p>The handout you received at the Public Meeting on September 13<sup>th</sup> 2006 was a complete version of the Power Point presentation. The purpose of the presentation was to describe the key elements of the proposed evaluation methodology.</p> <p>We appreciate any feedback on the diagrams and presentation material from the Public Meetings, and will work to better communicate the components of the study.</p> <p>We understand that the draft Terms of Reference and evaluation methodology use specialized wording, but we hope through these public meetings to generate an understanding of what defines a "reasonable alternative", and how these will be evaluated through the process.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>
<p><b>The facilitator:</b> He was condescending and patronizing. His opening remarks would have been better suited to an audience full of prepubescent children at a middle school whose primary purpose in life is to make noise and defy authority, not a room full of people struggling to maintain a quality of life that already compromised, will result in even less than what they've got, if the proposal for something that looks a lot like Blue 22 goes through. These people are adults, talking about survival, their health and their life savings. They have come repeatedly to these meetings to make their views known and no one, least of all a facilitator, has the right to tell them how to speak their truth.</p>	<p>With respect to your comments regarding the facilitator, we regret that you were offended by his approach. Glenn Pothier is a communications specialist with over 20 years experience in stakeholder consultation. Glenn has led a number of consultation and outreach exercises on a variety of projects, most of which involved contentious and sensitive issues.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p><b>The question/comment period:</b> Many people spoke and spoke well, whether their first language was English or not, whether they were highly educated or not, whether they were persons of colour or another ethnicity, middle class or not, disabled or not. Not one person spoke in favour of the proposal. What does that tell you? <b>How do you proceed with the terms of reference when there has been no agreement to the proposal?</b> The panel responded only to questions of format or procedure, reiterating what they had already said in their presentation. Their response to health concerns was to refer to factors they had predetermined they would look at, like noise levels. These are not the same. Their response to the homeowner who is already experiencing a drop in his property values was that they were going to look at more predetermined factors. This did not include conferring with real estate companies to assess what happens to the property values of those homes that are close to the train tracks when the first three rules of real estate for prospective buyers are location, location, location. <b>The school trustee who has expertise that is clearly of value to the study has been told her services are not required.</b> The senior who canvassed his neighbourhood to come forth with a petition of a 1000 signatures is told that his efforts which must have taken hours and hours are not only not in their possession but that "that was then", as if everyone has agreed to forget the fervent opposition raised at previous meetings before the panel reinvented itself. <b>The man who pointed out that the primary goal is still to provide an air rail link while only the secondary goal benefits local transportation, meaning Go Transit, was met with no response from the panel.</b> Another man came forward to demonstrate that the alternatives which appear equal to the Georgetown/Weston route are in fact impossible because they do not meet the burden of being executed at a reasonable cost or completed in a timely manner. Therefore we are still looking at the same route as before. Again, no comment from the panel. No comment to those who appealed to the desperate need for public transportation in the Weston/Mount Dennis/Jane St. communities, no comment on the obvious dearth of factors which capture the human cost. No comment. What do you expect the residents to think?</p> <p>The panel has failed and will continue to fail in the eyes of the residents as long as it persists in its unresponsive dumbness to the most salient issues raised. All that does is confirm the residents' worst suspicions: that this is going ahead at the expense/demise of the residents and their neighbourhoods, and that factors that can easily be measured which benefit the proposal will be considered, while those that present a negative</p>	<p>We recognize that the local community does not support and has concerns with a direct rail Airport Transportation Link in the Georgetown Corridor. It should be noted that a preferred alternative has not been selected and this is one of the many alternatives being considered.</p> <p>The reasons why specific questions related to potential effects were responded with 'process type responses' (i.e. how these issues will be addressed as the study proceeds) also relates to the stage of the process that we are at. As we have not begun examine the potential effects of the various alternatives it is not possible to comment on the potential effects in the Georgetown Corridor or any other corridor being considered. All we are able to do at this stage is to explain how these issues will be considered during the generation and evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>With regards to the specific issues you raised in your letter, we can offer the following responses:</p> <p><b><u>Representation of the School Board on the Public Liaison Committee</u></b></p> <p>It has been noted that the PLC is not a political committee and that it is not appropriate for elected officials or School Board Trustees to be members. School Board Trustees have never been excluded from attending as observers, and like all observers they have been given the opportunities to share their views at the end of the meetings.