

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
1	<p>T. Shevlin, P. Eng., Supervisor, Air and Noise Unit. Ministry of the Environment.</p> <p>Letter, dated November 14th 2006</p>	<p>1.0 Socio-Economic (or Social) Environmental Criteria</p> <p>The ToR refers to noise and vibration as criteria for assessment of the Social (Section 6.2.1) or the Socio-Economic (Table 6.1) Environment, which are considered by this review to be among a number of appropriate categories under which noise and vibration might be included.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During TOR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the TOR (Y/N)
	<p>2.0 Noise and Vibration Guidelines The TOR does not indicate specific guidelines under which noise and vibration would be assessed.</p> <p>The accompanying Consultation Record indicates that to members of some citizens groups, particularly in the Weston area of Toronto in which there are a number of older homes adjoining the rail line which would be the subject of the EA, noise and vibration are very important concerns.</p> <p>There would appear to be an underlying assumption expressed in various places in the Consultation Record that MOE will address noises and vibration in the future EA in terms of existing general MOE guidelines. The only existing MOE general guideline that addresses operating rail noise (as opposed to construction noise) is Publication LU-131, Noise Assessment Guidelines in Land Use Planning (October 1997), which is a land use guideline, and thus not applicable to this project. In MOE parlance, land use guidelines for noise are used when proposed housing or other sensitive receptors are to be built near existing noise sources, not when transportation noise sources are to be built or expanded near existing housing (or other sensitive receptors).</p> <p>In the end, the MOE requires guidelines by which to determine the approvability of the Environmental Assessment. In the past, MOE has negotiated project-specific guidelines for operational noise and vibration of new or expanded transportation facilities with the proponents of those facilities, such as GO Transit and the TTC. The previously-negotiated guidelines which comes closest to addressing the current subject proposal is "MOEE/GO Transit Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration Assessment", January 1995 (Draft #9). Although the Airport Link element of the proposal might differ in equipment, scheduling and frequency from conventional GO Transit operations, and will probably be operated by a body other GO, the Protocol nevertheless appears to this reviewer as an excellent technical starting point for noise guidelines for the combined rail sounds on the Georgetown South Corridor resulting from this project.</p> <p>It is suggested here that there are several obvious benefits, particularly in terms of perceived fairness, to having established the assessment guidelines for noise and vibration prior to the use of those guidelines for comparing alternatives in the EA itself. Thus it</p>	<p>We are of the opinion that the guidelines contained in "MOEE/GO Transit Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration Assessment", January 1995 (Draft #9) are appropriate for this study. A copy of the draft Protocol will be provided to MOE and GO Transit will work with MOE to finalize the Protocol. It is recognized that finalizing the Protocol is independent of this EA Study.</p>	N	

