

---

## **APPENDIX J**

### **Responses to Municipal, Agency and First Nation Comments During Pre-Submission Review of the Draft Terms of Reference**

---

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	Upon further review of the project schedule, I believe our office would rather be involved later in the project once the EA study has passed the Terms of Reference stage.	Comment noted
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	<p>The study area appears to be located within a primarily urban landscape and the assessment seems to include most of the required considerations. Since terrestrial natural heritage features are likely to be of high local rather than broader significance, the second step of the Downtown-Airport terrestrial natural environment evaluation should not be restricted only to Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Natural Heritage Systems and Wildlife Corridors.</p> <p>Other criteria features such as trees should also be noted.</p> <p>The aquatic and terrestrial assessments should be quantitative (as for air quality) as well as qualitative.</p>	Comment noted. All significant natural features will be considered.
Regional Municipality of Peel	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Peel is a major client for GO Transit services. As you are aware, GO rail service was initiated in the Region of Peel.</p> <p>There is a rapidly growing need for GO rail services, especially in the area of northwest Brampton</p> <p>The Georgetown GO line bisects one of the most rapidly growing areas of Ontario</p> <p>Places To Grow is a provincial policy that will require major new investment in interregional transportation. In addition, the expectation of rapidly rising fuel prices will make GO transit service in Peel and GTAH even more vital in the future.</p> <p>Can new service be made available quickly enough to lead development and encourage the future use of transit at a higher level than today?</p> <p>How will this EA affect the ability to expand future service on the GO Georgetown line?</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>This IEA study will be consistent with "Places To Grow" as Provincial policy. A section on Places to Grow has been added to the ToR</p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p>Part of the purpose of this IEA study is to examine potential alternatives that will address the deficiencies in GO Transit's existing infrastructure capacity to meet future demands along the Georgetown line for the next 20 to 30 years. A key focus of this study is to ensure that the Preferred Alternative does not preclude future service expansions for</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>A major concern is the need to move more quickly towards all-day, two-way service on a frequent basis. Will actions be taken as a result of this EA process that will result in constraining or limiting future GO service on the Georgetown line from a capacity perspective?</p> <p>Secondly, are actions going to be taken as a result of this EA process which will make the expansion of future GO services on the Georgetown line much more expensive?</p> <p>And finally, are we precluding the use of the Georgetown line for the future use for services to Guelph and Kitchener/Waterloo? All of these issues are of concern for the public interest of Peel and of the GTAH area.</p> <p>We recognize that the transportation system in the GTAH has to be developed to serve all users. Transportation decisions should be made while recognizing the relative benefits for different groups of users.</p> <p>The current IEA process is intended to be an open process which identifies the basic trade-offs between various users, beneficiaries, stake-holders and groups that may be disadvantaged by the recommendation of the EA process. The EA should look at all reasonable alternatives. With the current wording of the Draft EA Terms of Reference, there would appear to be a bias which may automatically favour the UPAG option over the other alternatives. I will elaborate further on this in the detailed comments below.</p> <p>The statements of the purpose and rationale of each component of the EA are very important drivers and determinants of the outcome of the whole EA process. The eventual outcomes of the EA process depend heavily upon how the purpose and rationale are defined.</p> <p><b>Detailed Comments</b></p> <p>Detailed comments below are referenced by giving the page number, section number and paragraph number respectively.</p> <p>p4, s.1.1.2, p2</p> <p>It should be noted in reference to airport service that the EA "has been expanded to look at all reasonable options for an express</p>	<p>GO Transit along the Georgetown line.</p> <p>Required future expansion will not be constrained. This study will develop alternatives that will allow GO Transit to provide an all-day two-way service along the Georgetown corridor and accommodate both the existing latent demand in the corridor as well as the forecasted growth over the next 30 years.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Project Team will ensure that the Preferred Planning Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative Method do not preclude future opportunities along the Georgetown line.</p> <p>Commented Noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Descriptors such as "express", "direct" and "seamless" have been removed from the requirements for the airport transportation link</p> <p>References to UPAG in the ToR have been changed to note that UPAG would be the operator of the service only if a specific AirLink service is selected as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>This comment has been noted by the Project Team. An</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>transportation link”, and this sets the tone for the purpose statement to follow. It indicates that the airport rail service is intended to be express in nature</p> <p>A decision was made to bundle two EA projects into one and this decision on EA structure could affect the implementation timing of the future GO Georgetown service improvements. We would like assurances that the approach of having a combined EA for the two projects is the best way to avoid future delay to the expansion of the Georgetown service. Specifically we would like to know if two separate EA’s would be a faster way to get service improvements implemented on the <u>GO Georgetown line?</u></p> <p><u>p5. s2.1</u></p>	<p>appropriate revision in the ToR has been made. The words “express”, “seamless” and “direct” have been removed from the description of the type of service required</p> <p>The Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and the Airport Transportation Link are being planned together in recognition that the preferred alternative could potentially result in infrastructure improvements and service operations within the same corridor. They cannot be planned or designed separately if the result of this study has both components in the same corridor sharing the same track.</p>
	<p>This section presents quite a clear statement of EA purpose and rationale for the Georgetown EA GO project. However, we would like it stated that the service should work towards an all-day, two-way service on a frequent basis for the Georgetown line.</p> <p><u>p6. s2.2</u></p>	<p>This comment has been noted by the Project Team. An appropriate revision in the ToR has been made.</p>
	<p>This section on the airport transportation link does not state a clear purpose and rationale for the airport transportation link. Rather, it starts off by mentioning the lack of a direct, frequent, rapid, reliable, seamless transportation connection to the Pearson airport. The purpose is only hinted at by inference. Furthermore, the rationale is not presented. Instead a <u>history</u> of the Air Rail Link Project is given. Furthermore the purpose <u>hinted</u> at is narrow in scope and it may eliminate most, if not all, of the alternatives being considered as part of the EA process.</p> <p>The purpose and rationale should be more broadly and clearly defined because it affects the course and the conclusions of the airport transportation link EA. The purpose should directly consider the needs and alternatives as means to improve transportation service in the study area for the various groups of transportation users.</p> <p><u>p6. s2.1. p7</u></p>	<p>The Project Team has revised the Purpose State of this ToR based on comments received from the public, members of the PLC, and members of TAC.</p> <p>The purpose statement now reads “As such, the purpose of this component of the study is to examine alternatives, both within and outside of the Georgetown South Corridor, in order to identify a preferred alternative to provide a frequent, rapid, reliable transportation connection between two of the busiest and fastest growing transportation hubs in the GTA (Union Station and LBPIA).</p> <p>Although the primary purpose of the study is to identify a preferred alternative to provide a frequent, rapid, reliable transportation connection between Union Station and LBPIA, the opportunity to derive local transportation benefits from the proposed services, where feasible, will also be examined. These opportunities include enhanced local transit connections (e.g., community has previously suggested additional stops) and will be developed when generating and evaluating alternatives.”</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>We agree generally that it is important to have the “improvements proceed expeditiously”. However, it should not be assumed that the public interest is best served by having the express rail link takes precedence over all other transportation services in the area and that this must be implemented ASAP.</p> <p>It should also be noted in paragraph 5 that the UPAG proposal must have EA approval before it becomes a project. This is an important condition that will come up later in the detailed comments.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>EA approval is required before any proposed infrastructure improvements can proceed.</p>
	<p>p7, s3.0, p1 While the study area shown encompasses most of the alternatives being investigated in the EA it should be noted that it does not include the major market area in Peel and beyond which generates most of the GO Georgetown traffic.</p>	<p>This comment has been noted by the Project Team. The Project Team will ensure that any preferred alternative will not preclude potential interconnectivity with future transit initiatives.</p>
	<p>p11, s5.1, p1 References are made to a “rapid” transportation link. Page 4 referred to an “express” transportation link. This is a further reference that should relate back to the purpose statement.</p>	<p>This comment has been noted by the Project Team. An appropriate revision in the ToR has been made.</p>
	<p>p11, s5.1.2, p1 A complete market analysis should be done for the study area, taking into account airport passengers, airport employees, GO transit users, commuters travelling on an express basis from Union to the Pearson area, public transit users, tourists etc. Past work on this however, has been piecemeal and incomplete. The whole subject of transportation market analysis seems to have been overlooked in the draft EA. O/D markets should be quantified as a basis to assess the effectiveness of the alternatives. Otherwise, we have no basis to understand the effectiveness of the various alternatives and what they achieve.</p>	<p>An airport passenger survey is being carried out to gather data in response to various technology, fare and travel time choices. This data will then be used to generate ridership estimates in the various corridors. This real time data will be supplemented by other available information from previous studies.</p>
	<p>p14 References are made on this page and elsewhere in the report to the “jurisdiction of UPAG”. This would seem to be presumptuous. UPAG will only have “jurisdiction” if the EA selects Blue 22 as the preferred option and recommends that it proceed.</p> <p>In reference to “Ability to implement in a timely manner”, one of the evaluation criteria associated with the EA alternatives is timing of the</p>	<p>References to UPAG in the ToR have been altered to note that UPAG would be the operator of the service only if a specific AirLink service is selected as the preferred alternative. If Georgetown line is not the selected Preferred Planning Alternative for the Airport Transportation Link, the GO Transit component of this IEA will still continue to proceed.</p> <p>This comment has been noted by the Project Team. “Implementation in a timely manner” has been removed</p>



