

---

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes**

---



2655 North Sheridan Way  
Mississauga, Ontario, L5K 2P8  
Tel: (905) 829-4988  
Fax: (905) 823-2669  
E-mail: adidrikson@ecoplans.com  
Website: www.ecoplans.com

---

## NOTES OF MEETING

**PROJECT:** GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station  
GO Transit Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

**MEETING NO:** 1

**FILE NO.:** 05-3036

**DATE:** September 7, 2006 **TIME:** 9:30 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.

**PLACE:** GO Transit Office, Toronto  
20 Bay Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Boardroom

**PRESENT:**

Dennis Callan	McCormick Rankin Corporation
Imants Hausmanis	GO Transit AGM
Mike Bricks	Ecoplans Limited
Amy Didrikson	Ecoplans Limited
Murray McLeod	Region of Peel
Ali Ruban	AGM
Peter Kole	Toronto Catholic District School Board
Mario Silva	Toronto District School Board
John Kelly	City of Toronto - Transportation
Mike Wiehkind	City of Toronto
Gene Corazolla	City of Toronto

**PURPOSE:** Technical Advisory Committee [feedback](#) on the draft Terms of Reference.

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PROCEEDINGS:</b>	<b>ACTION BY:</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> I. Hausmanis described the purpose of the meeting and led roundtable introductions. The purpose was to provide an overview of the draft ToR to assist TAC members in providing comments as well as obtain some initial feedback	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Presentation of the Terms of Reference - Background and Overview</b>	

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PROCEEDINGS:</b>	<b>ACTION BY:</b>
2.1	<p>D. Callan provided a background overview of the ToR through a slide presentation. Topics discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project background</li><li>• Propose of the undertaking</li><li>• Range and types of alternatives under consideration</li><li>• Overview of process flow chart</li></ul>	
2.2	<p>D. Callan emphasized that the Terms of Reference is currently a draft document. The Project Team is seeking input from various stakeholders (Public Liaison Committee, Public Meetings, Technical Advisory Committee) to assist in finalizing the document so that it can be submitted to MOE for approval. Comments from the Technical Advisory Committee have been previously requested for September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2006.</p>	TAC
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Presentation of Terms of Reference Evaluation Methodology</b>	
3.1	<p>M. Bricks presented the proposed Evaluation Methodology that is outlined in Chapters 5 and 6 of the Terms of Reference. In addition he outlined the Consultation Plan proposed to assist in the generation and evaluation of alternatives as well as the consultation undertaken to date: Topics discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluation overview and level of detail</li><li>• Two step process for evaluating alternatives to the undertaking</li><li>• Proposed Consultation Plan</li><li>• Consultation undertaken to date</li><li>• Anticipate project schedule</li></ul>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>TAC Feedback</b>	
	<p>Members of the TAC provided general input on the draft ToR, and the presentation material in a question and answer session. The following is intended to be a summary of major comments provided.</p>	
4.2	<p>General Comments on the draft ToR General feedback was brought forward on the draft ToR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• J. Kelly noted that the slide on general process should be reconsidered as it makes it appear as through the rail link along the Georgetown corridor has already been chosen as it is possible that GO Transit could be the proponent for one of the other alternatives. The Project Team agreed to re-examine this exhibit to add clarity.</li><li>▪ G. Corazolla commented that the rationale behind the undertaking must be better defined in the ToR. The Project Team agreed that additional details will be provided.</li><li>▪ The problem and opportunity statement needs to be clear, and perhaps expanded. The Project Team agreed that additional details will be provided.</li><li>▪ J. Kelly commented that the intended market for the air-rail link needs to be better defined in the objectives. The Project Team agreed that additional details will be provided.</li></ul>	

**ITEM PROCEEDINGS:**

**ACTION  
BY:**

- M. McLeod commented that the ToR must also emphasize the long-term use of the air-rail link, and integration with transit in other jurisdictions. This comment was noted and will be considered.
- M. Silva commented that the ToR must clarify the role of SNC-Lavalin. This comment was noted and will be considered.

4.3 Feedback on the Evaluation Methodology

The TAC provided feedback on the evaluation methodology:

- G. Corazzola commented that the public would likely have concerns with the first step of the evaluation process as environmental factors are not included. The Project Team explained that the objective of the first step was to focus on reasonable alternatives (i.e. those alternatives that meaningfully address the purpose of the study at a reasonable cost). It was noted that members of the public have made similar comments. To address this, the Project Team has committed that more than one corridor will be carried to the second step of the evaluation process. It was also noted that the Project Team would review the first step of the evaluation based on comments received.
- M. Turpin commented that there are many practical elements relating to the objective that should also screen the alternatives. There is a need to know who the users of this Union Pearson link will be. For example, if the primary users will be tourists (with luggage), an alternative with a transfer may not be feasible. Comment noted. This issue will be factored in to the modelling to determine ridership on the various alternatives.
- M. McLeod suggested that the ToR include an evaluation process that includes opportunities for future expansion. This comment was noted and will be considered.

**5.0 Final Comments, Wrap-up**

5.1 I. Hausmanis offered to make update presentations to staff and Council at the Region of Peel and City of Toronto as required as we progress through the study. It was requested that any requests for additional presentations be directed to I. Hausmanis.

5.2 G. Corazzola from the City of Toronto stated that the City is consolidating its comments and a summary will be provided to GO/AGM/MRC/ECoplans next week. City of Toronto

5.3 I. Hausmanis agreed to send the presentation to the City of Toronto and all other members of TAC. Proponent

5.4 It was noted that the members of the TAC were not notified of the September 13<sup>th</sup> follow-up PIC. It was agreed that the members of the TAC will be added on the notification list for all future public consultation events. Proponent

*The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.*

*The forgoing represents the writer's understanding of the major items of discussion and the decisions reached and/or future actions required. If the above does not accurately represent the understanding of all parties attending, please notify the undersigned immediately upon receiving these minutes (905-823-4988).*

Minutes Prepared by:  
**Ecoplans Limited**

---

Amy Didrikson

cc: Attendees  
Other TAC members