



City Planning Division
Metro Hall, 22nd Floor
55 John Street
Toronto, Ontario M5V 3C6

Transportation Planning
G. Corazzola, Sr. Planner
Tel: 416-397-0041
Fax: 416-392-3821

FAX

DATE: December 1, 2006

TO: Hayley Berlin

COMPANY: MOE

FAX NO.: (416) 314-8452

TEL. NO.:

FROM: Gene Corazzola, Senior Planner
SECTION: City Planning Division - Transportation Planning
TEL. NO.: 416-397-0041

TOTAL NO. OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER PAGE): 2

SUBJECT: GO Georgetown South Corridor / Airport Transportation Link EA Terms of Reference

Hi Hayley,

Apologies for the Fax problem.

Here is the 3rd page.

The full paragraph should read,

4. Section 6.2.1 - It is recommended that a specific criteria related to effects on community access and on community linkages be included under the Social Environment and Transportation Effects evaluation categories listed on Pages 31-32 to reflect the close interrelationship between the need to maintain transportation routes and the need to maintain viable connections within and between neighbourhoods from a social and space perspective.

The original will be sent out by mail to you today also.

Regards,
Gene

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Gene Corazzola", written over the typed name.

Berlin, Hayley (ENE)

From: Gene Corazzola [GCorazz@toronto.ca]
Sent: December 18, 2006 3:02 PM
To: Mike Bricks
Cc: Berlin, Hayley (ENE); Dennis Callan; Hank Wang
Subject: Re: GO Georgetown South IEA

Hi Mike,

We will include Heritage Preservation Services among the groups we consult with in the City. We have not requested comments from them to date but they now have a copy of the ToR.

Brian Gallaugher (Preservation Co-ordinator) of the section will be our contact. If you ever need to contact him directly during the study, his number is (416) 338-1083.

Brian will advise if/when the Toronto Preservation Board need to be consulted at any point.

Regards,
Gene

Gene Corazzola
Senior Planner, Transportation Planning
City of Toronto
Metro Hall, 22nd Floor
55 John Street
Toronto, ON
M5V 3C6
(416) 397-0041
E-mail: gcorazz@toronto.ca
www.toronto.ca/planning/tp_index.htm

>>> "Bricks, Mike" <MBricks@ecoplans.com> 12/16/2006 11:40 AM >>>
Gene

As I understand it, you and Rod are our 'one-window' into the City of Toronto. Can you please confirm if you have also been discussing this study with Heritage Preservation Services Unit and/or the Toronto Preservation Board. If not, will you be including this department in the future? If not, do you have a contact that we could directly consult with in the future.

Thanks
Mike

Berlin, Hayley (ENE)

From: Gene Corazzola [GCorazz@toronto.ca]
Sent: December 14, 2006 3:16 PM
To: Berlin, Hayley (ENE)
Subject: Re: GO Transit ToR

Hello Hayley,

Thanks for the chance to review the proponent's responses.

We are satisfied with the highlighted amendments and acknowledge GO Transit's commitments to address our remaining concerns during the EA, including a commitment to develop more specific criteria for evaluation of alternatives.

Our only specific comment relates to the response for Item 4. We believe the response should be strengthened to read, "Specific measures **will** be developed during the course of the EA to assess these factors (*effects on community access and on community linkages*)" and "These measures **will** be included under the criteria of "Effect on individual properties and access" and "Impact on existing and proposed road , rail, pedestrian and trail systems".

Regards,

↳ GO Transit agrees - Draft Dec 16, 2006
 Summary of Chgs to ToR.

Gene Corazzola
 Senior Planner, Transportation Planning
 City of Toronto
 Metro Hall, 22nd Floor
 55 John Street
 Toronto, ON
 M5V 3C6
 (416) 397-0041
 E-mail: gcorazz@toronto.ca
 www.toronto.ca/planning/tp_index.htm

>>> "Berlin, Hayley (ENE)" <Hayley.Berlin@ontario.ca> 12/12/2006 2:08 PM >>>
 Hi Gene

I'm providing you a copy of the City's comments and GO Transit's responses for the Georgetown South Corridor/ARL ToR. I believe that your concerns have been addressed by GO Transit's commitments to develop more specific criteria during the EA and through consultation. As well, proposed amendments have been proposed - I've highlighted those for your consideration.

If you have any concerns please let me know by Friday December 15, 2006. Thank you and I appreciate the quick turn around.


Hayley

<p>This letter is a joint response to your request for comments (dated July 27, 2005) on the above noted EA Terms of Reference (ToR) report from staff of the City of Toronto's City Planning Division, Transportation Services Division, Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division and the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC Service Planning Department).</p>	
<p>Since study initiation, City and TTC staff have been given the</p>	<p>Comment noted. Our intent is to provide a traceable</p>

November 29, 2006

BY FAX AND MAIL

Ms. Hayley Berlin
Project Officer
Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch
2 St. Clair Avenue West
Floor 12A
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5



Dear Ms. Berlin:

Re: GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion & Airport Transportation Link between Pearson Airport and Union Station Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference

This letter is a joint response to your request for comments (dated July 27, 2005) on the above-noted EA Terms of Reference (ToR) report from staff of the City of Toronto's City Planning Division, Transportation Services Division, Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division and the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC Service Planning Department).

