

November 23, 2006

Ms. Hayley Berlin
Projects Officer
Ministry of the Environment
Environmental Assessment & Approvals Branch
2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5
Phone: 416-314-7106
Fax: 416-314-8452

Dear Ms. Berlin;

I am writing to you to submit my observations, comments and suggestions that I feel are necessary to take into consideration in accepting or denying the Terms of Reference for the GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and The Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson Airport and Union Station.

I will go through the TOR by each page and note what I think should be altered or added to the TOR before it is accepted or denied as a guide to the Environmental Assessments.

Page 2: 1.1.1 Area Context

It states "In the City of Toronto, land use includes residential as well as a variety of light to medium industrial-commercial areas"

It should be added that there are also Schools and Churches along the corridor and that there has been new housing communities built in the past few years and some developments are still being built as we speak. This should be added so that the TOR can make special note that it will deal with the problems and special needs from the schools and churches and to pay attention to the new home owners who have no idea what may happen to the new investment.

Page 1. Introduction

It states: "The other component is to examine alternatives both within and outside of the Georgetown South Corridor for an Airport Transportation Link between Union Station and LBPIA."

There is now a new report in regards to the transportation needs for Greater Growth Horseshoe in the, Places to Grow Report. Would it not be wise to go to the new agency to look for the bigger picture in public transportation needs and see if the ARL is the best venue for the city in the future? The proponent will have a possible 57 year contract which can not be broken. Thereby eliminating a unique corridor for the foreseeable future.

Page 3: 1.1.3 Government of Ontario-“Places to grow” Policy Initiative

Why was this Policy not discussed at any of the PIC’s and PLC meetings if MCR wanted to use it as a reference point in the TOR.

“The expressed purpose of the Places to Grow Act, 2005 are:

(b) To promote a rational and balanced approach to decisions about growth that builds on community priorities strengths and opportunities and makes efficient use of infrastructure:

(c) To enable planning for growth in a manner that reflects a broad geographical perspective and is integrated across natural and municipal boundaries:

What I presume this Act to say is that, any existing infrastructure in the GTA should be used to integrate different municipalities. This implies they are suggesting mass transit across different cities, not selective special interest areas; therefore we must utilize our finite corridors in the most beneficial manner.

Page 3: It states: “Establishes an integrated transportation network that will offer more transportation choices for getting from place to place, reducing congestion on our road:” This speaks for itself and promotes better access for all citizens in their mobility to get from one place to another. The purpose of the ARL is from one set point to another set point with a limited cliental. The Act clearly advocates mass transportation as a means of improving daily life for the whole GTA.

This is reiterated on page 4: “ Within the context of this environmental assessment, The plan also provides guidance to decision-makers for the development, optimized, and/or expansion of new or existing transportation corridors, including: ensuring that corridors are identified and protected to meet current and projected needs for various travel modes.”

Page 9: states “A preliminary evaluation of these alternatives was conducted based on overall cost, feasibility, and desirability.” This statement implies that cost was a major factor in determining the original route was cost, more so then environmental effects. We must remember that this TOR is the guide lines for an Environmental Assessment not a Financial Assessment.

Page 9: 1.1.6 Initiation of the Air-Rail Link Project

It states: “Working with GO Transit in determining possible funding for proposed GO Transit expansion; Transport Canada identified an opportunity to use excess capacity within the Georgetown Corridor to provide enhanced transportation service from Union Station to LBPIA.”

Since Transport Canada is using the excess capacity for the justification of the ARL. Where is the report that evaluated the Corridors present usage and the projections of the maximum capability of the Corridor? Since the TOR has incorporated this statement as justification for both projects if we find that there was no substantiality for the statement then both projects should stop until the correct information is gathered. Another point is if the excess capacity was at level crossings or would it be only if streets are closed and if

bridges and infrastructure would have to be upgraded. When I hear the word excess capacity I think that nothing has to change to increase the movement of goods or people. An example would be the 401 is under capacity if you could put an elevated highway on top of it. Also this statement was made in 2001 and we now have the Places to Grow Act which put Public Transportation as the number 1 priority for any under utilized corridors in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Page 12: Purpose of the GO Transit Georgetown South Corridor Expansion

It is explained that rider ship has grown from 2,500 daily trips in 1985 to over 8,000 daily trips in 2006. Projected growth over the next 30 years will exceed 12,000 daily one-way boarding's.

