

Berlin, Hayley (ENE)

From: Horne, Malcolm (MCL)
Sent: December 13, 2006 9:18 AM
To: Berlin, Hayley (ENE)
Subject: RE: GO Transit ToR Response

I am fine with GO Transit's responses. I have no further questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Malcolm Horne
 Heritage Planner/Archaeologist
 Heritage Operations Unit
 Ministry of Culture
 400 University Avenue, 4th Floor
 Toronto ON M7A 2R9

Tel: (416) 314-7146
 Fax: (416) 314-7175
 e-mail: malcolm.horne@ontario.ca

From: Berlin, Hayley (ENE)
Sent: December 12, 2006 1:59 PM
To: Horne, Malcolm (MCL)
Subject: GO Transit ToR Response

Hi Malcolm

Below please find a copy of your comments on GO Transit ToR for the Georgetown South Corridor/ARL and GO Transit's responses to the issues raised. As you will see, GO Transit has agreed to some of the proposed amendments and has provided suggestions to the wording you have provided. If you have any questions or concerns please let me know by December 15, 2006. Sorry about the short time frame but I am under regulated timelines. If you agree with GO Transit's responses please also indicate that to me so that I can make my recommendations to the Minsiter.

Thanks
 Hayley

<p>We have reviewed the document entitled GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion & Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station, Environmental Assessment Terms of References, dated October, 2006. We generally support the approach and the commitments made. We have the following comments and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2.2, Table 5-1 pages 25-26, Cultural Environment, "Displacement of Built Heritage Features and Culture Landscapes". The term "displacement" should be replaced by "disruption and displacement" in both the Criteria and Measure columns. The term "Qualitative" in the specialist will involve both qualitative and quantitative measurements. The 	<p>Comment noted. We agree the wording should be changed to 'Disruption and Displacement'.</p> <p>It should be noted that the specific effects to the heritage features may not be fully identified at this stage in the process and the more detailed work (specific property impacts, noise and vibration assessment, aesthetics) will be undertaken during the design alternatives stage.</p>
--	--

<p>assessment should be not only a quantitative cataloguing of the number of features to be displaced or disrupted, but should also include an evaluation of the level of cultural heritage value or interest of those features. Features that possess high levels of cultural heritage value of interest may require different strategies for mitigation of impacts than those of a lesser level of cultural heritage value or interest, and may therefore possess greater weight in evaluating alternatives within an environmental assessment.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.2.2, Table 5-1, pages 25-26, Cultural Environment, for Archaeology, to correspond with the built heritage section, the Criteria column should be rewritten as "Impacts to Archaeological Sites". This is measured through assessment of the potential for impacts to archaeological sites by a licensed archaeologist. The phrase "Areas affected that have previously been undisturbed by development" should be deleted and replaced by "Assessment by a licensed archaeologist of the potential for impacts to archaeological sites. The evaluation of the potential for impacts to archeological sites within previously developed areas should be evaluated by the licensed archaeologist since the degree of disturbance that is present is not always sufficient to eliminate potential for archaeological sits to have survived. 	<p>We suggest that the proposed wording suggested by MOC be modified to read:</p> <p>"Assessment by a licensed archaeologist of the impacts to lands with archaeological potential"</p> <p>This wording is suggested because specific Stage 2 archaeological investigations will not be undertaken for planning alternatives and therefore it is impossible to determine impacts to archaeological sites at this stage. Stage 2 archaeological assessments will be undertaken for the preferred alternative to identify specific impacts and develop mitigation. This approach is consistent with the approach used for planning all major linear facilities in the Province.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All areas to be impacted by this project should be evaluated for impacts to cultural heritage resources, included storage and staging sites, detours, access roads, and any ancillary facilities that it will be necessary to construct (e.g., stormwater management ponds) Please ensure that the appropriate staff at the local municipalities are contacted regarding the potential for impacts to cultural heritage resources. Both the City of Toronto (Heritage Preservation Services Unit) and the City of Mississauga (Community Services Unit) have staff that are assigned specifically to cultural heritage conservation and should be consulted in this regard. 	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Hayley Berlin
 Project Officer
 Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
 Ministry of the Environment
 2 St. Clair Avenue West
 12A Floor
 Toronto ON M4V 1L5
 416-314-7106
 **Note new email address: hayley.berlin@ontario.ca