</p> <p><b><u>Petition Signed By Members of the Local Community</u></b></p> <p>Regarding the petition signed by members of the local community in the previous study, please know that this study is not being undertaken in ignorance of the issues raised in the previous Class EA study. Indeed, the previous study forms part of this project's contextual backdrop. In the new Individual Environmental Assessment we are not forcing consensus on one proposed project. The purpose of the Public Meetings is to inform public debate that fosters a knowledge base allowing for a reasonable exploration of complex issues.</p> <p><b><u>Primary Goal of the Study</u></b></p> <p>One of the major criticisms of the previous Class EA process was that a full range of alternatives for providing service between Union</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>scenario will be "mitigated". At no time has any panel member referred to how much better the quality of life will be for the average Weston et al citizen when this air rail link happens. The panel is not talking in public meetings about projections of increasing property values, of stimulating the economy through small business, of the convenience of better transportation, of expecting to enjoy a higher standard of living. Do you think that we are not in business for ourselves? Why are SNC Lavalin and Go Transit the only ones to profit here? If self interest is the way to make a deal, then offer us something. Instead of "mitigating disadvantages", show us the money. That's what SNC Lavalin did to GO. If we are supposed to believe that our sacrifice of years of untold hazards and disruptions starting with the construction phase is necessary, we need to benefit, and handsomely too. But the panel is not saying anything like that, and in its continued silence, it speaks volumes.</p> <p>I trust that there will be more than just a reply that you received my letter and have sent it to the proper channels. Tell me in no uncertain terms, what you can do for me and my community.</p>	<p>Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport was not explored. As a result of this, GO Transit agreed to initiate an Individual EA Process to ensure that a range of alternatives is explored and a clear rationale for the preferred alternative is provided. This is the primary purpose of this IEA study – not to provide an air rail link.</p>	
<p>1. Build the subway from Eglinton West Subway Station to the Airport! Original construction should HAVE NEVER STOPPED!</p>	<p>We note your preference for the Eglinton alternative.</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>2. As a resident of Weston I do not want a fast dirty train roaring through every 7 to 10 minutes and to service only the chosen few rich business men from Union Station to the Airport – at any expense.</p> <p>5. Good idea to have a GO Train to do frequent stops – including Weston – from Union to the Airport. Who needs some outside train company! Train to leave Airport/Union every hour or so.</p>	<p>As you are aware, the link between Lester B. Pearson airport and Union Station will not necessarily be a direct line between the two transportation hubs. In the evaluation of “Planning Alternatives” we will examine the possibility of providing stops along the route. Ultimately, we hope to provide such a link to satisfy existing and projected demands at these hubs to compliment existing public transit services, including establishing connections among the various transportation systems.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>As you are aware, I raised a number of important questions and issues by letter to you in early June. Your response was only received by the undersigned in late August. Coupled with the Public Liaison Committee meeting, which raised more questions, and the Public Information Centre which raised still more, I feel I must ask at this late date for significant changes to the draft Terms of Reference document. I will outline my reasoning below.</p> <p>First and foremost, as was clearly evident by the excellent analyses and your responses at the public meeting, it is apparent that the Terms of Reference, as drafted, will not achieve the original purpose of determining the best route and technology for transporting people to and from Pearson Airport. The Terms of Reference, as drafted, forces all potential routings and technologies to meet tests which are at best unfairly selective and at worst vague and unspecific, while failing to properly study the environmental impacts of any but a chosen route. Thus there will be limited ‘environmental’ study on most if not all of the potential routings. In addition, your single-minded unwillingness to admit that any potential route might have significant local impacts on businesses and home owners, as well as health impacts on a long term basis beyond what ‘limits’ might be currently set for casual or industrial exposure in the province, goes to the heart of the failings of the proposed study. Finally, your refusal, on several occasions, despite pointed questioning from the undersigned and other members of the public, to describe what value systems you plan to utilize in your determination of ‘trade-offs’ and ‘reasoned arguments’ to ‘prove’ your choice of corridor and technology leaves the process far from transparent to the ordinary citizenry.</p>	<p>The project team responded in some detail to the writer as noted and then sat down individually with the writer to make sure that we understood his questions and that he understood our responses. As a result of this dialogue we made some adjustments to our responses and then circulated the table and our responses to the Public Liaison Committee for further discussion. (see responses to June submission earlier in this table)</p> <p>In the main, there was a better understanding of many of the issues that had been raised but there were some issues that are mentioned here that we have addressed with changes to the ToR document.