

Dear Mr. Dennis Callan and Mr. Imants Hausmanis,

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.

I'd like to address three areas:

- the presentation by the consultants
- the manner of the facilitator
- the question/comments from the floor

Presentation: 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.

The facilitator: 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.

The question/comment period: 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? How do you proceed with the terms of reference when there has been no agreement to the proposal? 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. The school trustee who has expertise that is clearly of value to the study has been told her services are not required. 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. 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. 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?

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 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.

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.

Looking forward to hearing from you,
Pearl Goodman, Weston Resident

cc.: Frances Nunziata, Joe Cordiano's office, Alan Tonks, Jim O'Mara,
Mike Sullivan and the Coalition.