December 22, 2006

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>It is further recommended that the noise and vibration emissions of any competing transportation technologies, particularly for the Airport Link, be quantified in the Environmental Assessments, in order that potential noise and vibration impact may be used as criteria for selection of the desired technology.</p>	<p>Technology issues are primarily related to corridor issues and are related to bus or rail. The proposed approach is to address these issues at the planning alternatives using surrogate measure of proximity to surface facilities to indicate potential nuisance effects (see Table 5-1). Additional modeling will be undertaken to assist in the evaluation of design alternatives and to develop specific mitigation measures for the preferred alternative as noted Chapter 6.</p>	N
	<p>3.0 Noise Sensitive Points of Reception</p> <p>The locations at which the noise and vibration guidelines are to be assessed are known as "Points of Reception", which are another area which should be predefined by negotiation between the proponents of the project and MOE. In one current MOE definition, "Point of Reception" means any point on a premises where sound or vibration originating from other than those premises is received. The point of reception may be located on any of the following existing or zoned for future use premises: permanent or seasonal residences, hotels/motels, nursing/retirement homes, rental residences, hospitals, camp grounds, and noise sensitive buildings such as school and places of worship.</p> <p>Other factors incorporated in definitions used by past Protocols include commercial/industrial operations that are exceptionally sensitive to noise or vibration, approved site plans, approved condominium plans or draft approved plans of subdivision.</p> <p>4.0 Construction Equipment</p> <p>The EA document should also note that noise emissions from construction equipment are subject to the limits set out in Ministry Publication NPC-115.</p>	<p>Receivers or 'Points of Reception' will be identified in accordance with "MOE/GO Transit Draft Protocol for Noise and Vibration Assessment", January 1995 (Draft #9).</p>	N	
2	<p>Rob Reed Environment Canada</p>	<p>We are satisfied the proposed ToR will address our mandate, but wish to be involved in the preparation of the EA. We wish to be contacted when a preferred alternative has been selected.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
3	Kitty Ma Health Canada	<p>We have no comments and do not require further involvement with this proposal, until triggered under CEAA. Once it is in the federal system, Health Canada will provide comments upon request by an RA.</p> <p>In view of the available information, it has been determined that Health Canada would not require an environmental assessment under the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)</i> and is therefore not a Responsible Authority (RA) in accordance with the Act. Should CEAA be triggered by another federal agency, Health Canada determines that it could act as a Federal Authority (FA) under section 12(3) of CEAA, if requested to do so by the RA. Health Canada is only involved in federal of multi-jurisdictional environmental assessments where CEAA is triggered. Therefore, Health Canada will not comment on the Terms of Reference at the present time, until requested by a RA.</p> <p>However, regardless of whether CEAA is triggered, Health Canada would like to encourage that any environmental assessment to be conducted include a health impact assessment component. Upon review of the draft Terms of Reference, Health Canada would like to recommend the followings to be included in the environmental assessment as part of the health impact assessment component:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the potential to increase human exposure to contaminants from potential to increase human exposure to contaminants from changes to water quality, air quality, and soil quality taking into consideration of all project activities; 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The health impact assessment will be considered as the study moves forward. Many of the issues outlined below (e.g. air quality, noise, emergency procedures and aboriginal issues) are identified in the ToR. The specific scope of work for the Federal EA will be determined by the RAs in consultation with Health Canada.</p> <p>The study team will consider adding a human health specialist to the team to help interpret the results of noise, vibration and air quality assessments on human health if and when required.</p>	<p>N</p> <p>N</p> <p>N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	December 22, 2006			