I would like to know how many extra trains would GO have to run to accommodate these passengers. The reason I am curious about this is because along with GO CN, CP and VIA run on this corridor. We need to know in the TOR what limits the provincial and Federal Governments place on air quality. This is important because it will limit any other new systems being introduced on this corridor. Since the ARL is to be given a 57 year contract right of way we maybe limiting our Public Transport System future growth over a privet System.

Page 14: 2.2 Purpose of the Airport Transportation Link

The 2002 Halcrow Revenue and Rider ship Study that was used has not taken into account the new Porter Island Airline. Just recently the airline has begun service for the business traveler who wants to end in the downtown core. Mayor Miller has said that he was against the 10 flights a day because it could turn into 160 flights a day. This would mean that the Halcrow study of 2002 has not used any of this information in determining the projected users of a proposed ARL. I therefore believe that new studies need to be undertaken before the TOR can even be considered. A new study may find the majority of the projected clients for the ARL will bypass LBPIA all together.

In this report they admit that European Cities use the Rail Systems far more then American Cities. But they have projected the proposed ARL would fall somewhere in between the two. I think that Canada would be very similar to the American models and therefore the projected rider ship would fall far short of their forecasts and skew the initial premise that the ARL is warranted.

Page 17: Section 4.

The TOR as it is written is very vague about the environmental conditions and the potential effects. It should also include the effects the ARL would have on the Hotels in the Airport area. If there was a Public transportation system the hotels would be able to advertise the fact that downtown was an affordable daily commute. Not so if it only starts from the airport at a proposed \$20.00 one way fare.

Page 18: section 4.2.1

“The EA will describe and identify the potential natural, social, economic and cultural environmental effects of the preferred undertaking and alternatives.”

In this section the construction rules should be mentioned so that we would know what the EA would be studying during this disruptive period. An example where this information would have an impact would be Schools and Churches along any corridor selected. Also there are many new developments that have been built and are being built as this TOR is being considered. I think that the MOE needs to have all the information supplied to them so they can make an informed decision to continue with these EAs. Special studies should be included in the TOR to address the interests of the new home owners who have no idea about the proposed ARL in their newly paid for backyards. I find it disconcerting that the Realtor Board does not feel in necessary to inform the new buyers of what is going on. At the very least the proponent must be obliged to inform all of the new property owners with a formal direct mailing. This must be included as part of the TOR.

Page 19: 4.2.2 Mitigation

In this part of the TOR I would like to have clarification. Who determines the “extent possible” in minimizing the environmental effects?

What extent is cost to play in the determination?

I would like to have the scale that will be used to determine mitigating factors explained in the Tor and not just “reasonable”, because everyone has a different notion of reasonable.

The monitoring program needs to be explained now. Who will be responsible in standards and accountability at all stages of the EA and construction, post construction and long term.

How long will the long term be?

Mitigation will also have to deal with property values and nuisance effects.

At the present time I am disputing my property assessment because of what may happen if the corridor behind my property is chosen for both projects. So I would like the TOR to fully explore the effect the projects will have upon property value because that will affect their mitigation costs. It must be written in the TOR and not left to the discretion of the proponent.

Page 25: Table 5-1

Criteria- Travel time: Time to get downtown to the airport.

If the time travel is the determining factor for the corridor then this EA will have already chosen a route by default. This should not be a determining factor, and the TOR must recognize this.

Regional Air Quality: For this measure the TOR should also factor in Smog days. In 2005, there were 48 smog days. It will be important to show the effects the pollutants will have over and above the worst case scenarios on the air quality in the different corridors. The TOR must specify this before the EA can proceed.

Potential Impacts to Schools: In the TOR it says that it will study the impacts to schools by looking at the nuisance effects. I want to demand that the TOR goes further than that. We are talking about 1000 children in two schools in one location that will be affected by the GO expansion. The EA must conduct specific tests dealing with the learn abilities of children during construction and post construction. It must be in writing and not to be trusted that the Proponent will do the right and ethical thing.