</p> <p>The main concern expressed in the points following revolve around the screening evaluation of the many “Airport transportation link” options to get down to a more reasonable number of options for more detailed evaluation. This issue is addressed below</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>1. You have stated publicly that if any other route or technology than the Weston Corridor with Blue 22 type technology is found to be the 'best' as a result of this study, it will fall to other agencies than GO Transit or the other proponent to fund or arrange to use that route or technology. But, the prime consideration for the determination of 'best' as you have admitted, is cost, presumably both public and private. It must be capable of being built 'at a reasonable cost' (completely indeterminate) and in a reasonable period of time. And it must attract sufficient ridership (again indeterminate) to meet the purpose of transportation. We know that the proposal through Weston must set a price high enough to keep riders away, else it would swamp the technology. So ridership can be easily manipulated by ticket price. And if another agency or proponent is to fund or arrange, how can you pre-determine what is 'reasonable' in terms of finance and time, let alone ridership, to that other agency or proponent? And how is the process transparent, if the public cannot understand or know what the prime determining factor of an 'environmental' assessment will be until after you have determined it? If there is no budget, no cost attributed to the project in advance, is it therefore not reasonable to expect that you will price out all alternatives and leave it up to the public and their elected officials to determine what is 'reasonable' both in terms of dollar cost, and in terms of environmental cost? And you have decided that 'public' transportation along the corridor is merely an 'ancillary' benefit of the project. Should that not also be up to the public or the elected officials to decide? Unfortunately that is not how you have structured the Terms of Reference, and therefore it is flawed, and as some have pointed out, fatally.</p> <p><b><i>Therefore we must demand that the Terms of Reference be modified significantly, to remove any reference to 'reasonable cost' or 'reasonable time to construct' or similar. We must demand that the terms of reference redefine the project purpose to study fairly and without bias all potential routings and technologies, regardless of cost or time, without the restrictions of words such as 'express' and 'seamless' which will prejudice as failures a number of potentially viable options.</i></b></p>	<p>As part of the ToR consultation process the public was asked to suggest any and all options that the project team should consider when evaluating the Airport transportation link. As a result there are a multitude of corridor and technology options that have been included in the ToR covering every obvious corridor. All corridors suggested have been included.</p> <p>In order to pair the list down to a more reasonable size for detailed analysis we have suggested a first step screening criteria as an initial filter. We are not attempting to determine the "best" option through this process but simply to eliminate the least worthy candidates.</p> <p>There is a perception (by some) that the project team will use the screening process to get down to only one option. In order to insure the public that that will not happen, we have committed in the ToR to "carrying forward alternatives in more than one of the corridors" identified in the ToR. This means that at least 2 corridors will be carried forward for more detailed environmental analysis. This commitment was also made at the September 13 public meeting.</p> <p>At no time has the project team suggested that cost is the prime consideration of what is the "best" solution. It is a major consideration (any always will be for public infrastructure considerations) but it is only one of a number of comparative factors that will be used in both the screening and more detailed analysis.</p> <p>"Reasonable cost" is to be used as a relative term in comparing one alternative to the other for the purpose of short listing the large number of planning alternatives. As requested we have removed "reasonable time to construct" as well as words such as "express", "seamless" and "direct". We have also committed to having at least two corridor options to consider in more detail, with full environmental considerations, after we have carried out the short listing analysis. This analysis will be openly reviewed with the Public Liaison Committee and the general public and government agencies</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Section 5.2.2</p>
<p>2. The Terms of Reference describe a three stage process. First, potential routings are to be 'culled' on the basis primarily of their cost and expediency of construction, with only a cursory look at their environmental impacts. You have admitted to the PLC that significant differences in environmental cost will not be the prime determining</p>	<p>Please see the response above, as issues under item 2 are very similar.</p> <p>Again we are committed to carrying at least two corridors through a</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Section 5.2.2</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>factor. You admitted that only a 'go/no go' environmental issue would stop any potential route on an environmental basis. Your example was that if a route destroyed the remaining habitat for an endangered species in an unmitigable way, it would not receive further consideration. However, the various routes which do NOT have unmitigable environmental disasters, will NOT be compared environmentally in any detailed way in that first cull. Once again, cost will be the prime determining factor, not environmental cost. Again, this is a serious flaw in a so-called 'environmental' assessment when the environment and the cost thereto are secondary factors. But we do not accept that a route with significant environmental impact (such as potentially Weston) might win over a route with a much less significant environmental impact simply because the environment was not universally studied at the outset.</p> <p><b><i>Therefore we must demand that the Terms of Reference be amended, to ensure that sufficient environmental study is undertaken of all potential routings that the cost of the project to the environment can be compared. In addition, that the terms of reference provide for a mechanism to weigh those costs fairly and transparently as the prime determining factors for selections of potential routings.</i></b></p>	<p>full detailed analysis, including environmental factors, after we have carried out the short listing analysis.</p> <p>All analysis will be completed with full disclosure and discussion with the Public Liaison Committee, government agencies and the general public</p>	