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During TOR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the TOR (Y/N)
4	Malcolm Horne Ontario Ministry of Culture	<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 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>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>	Y
		<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 archaeological 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 sites 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>	Y
		<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 	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
5	Eric Advocate, CEAA	<p>We are satisfied the proposed ToR will address our mandate, but wish to be involved in the preparation of the EA.</p> <p>that it will be necessary to construct (e.g., stormwater management ponds)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Comment noted.	N
6	Hayley Berlin, EAAB	<p>As you are aware the Crown has a duty to consult with Aboriginal communities. Further we encourage proponents to consult with potentially interested Aboriginal communities throughout the environmental assessment process in order to identify and address any issues that they may have with proposal. The ToR outlines the consultation activities that have occurred during the preparation of the ToR, as well you have outlined an Aboriginal consultation plan for the EA process. The ToR outlines that Archaeological Service Inc. and Chief Kris Nahrgang of the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation identified the Mississaugas of New Credit, Mississaugas of Scugog Island and the Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nations as having a potential interest in the process. I am unsure how they have identified these communities. Please explain why or how these communities have been identified as having an interest in the proposal.</p>	<p>The focus was to engage those Nations identified by Chief Nahrgang as having a potential interest in the project due to their close proximity or previous engagement with local EAs to determine if they had an interest in the study, to identify any features that should be considered during the study and to identify opportunities for future consultation as the study progresses. These Nations included Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation, Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation, and Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation, the latter of which MINR has afforded Treaty Rights in this area. It is recognized that other Williams Treaty bands may express an interest in the study. Discussions with all interested First Nations will occur from the outset of the Individual Environmental Assessment and continue in a manner appropriate to them. Consultation activities will be adjusted during the Individual EA to meet the particular needs of specific First Nations as those needs are made apparent. As a minimum, each First Nation will be asked to comment at each benchmark, before decisions are made pertaining to planning and design alternatives.</p>	N
		<p>As the proposal is within the boundaries of Williams Treaty area, the ministry suggested that you contact the Aboriginal communities involved in those negotiations. Based on previous correspondence received from the Huron of the Wendat about the study area, the ministry also suggested that they be included during the review of the ToR.</p>	<p>As requested, copies of the ToR submitted to MOE were sent to these groups.</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>It has now come to my attention that the Six Nations of the Grand River may have an interest in your proposal. The Six Nations of the Grand River have requested to be consulted on other transit projects within the study area. As such, the ministry has forwarded a copy of the ToR to the Six Nations and has asked them to indicate if they wish to be involved in the EA process. I recommend that you also contact the Six Nations to determine what level of involvement they may want to have in the proposal.</p> <p>In my review of the ToR, I noticed that you did not contact OSAA or the three branches of INAC (i.e. Specific Claims, Comprehensive Claims and Litigation Management and Resolution Branches) to determine which Aboriginal communities may have an interest in the proposal. While a general INAC contact was part of the government review team, OSAA and the INAC branches were not contacted. As such, I have sent a letter along with the study area map to the branches and to OSAA and I have asked them to identify any potentially interested Aboriginal communities. When I receive a response, I will forward the information to you.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Six Nations will be contacted regarding their desired level of involvement in the study, and the manner through which they wish to be consulted.</p> <p>Comment noted. OSAA will be added to the contact list.</p>	
		<p>The ToR outlines that a Public Liaison Committee (PLC) has been established to ensure that the residents, businesses and other stakeholders can provide input into the EA process. Can you please explain how the members of the PLC were selected and the general composition of the PLC?</p>	<p>The study team considered the overall study area and solicited participation from ratepayer and BIA representatives both along the Georgetown corridor and in farther reaches of the study area. Representatives distant from the study area generally declined to participate. In order to ensure that we had wider business/stakeholder representation we also contacted the Toronto Board of Trade and Tourism Toronto to request representatives for the PLC. The Weston Historical Society also asked to be a member of the PLC and that was agreed to.</p>	

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
7	Ernie Hart, MOE Central Region	<p>The following documents have been considered in this review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station. Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference. October 2006. • EA Terms of Reference Consultation Record. October 2006. <p>As requested, our review has focused on how the ministry's mandated responsibilities will be addressed if the EA is completed as proposed by the ToR.</p> <p>This memorandum includes comments from Central Region Technical Support Section Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning. For your information, I note that the Toronto District Office has identified they will not be providing comments on the ToR at this time.</p>		

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		<p>MOE Legislation and Guidelines</p> <p>Although Section 9 of the ToR discusses approvals which may be required for the project, the ToR does not reference relevant MOE guidelines which need to be considered in the EA. We suggest that the following MOE guidelines be referenced and utilized, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOE's <i>Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual</i> (2003); • <i>Guidelines for Evaluating Construction Activities Impacting on Water Resources</i> (Guideline B-6); • <i>Land Use Compatibility</i> (Guideline D-1). <p>Legislation and appropriate MOE guidelines should be considered when the proponent assesses planning and design alternatives to ensure that the decision making process has regard to applicable policies.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Section 6.3 of the ToR notes that mitigation measures will be developed in accordance with relevant technical guidelines. This would include the recommended guidelines and legislation. We do not think that is appropriate to list specific guidelines as there is always the potential that the list will not be complete or that the guidelines will be modified, updated or replaced during the course of the study.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During TOR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the TOR (Y/N)
	<p>Table 5-1</p> <p>This section of the TOR identifies under the <i>Regional Air Quality</i> criterion that a "Quantitative assessment of pollutant loading based on general emission standards, type of vehicles and number of vehicles/km trips" will be undertaken.</p> <p>We suggest that the Air Quality Assessment Report shall, at a minimum include the following:</p> <p>a) A comparison of predicted contaminant concentrations with all available Ontario Regulation 419/05 Air Pollution – Local Air Quality Regulation Schedule 3 standards and proposed Canada Wide Standards for: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Particulate Matter - Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) as well as PM10 and PM2.5, and selected Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs);</p> <p>b) Assessment of the study area, consisting of a comparison between the background contaminant concentration levels and anticipated contaminant concentration levels resulting from the project, including future traffic volumes</p> <p>We encourage GO Transit to contact Central Region Technical Support Section directly before they begin conducting any detailed Air Quality Impact Assessment so that we may assist in defining the details of the approach that the proponent could use to address the ministry's requirements.</p>	<p>The intent of the assessment at the planning alternatives stage is to assess broader air quality issues.</p> <p>Detailed air quality modeling will be undertaken for the preferred alternative and will include a comparison of predicted contaminant concentrations at specific receivers with provincial objectives. The Project Team will consult with MOE during the preparation of the specific air quality work plan to finalize the methodology and appropriate criteria to be used.</p> <p>It is our understanding that O.Reg. 419 does not apply to motor vehicles. Section 5 of the Regulation states that " This Regulation does not apply to discharge of contaminants from motor vehicles". Therefore, Canada Wide Standards and MOE Ambient Air Quality Criteria should be used in the assessment.</p>	<p align="center">N</p>	

