

Berlin, Hayley (ENE)

From: Callan, Dennis [DCallan@mrc.ca]
Sent: October 18, 2006 4:55 AM
To: Rodney Northey
Cc: Berlin, Hayley (ENE); Heeney, Paul (ENE); Imants Hausmanis; Bricks, Mike; Ian Upjohn
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's meeting

Rodney et al

See my responses to your questions below for further discussion at 10:00 am.

Dennis

Dennis Callan, P. Eng.
Principal

McCormick Rankin Corporation

2655 North Sheridan Way

Mississauga, Ontario

Canada, L5K 2P8

MRC: 905-823-8500 *Direct:* 905-829-6235

Fax: 905-823-8503 **New Cell: 647-280-6073**

E-Mail: dcallan@mrc.ca *Web:* www.mrc.ca

From: Rodney Northey [mailto:rn@birchallnorthey.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2006 12:27 AM
To: Imants Hausmanis; Callan, Dennis; Bricks, Mike; Ian Upjohn
Cc: Hayley Berlin; Paul Heeney
Subject: Tomorrow's meeting

Good evening all:

I am following up on our two recent conversations and, in particular, Dennis' interest in discussions on the process outlined in Section 5.2 of the proposed Terms of Reference (ToR).

As set out in the present ToR, the GO Transit Improvements receive a one-step "alternatives to" review, while the Airport Transportation Link receives a two-step "alternatives to" review because of the extensive number of alternatives identified in the ToR.

A few questions:

(1) Some EAs use a screening process to expeditiously focus on the "reasonable" alternatives. A screening process involves minimum standards and a yes/no format. The present ToR does not use a screening process to focus on the "reasonable alternatives", but the language of the step suggests that the idea is to get rid of all unreasonable alternatives. What is the philosophy for this step?

The purpose of our section 5.22 is as a screening process, but not to your definition of screening using minimum standards. Our intent was to take the long list of 10 or more corridor/technology options and reduce it to a more reasonable 3-4 corridor technology options for more detailed evaluation in step 2. Many of the options outside of the Georgetown corridor will have similar travel time, ridership, cost etc and our intent was to screen down to the best 1-2 of these and compare with 1-2 options within the corridor. We have a very public commitment to retain

2006/10/18

at least one option outside of the Georgetown South corridor for a more detailed review after the screening process.

(2) The language of the criteria suggested for the Step 1 process differs from the language of the criteria suggested for the GO Transit improvements and Step 2 of the Airport Transportation link. At present, the criteria are ambiguous on whether they are qualitative or quantitative criteria (i.e., "The level of..."). Do you have any minimum standards in mind to make these criteria quantitative?

We have not set minimum standards. The one criterion that I can think of might be to get to the airport within, say 45 minutes. If an option cannot achieve that then it would not meet the primary purpose of the "Airport link". We can discuss this one at our meeting but we might get a strong public push back since this was never discussed

(3) Your text for 5.2.2 suggests that you are trying to base this step on meeting the "primary purpose" of the undertaking; however, you talk about the relative standard of "how well" an alternative may meet the purpose, rather than the absolute standard of "whether" the alternative meets the purpose. This approach will likely have implications for the "acceptability" of the results to interested parties as the former approach includes more "judgement" than the latter. Did you consider yes/no criteria related to the "purpose" of the undertaking (or the related EA topics of rationale and need)? If so, what were the reasons for rejecting them?

See response above re 45 minutes minimum to the airport

(4) Based on your discussion of the "Blue 22" idea, it seems that it may have some key "feasibility" issues. Is it possible to tie this feasibility discussion into a kind of "feasibility" screen? One example would be a three-part screen (i.e., an alternative must meet all three) based on three criteria:

- (a) capacity;
- (b) catchment; and
- (c) cost.

All of our options will have the appropriate capacity. The catchment area is not germane in that all options start at Union Station and end at the Airport, our two primary catchment areas for purpose of the Airport transportation link. I do not believe we can set a minimum cost. How would we even know what it was until we had determined and designed the best option. It would be open to much debate and would arbitrarily rule out options without considering the benefits side. I have never seen an EA that used a "can not cost more than \$XX" criteria.

Capacity would relate to the line/technology fit; whereas catchment would refer to the location of the option and potential users.

Do these three areas capture the main aspects of the purpose of the undertaking? If not, what is missing?

In considering this approach to criteria, the challenge is whether there are appropriate minimum or maximum standards for each. Some ways of developing minimum or maximum standards on these topics include:

- (a) capacity: alternative must be capable of moving at least X thousands of people per hour (based on a chart that I have recently seen in TTC documents known to Dennis and Mike);
- (b) catchment: alternative must have access to Y tens of thousands of people within Z

transit minutes of the proposed stops (on basis of the Blue 22 idea that any group outside that time zone will find it more time-effective to take driving/ taxi option (ie. some overall total time of 15 transit minutes plus Blue 22 minutes, totalling 37 minutes); and

(c) cost: alternative must deliver capacity at capital cost of no more than \$ XX (could include operating or life cycle costs, but these costs may be too variable to be included here).

The idea behind this particular screen is that any alternative must meet all three screens to get carried forward. However, does this kind of approach strike the appropriate balance between cost, financial reward, and financial opportunity?

I do not know whether this approach has been considered and rejected previously by you; however, perhaps it will assist future discussions.

(5) Your present criterion (4) dealing with potential impacts on residents appears to be a nuisance/ adverse impacts criterion. Is that the intent? How will that affect the routing question shared by the two undertakings? While it would be better from an adverse impacts standpoint to locate these undertakings away from population centres, would it not be better from a benefit's and/or catchment standpoint of maximizing transit use to be located near population centres? Should both considerations co-exist at this stage or should impacts trump benefits?

Criterion 4 is not necessary for our first step screening (as explained in our latest ToR wording) but was inserted at the request of the public who said how can you consider short-listing/screening without taking the "environment" into account? Remember that the "Blue 22" was from downtown to the airport without much consideration for the catchment area in between. We should still discuss criteria 4. Note that all corridors outside of Georgetown will be much more expensive even if they have less "nuisance" effects. ✓

See you tomorrow,

Rodney Northey
Birchall Northey LLP
36 Wellington St. E. Suite 300
Toronto, Ontario M5E 1C7
direct: 416.860-1412
fax: 416.860.1827
email: rn@birchallnorthey.com