<p>3. You are painfully aware, from the comments at public meetings and elsewhere, that there is serious public concern about the socio-economic cost of the proposal, at least in terms of the most developed proposal, that through Weston. The proximity of schools, churches, houses, as well as the devastating potential effects on local businesses, has been raised time and again as serious issues. The Terms of Reference as proposed are very light on any description of how you will study these socio-economic impacts, other than to suggest that 'nuisance' factors will be compared, and that all provincial standards will be met. That does not satisfy the public concern raised over and over again. There is no provincial standard for long-term exposure by children or adults to diesel fumes and their particulates. There is no provincial standard for acceptable levels of noise and vibration, particularly not on a time-frame such as the over a century long term of some of the proposed contracts for the project. And you have quite clearly indicated that you have no intention of considering as mitigation, compensating anyone financially for localized losses, such as property values, business closings etc. This is particularly galling since the 'Blue 22' proponent, who intend to make significant profits from the venture,</p>	<p>Regarding your concern with health issues, specifically air quality impacts associated with diesel trains, please be aware that air quality will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>Air pollution and noise will both be used as measures to compare the "nuisance effects" of alternatives. Once these potential effects are identified, the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping, etc.) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technically and economically feasible. This approach is consistent with virtually all EAs completed for transportation infrastructure in Ontario.</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to property values, the research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a</p>	<p>Y Page: 25 Table 5-1 Criteria, "Regional Air Quality"</p>

Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference

Responses to Comments - General Public

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>are not at the table, and are not involved in the drafting of the Terms of Reference, though if successful, may in fact be the payor of mitigation expenses. Again without a level playing field and a transparent process, socio-economic costs such as property value losses will not be factored into the equations if mitigation costs are not part of the process.</p> <p><b><i>Therefore we must demand that the Terms of Reference be amended, to provide significant detail as to how the proponents intend to study the socio-economic impacts of the various routings and technologies, and the health and well-being impacts of the potential proximity to noise, vibration, and pollution on a long-term basis. Further, that all of the proponents provide detailed examples of the mitigation possible, in the terms of reference, and include in that the potential for property value, business value, and property loss of employment mitigation.</i></b></p>	<p>significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics).</p> <p>As noted above we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p> <p>It is not possible or appropriate in a ToR to describe all possible mitigation measures to issues that will only be developed and known as a result of the study.</p>	
<p>4. Finally, your terms of reference are vague and unintelligible when it comes to understanding what value systems you will use in making 'trade-offs' and 'reasoned arguments' about which routing or technology gets your approval. You have refused our requests to give us some sense of what those values will be. It makes a mockery of the EA process if a proponent can describe their decision-making mechanisms in so vague a manner that no one could ever challenge the result, no matter what the outcome. You have suggested that if you make patently wrong decisions, you might face some opposition from the minister. However, the law seems to only require that once the Terms of Reference are set, you need only meet those terms in a manner which is understandable and replicable. So if the Terms of Reference are deliberately vague, your results have no structure and therefore can be whatever you want them to be. Ultimately, your 'trade-offs' will be public dollars for public environment, and we need to know going in how you will value the environment and cost it in preparation for making those 'trade-offs'.</p> <p><b><i>Therefore we must demand that the Terms of Reference be amended to provide for a full description of the value systems the proponents will use in making the 'trade-offs' or 'reasoned arguments'. We demand that sufficiently clear examples be provided that a reasonable citizen will understand them, and be able to challenge them if necessary at the terms of reference stage of this EA.</i></b></p>	<p>It is difficult to explicitly state the importance of specific evaluation criteria prior to understanding the potential effects and significance of the effect. The Terms of Reference commits the Project Team to clearly document and explain the rationale and logic change behind the comparison of the advantages and disadvantages leading to the selection of a preferred alternative. The evaluation process will include an assessment of the significance of the potential effects that may be caused by the various alternatives. This assessment will be undertaken by the various project team specialists in order to determine the magnitude and significance of effects. The wording in Section 6.2 will be modified to better reflect this concept.