Since study initiation, City and TTC staff have been given the opportunity to participate in the pre-submission phase of this study including meetings with the proponent and other stakeholders providing input into the ToR. In summary, our principal areas of concern on the proposed undertaking and study to date have related to:

- Study process – Ensuring a traceable process for the identification and evaluation of all reasonable planning and design alternatives in the study area, while applying comprehensive, and context-specific evaluation criteria and planning and design principles in the assessment and development of alternatives. It is important that refinements to the evaluation criteria and methods proposed in the ToR during the EA study are made in cooperation with the public and community stakeholders;
- Potential impacts to adjacent communities (e.g. minimizing adverse effects on transportation access and connections, community linkages, socio-economic and environmental effects, land use, and planned/future recreational opportunities);
- Compatibility with City planning policies, guidelines and initiatives particularly related to transportation, urban design, and natural and built heritage;
- Ensuring sufficient evaluation of opportunities to provide local transit benefits including enhanced local transit connections;
- Potential impacts on municipal infrastructure (e.g., street-related, including water, utilities).

Our written comments on the Draft ToR were last provided and discussed with the proponent and their consultants in September 2006. Overall, we are generally pleased that our concerns are reflected in the submitted ToR document and that the proponent is committed to working closely with City/TTC staff during the EA study process. However, summarized below are some specific comments for your consideration which we believe require some further clarification in the ToR or during the EA stage:

1. Section 5.1.2, page 21 - Under the descriptions of alternatives, point ii) indicates that Express Bus service will be evaluated based on the "*existing roadway configuration*" being maintained between Union Station and Pearson Airport. This approach seems to limit a full assessment of this alternative by restricting the option to conversion of existing vehicular lanes only. While this may be acceptable, there may be sections where it is more appropriate to construct or use additional or expanded lanes or structures to complete the network. For example, MTO is currently undertaking an EA Study for Highway 427 improvements between the QEW/Gardiner and Hwy 401 which includes opportunities to implement transit priority measures. Such a facility could benefit an express bus service between Pearson Airport and Union Station as well as serve an interregional transit facility in the Etobicoke Centre area connecting to the Bloor subway line. As part of recent public consultation for the MTO study, information was presented regarding Higher-Order Transit opportunities and identifies the Highway 427/QEW/Airport corridor as a "Major Inter-Regional Surface Transit Link". A copy of a display panel is attached for your information.
2. Section 5.2, page 23 Point# 5 – The specific wording used to describe this scenario discounts expanded GO bus service as a possibility and presumes that the only alternative that could be taken forward to the alternative design phase involves the rail corridor. The wording used in Point #5 on Page 27 is more appropriate.

Similarly, Exhibit 6-1 makes the advanced presumption that Airport Rail options in the Georgetown corridor would be the only alternative for the airport link component (and also under the jurisdiction of GO) that could still continue to the alternative design stage. For example, it doesn't include option vii) on Page 22 among the given list of alternatives. Presumably, that option would still be within the jurisdiction of GO and UPAG (labelled "green"), but would not be located in the Georgetown corridor. To accurately correct for this possibility, the shaded green box in Exhibit 6-1 should simply read, Assess Alternative Designs.

3. Section 5.2.2 - page 24 - The second paragraph states that during step one of the assessment of Planning Alternatives for the air transportation link, options will be evaluated based on how well they address "*...the primary purpose (of the undertaking) of providing a frequent, rapid, reliable transportation service to the airport, how well the various alternatives provide ancillary benefits of enhancing the local transit network, and the estimated public costs to implement the alternatives ..*" During the EA stage, further definition of "frequent, rapid and reliable" will be required. Additional explanation is needed of the relative importance/weighting to be placed on each of those three factors in determining which alternatives proceed to step 2 of the planning evaluation, particularly where competing alternatives rank equally well on different factors (where the assessed benefits offset each other). This is expected to be an important consideration when deciding which alternatives proceed to step 2 of the planning evaluation and which options are screened out.

4. Section 6.2.1 - It is recommended that a specific criteria related to effects on community access and on community linkages be included under the Social Environment and Transportation Effects evaluation categories listed on Pages 31-32 to reflect the close interrelationship between the need to maintain transportation routes and the need to maintain viable connections within and between neighbourhoods from a social and space perspective.
5. Table 5-1 Page 26 - It is recommended that the measures for assessing Potential Impact to Schools be expanded to include effects on community services and facilities (e.g. hospitals, libraries). These facilities are located within a short distance to the rail corridor in the Weston Area.

Also, as part of the Criteria Potential Impacts to Community Access, additional measures are recommended to assess impacts on access by emergency services as well as impact to access by residents and businesses to community services (e.g., hospitals and libraries).

I hope these comments are helpful in your review. If you have any questions or require further clarification on any of these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me or Mr. Gene Corazzola, Senior Planner at (416) 397-0041.

Yours truly,



Rod McPhail
Director, Transportation Planning

Attachment