Another point I would like to make is that we are not told in which order the Criteria will be rated in terms of importance. This is needed to fully understand the transparency of the EA process.

Page 31: 6.2.1

It states that: “The factor specific environmental specialists will be responsible for determining the overall impact of the various alternatives on the natural, social-economic and cultural environment.”

Will these specialists be responsible and liable in any way for the decisions they make? The TOR must outline their responsibilities.

Under the section: Social Environment. Effects on Children’s health and learning abilities must be added.

Page 32: 6.3

It states: “Mitigation measures will also include recommendations for a monitoring program.”

I want the TOR to make clear reference that a monitoring program will be installed for certain and not just recommended. Also I think that the PLC should be able to dictate a certain amount of the monitoring program. This is to insure that the Proponent is at arms length during this process.

Section 7: EA Consultation Plan

During the consultation process up to now we have witness numerous errors on the part of the Proponent.

1. From some of the fist public meetings the facilitators notes were modified when the minutes were issued.
2. The minutes that were taken at the PIC and PLC did not identify the speakers. They are useless as a point of reference if they were to be needed.
3. The correspondence with some of the PLC members was not successful. This led to less participation then would be desired. At one meeting only 9 of 20 members were in attendance.
4. At one of the PLC I suggested that I would like to fill one of the empty chairs, but was refused.

5. A TDSB Trustee who was seated at the first meeting was very productive. I had asked Mr. Hausmani if a Catholic Trustee could be represented as well as a Public Trustee, and he said he would arrange it. But there was a change of policy and by the second PLC neither was there to represent the children's interests.
6. In the TAC the Proponent has invited the TDSB and the TCDSB as members. I have spoken to the TCDSB member Mr. Kole, his role at the TCDSB is in the planning department. I believe the Terms of Reference has to include a health and learning specialist be added to the TAC to assure the well being of our children is made a priority.

Page 42: Other Approvals Required

It talks about Municipal Noise bylaw amendments/exemption during construction. There has to be an addition to this about the school children as they are within 30 meters of the construction zone.

Page 43: CEEA Coordination

I would like it stated in the TOR document what office private citizens and community groups can call to report any concerns they may have during the EA and what support the member can provide to their concerns.

Page 44: Monitoring

Again special consideration and mention in the TOR must be given to Schools and Churches before the TOR can be accepted as the guide for the EAs. This section talks about baseline information on existing environment conditions. One point that has not been noted in this TOR is that many homes along the Georgetown Weston corridor vary in age from 6 years to 150 years. The monitoring procedure that would be acceptable for modern subdivision homes will not be precise enough to give a true understanding of the existing environment conditions. If we just look at vibration, every home will act different since some are built on foundations of stone, block or cement. I do not attempt to know how vibrations would affect all the different styles of homes so I think that the TOR should include a more detailed procedure for the monitoring of existing environment conditions. I own 2 properties adjacent to the corridor; one was built about 100 years ago on poured cement footings the other built about 50 years ago on a block footing. These two properties are side by side but I am sure they will be affected differently from any increased vibration created in the corridor.

During the past 2 years my family has been very active in the process of combating the ARL project and to some degree the GO Transit Expansion. We have seriously considered moving from our home of 17 years because we thought what was going on was not fair. We don't want to move, and at the present time it would be impossible to get fair market value with the two projects being discussed. I hope that the Ministry of the Environment can look at the impact these two projects will have on tax paying

law abiding citizens. From the beginning we have asked if we will be reimbursed financial for the loss our properties would suffer. Mr. Greg Ashbee said at the Prayer Palace meeting of 2005 that property value will go up or not have any effect whatsoever. A train passing every seven and half minutes will affect my property value, my children's and my and quality of life. I ask that you as Minister keep the well being and rights of the citizens affected by these projects at heart and reject the TOR as it is written in its present form.

Thank You

Carlo Ammendolia
144 Rosemount Ave.
Weston Ont.
M9N 3B9

carloammendolia@hotmail.com

416 241 1244

cc. Ismants Hausmanis
Mike Sullivan – Weston Community Coalition
The proponent SNC Lavalin can not be copied as they
do not want to be involved in this process.