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Page: 30, Section 6.2</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>5. On the matter of the GO Transit expansion on the Georgetown Corridor, the above comments should also apply, particularly in light of the comments by one of the proponents that GO Transit had already decided on the technology, and that therefore electrification of the route would not be considered. This is quite typical of the apparent arrogance of the proponents in pre-determining the outcome of the EA. It colours the process and gives the public the impression that the 'fix' is in and the public's 'reasoned arguments' will not be fairly or transparently considered.</p>	<p>We agree that questions on electrification of GO trains are reasonable issues to be raised. Answers to these issues will be responded to and developed during the course of the study.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>As we are dragged kicking and screaming into this whole matter of (still) persisting to inflict an Air Rail Link that so clearly is fatally flawed from the outset by any logical rational: It makes one truly wonder why it takes millions of dollars and years of study to see what is evident in the first hour.</p>		<p>N</p>
<p>Basic common sense tells you there will be serious health and welfare burdens to the people along the Georgetown route. This is indisputable. Noise and pollution will wreck havoc to the many marginalized seniors, whose seniors residences border the route, through Weston, as well as thousands of young children who attend the two schools- these are the vulnerable ones who can not even speak and attend your "last chance" seminars..nor begin to understand the ToR and EA that is being conducted over their rights- that you would be gravely and indiscriminately violating.</p> <p>Documented heart problems due to stress of excessive noise, as well as substantial hearing loss and impairment are the conclusion of studies already studied extensively in this area.</p> <p>No EA is going to come to another conclusion.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern for the health and welfare of the local community along the Georgetown South Rail Corridor. Please be assured that these issues will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives. Section 5.1.2 outlines the proposed criteria to assess the planning alternatives. As part of this we will examine the potential nuisance effects (noise, air quality, visual impacts etc) of the various corridors. In addition we have added a criterion to assess the potential nuisance effects on schools.</p> <p>It is recognized that, at the Planning Alternatives phase, we proposed to use 'surrogate' or 'proxy' measures. This is considered to be appropriate to provide an indication of potential nuisance effects to examine the various corridors. It is recognized that impacts to specific properties will not be identified at this stage however the analysis should be sufficient to indicate the number of features</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>Your absolute failure to recognize compensation to the many property owners along the Georgetown line..is another violation. Any realty agent can tell you without an extensive study that-you cannot sell property with 70 mp dirty diesel trains running every 7 minutes through their backyard – to anybody! Even the rumour that it may be built is cause to have buyers back well off. Property owners are now in a state of limbo waiting for the conclusion to this fiasco before they can move forward or move at all.</p>	<p>potentially affected. Detailed modeling will be undertaken during the Alternative Design stage to identify specific impacts and investigate mitigation. This is already included in Section 6.2.1 of the draft EA ToR.</p>	
<p>Regarding potential impacts to property values, the research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics).</p> <p>As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	<p>Regarding potential impacts to property values, the research and literature on this subject indicates that, in many cases, improved transportation infrastructure has a positive effect on property values as it improves accessibility and reduces congestion on other facilities. The research and literature also does suggest that transportation infrastructure could have negative effects if the project results in a significant change to nuisance effects (i.e. noise, air quality and aesthetics).</p> <p>As part of this study we will examine potential nuisance effects to determine potential adverse effects. Once these potential effects are identified the project team will examine mitigation measures (e.g. noise wall, grade changes, berming, landscaping) in an attempt to bring these effects back to preconstruction conditions as much as is technical and economic feasible.</p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
<p>I have listened carefully as the EA process was explained to us. It is essentially a balance of arbitrary values. Cost being the major value&gt; is how Weston and the Georgetown line somehow grew into ..an expendible option at the starting gate.</p> <p>At the outset no one really cared about any other value...so now that we fought for an EA study of alternatives, the board seems to be slanted that everything will roll back to us because of the prominence given to this cost-value in your study. We value our health /well being and quality of life and you haven't valued this at all.. Ours is a commodity that has no price in the equation. Life is priceless and you must recognize you can not weigh how expendible people are for a rail line.