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
	Section 6.2.1	<p>This section of the ToR identifies under the Social Environment criterion that "Impact on approved land use plans" will be a consideration during the generation of alternative designs. The proponent should be advised to consider land use compatibility in terms of the ability of the design alternatives to maintain or establish adequate separation distances to mitigate impacts due to noise, vibration, air, etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Given that the study area is in an existing urbanized area, achieving adequate separation distance may not always be possible. As such, other mitigation measures will also likely be explored as well.</p>	N
8	<p>Martin Powell, P. Eng. Transportation and Works City of Mississauga</p>	<p>Central Region looks forward to providing more detailed technical comments throughout the planning process as the alternatives are identified, evaluated, and when a preferred alternative is determined.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this ToR. In general, we find the ToR to be an acceptable framework to support the proponents' assessment of the undertaking.</p> <p>The City of Mississauga in the letter of September 20, 2006, has provided comments on the Environmental Assessment draft Terms of Reference dated June 2006. Upon review of the submitted project Terms of Reference document of October 2006, the recommendation to specifically consider rapid transit connections from the airport to the Bloor-Danforth subway system along Highway 427 has been adequately addressed through option V in Section 5.1.2.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N
		<p>Our Environmental Services section also advises that since the rail corridor crosses Mimico Creek within the City limits, the capacity of this crossing should be investigated during the detailed design to ensure that it has adequate capacity to accommodate the upstream flows and, if required, recommend any upgrading to the crossing.</p>	<p>Should this corridor be selected through the evaluation of planning alternatives, the evaluation of design alternatives will include an assessment of the hydraulic capacity of structural options proposed for existing/extended and new watercourse crossings, in order to accommodate storm event design flows, determine potential impacts to upstream lands, and recommend any needed upgrades.</p>	N
		<p>Furthermore, as the boundary for this proposal includes sections of the City of Mississauga, we request that the City be added to the distribution lists for technical and public consultation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The City of Mississauga was previously contacted and has been added to the TAC list and distribution list</p>	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
9	Don Boswell Specific Claims Claims Analyst INAC	The only claim that would lie in the area set out in your map for the Georgetown south rail corridor would be the Toronto Purchase specific claim. This claim was submitted by the Mississauga Tribal Claims Council (MTCC) and alleged that the Toronto Purchase of 1787 and 1805 was illegal. Through the Toronto Purchase of 1805, the Mississauga surrendered much of what is now metropolitan Toronto. Canada accepted the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation's claim for negotiation under the Specific Claims policy on July 23, 2002. Negotiators for the parties are trying to reach agreement on what constitutes fair cash compensation for the losses to the First Nation as a result of the 1805 Toronto Purchase. The current ownership of the lands is not in question and is not at issue in this claim.	Comment noted. The Mississaugas of the New Credit are being consulted as part of the process.	N
10	Chief Sharon Stinson Henry, Rama Mnjikaning First Nation	As a member of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama Mnjikaning First Nations acknowledges receipt of your letter of October 27, 2006. A copy of your letter has been forwarded to Karry Sandy, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Ms. Sandy's address is 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2J7 and her telephone number is (705) 792-5087.	Comment noted.	N
11	Jody Holmes, Councillor Alderville First Nation	Thank you for the information, however under no circumstance will any of the correspondence or documentation exchanged between representatives from this organization to the above named individual be characterized as consultation with Alderville First Nation. Section 35 of the Constitution Act. 1982 recognizes and affirms Aboriginal and treaty rights. This protects of these rights and requires a process of consultation and accommodation. At this time we have no comments or concerns, but please forward any new or additional information that may arise.	Comment noted. Discussions will continue with your First Nation as the project continues, and notification will be provided at key points decision-making points during the study.	N
12	Janet Lo Senior Associate Ministry of	Thank you again for your email. This email is to confirm that we have no comments on the ToR. We do wish to be kept informed regarding the EA for the future steps and consultations in the process: evaluation of alternatives, alternative methods, preliminary design, and draft EA report.	Comment noted.	N

GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
 Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
 Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
13	Rod McPhail City of Toronto Public Infrastructure Renewal Ontario Growth Secretariat	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 presubmission 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;	Comment noted. Our intent is to provide a traceable process leading to the selection of the preferred alternatives. We will be examining opportunities to derive local transit benefits; however that is not the primary purpose of the study.	N
				N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During TOR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the TOR (Y/N)
		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:	Comment noted.	N
		<p>1. Section 5.1.2, page 21 – under the descriptions of alternatives, point (i) 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 “Mayor Inter-Regional Surface Transit Link”. A copy of a display panel is attached for your information.</p>	Please note the last sentence in that point that states “Opportunities for dedicated lanes will be reviewed to improve travel time and reliability.” It is our intent to review those issues.	N
		<p>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</p>	The problem being addressed is lack of GO Rail infrastructure in the corridor to allow sufficient commuter expansion in the future. It is not expected that either the “do nothing” option or the expansion of GO Bus service will resolve that problem. Nevertheless those options will be assessed and documented in the EA. If the assumptions are incorrect, then the EA report will document the	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During ToR Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the ToR (Y/N)
		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 (Labeled "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 Alternatives Designs	results accordingly	N
	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.	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 alternatives. This assessment will be undertaken by the various project team specialists in order to determine the magnitude and significance of effects. It should be noted that stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on this process.	N
	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.	Specific measures will be developed during the course of the EA to assess these factors (effects on community access and on community linkages). 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"	N

**GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link
Individual Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference
Response to Agency Comments During Tor Review Period (October 27 to November 28, 2006)**

#	Submission Details (name, format submitted, date)	Comment	Response	Change to the TOR (Y/N)
		<p>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 business to community services (e.g., hospitals and libraries)</p>	<p>We agree with the first comment and proposes that this criteria be changed to read: "Potential Impacts to Schools, Hospitals and Libraries" With regards to the second comment we suggest that the way in which we would measure impacts to emergency services at this level of assessment would be the same for how we would measure impacts to community access. As such, we suggest that this criteria be changed to read: "Potential Impacts to Community Access and Emergency Service Access"</p>	Y
14	<p>Surinder Singh Gill Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs</p>	<p>Provided names of First Nations Organizations to consult (Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and Mississaugas of Scougog Island)</p>	<p>These groups, and additional groups have already been contacted</p>	N
		<p>Suggested contacting Association Of Iroquois And Allied Indians and Anishinabek Nation to identify other potential groups.</p>	<p>Other potential groups have been contacted based on discussions with MOE.</p>	N
		<p>Suggested contacting Indian and Northern Affairs Canada</p>	<p>Indian and Northern Affairs Canada have already been contacted.</p>	N