</p> <p>What does this tell us about a transparent fair study when there are gaping oceans between our values. Ours is a value that precludes us as a viable option and yours is a cost value that is willing to violate peoples health, rob them of the value of their properties, destroy historic buildings and a lovely community for a rail line. FATALY flawed, crossed values</p>	<p>The Project Team is of the opinion that cost is a valid criterion to include in the evaluation as it is important to understand whether an alternative is affordable and able to be implemented. It should be recognized that many of the alternatives under consideration would require the expenditure of public funds. This should be included in the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>It is difficult to convert all impacts to a dollar value. For this reason we have chosen to use a Reasoned Argument Approach where the evaluation of alternatives and 'trade-offs' made by the Project Team will be clearly documented and explained throughout the planning process. It should be noted that stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on this process. It should also be noted that the Ontario Minister of the Environment is the ultimate decision maker. If an individual, group or agency disagrees with the rationale behind the decision making process, they have the right to submit their comments to the Minister and explain why they feel the Project Team made the wrong 'trade-offs'. The ultimate decision rests with the Minister of the Environment.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Whatever the cost of this Blue 22, Make no mistake it is the people of Weston, Mt Dennis and the Georgetown line who will be carrying this project on their backs to their grave, when your assessment is long gone. Everybody walked out of your meeting with a feeling you just don't hear the voices of the people for the sound of the cash register. And yet in the end&gt; whatever the EA concludes: the future senario will prove we were right. I think perhaps you already know this within yourselves.</p> <p>It doesn't take a million dollar study to reach a conclusion on this one, it takes common sense. The common sense of Mary Louise Ashbourne who asked you to remove us from the list of viable options being studied, and include real alternatives like transit that would include higher ridership, enhance property values and community and leave us as you found us..a lovely community in harmony with GO.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns expressed by the local community are encouraged and accepted throughout the process, and will be reviewed and responded to, as appropriate. Where ever it is warranted, input will be integrated into the Terms of Reference, and the evaluation of alternatives.</p> <p>You can provide input through our website (<a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca">http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca</a>) by e-mail, fax, phone or mail. We will respond to your questions as soon as possible.</p> <p>One of the major criticisms of the previous Class EA process was that a full range of alternatives for providing service between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport was not explored. As a result of this, GO Transit agreed to initiate an Individual EA Process to ensure that a range of alternatives is explored and a clear rationale for the preferred alternative is provided. As such, the alternative to provide rail service from Union Station to the Airport is an alternative to be considered.</p> <p>With regards to the Airport Transportation Link, in addition to the primarily purpose (a link from Pearson Airport to Union Station), the study will explore if the alternatives can derive local transportation</p>	<p>N</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	<p>benefits from both of the proposed services, where feasible, including enhanced local transit connections.</p> <p>Please note that we will also be examining Express bus service between Union Station and LBPIA using the Gardiner Expressway and Highway 427, Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and a connection to the airport, among others.</p>	
<p>Please add to the Planning or Design Alternatives the following option: A separate system that runs from the Airport to the closest point on the rail transit corridor only. It would act as a feeder link from the airport to the corridor.</p>	<p>One of the options being considered, is Go transit service in the Georgetown corridor with a separate link into the airport.</p>	N
<p>This last meeting did not address the situation in Weston at all. You are not taking into account the people who had homes here for years and take care of them and keep Weston clean.</p> <p>You have not even made an attempt to seriously look at all alternatives.</p> <p>The majority of the speaking by the moderator and Dennis Callan was just jargon and bureaucratic bungling. It did not address at all about the people in the community.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your concern for your community. Comments and concerns expressed by the local community are encouraged and accepted throughout the process, and will be reviewed and responded to, as appropriate. Where ever it is warranted, input will be integrated into the Terms of Reference, and the evaluation of alternatives. It should be noted that we are currently at the Terms of Reference stage and a preferred alternative has not yet been identified.</p> <p>You can provide input at any point during this study, through our website, by e-mail, fax, phone or mail. You can also provide input to the study through our website, listed below. We will respond to your questions as soon as possible. <a href="http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca">http://www.georgetownpearsonstudy.ca</a></p>	N

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to Comments - General Public**

Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	<p>Regarding the evaluation of alternatives, please be assured that we are committed to carrying forward alternatives in more than one of the corridors being examined as part of the study. We do recognize that there is the perception that the process is designed to eliminate all alternatives, other than options within the Georgetown corridor, at the first step. To address this we have committed to adding the following words to Section 5.2.2 of the ToR. "Although the results of the first step analysis are not known at this time, the Project Team is committed to carrying forward alternatives in more than one of the corridors identified in Section 5.1.2."</p>	