**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>p24, s7.2 Peel staff would like to be included in the consultation process and involved in the evaluation work.</p>	<p>the ability of each Planning Alternative to derive local transportation benefits and, where feasible, enhance local transit connections.</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Peel is a member of the Project Team's Technical Advisory Committee. As such, the Region will be kept apprised of project activities through scheduled meetings at key project milestones throughout this IEA study. We welcome the Region's continued input of their advice and suggestions.</p>
<p>City of Toronto</p>	<p>p27, s8, last para Where is attachment A the consultation record? As discussed at the meeting of the study TAC on September 7th, a new or expanded section should be included before or as part of Section 2 or 5, more clearly identifying the specific factors comprising the Problem Statement and Opportunities for the undertaking, especially related to the air transportation link component, which should include better definition of the intended travel markets /customers being served, and clearly defined project objectives. Section 5.1, page 11 - This section does not discuss how the Rationale will be developed. It implies that this has already been done. Section 5.2, page 14 - Point #5 is a leap in logic as it discounts bus service as a possibility and presumes that the only alternative that could be taken to the alternative design phase involves the rail corridor. This is repeated on the flow chart on page 15 and in Section 6 on page 19. Section 5.2.1, Page 16, GO Transit Improvements - While recognizing that the planning alternatives for the GO Transit improvements will be assessed at a high strategic level, the points listed in this section should include reference to the railpath in some fashion (e.g., "the degree to which the alternative impacts other road, pedestrian and trail facilities"). Section 5.2.2, Page 17, Airport Transportation Link - Under the category of "Socio-Economic Environment" there criteria on "Potential Impacts to Recreational Facilities Including Schools" includes the measure "Potential impact to linear corridors with the opportunity for future recreational opportunities." This specific measure is not included in the "Evaluation Method Discussion Paper" available on the project website. While it is assumed that the June 2006 Draft</p>	<p>It will be included in the final version of the ToR. This section has been expanded in the final ToR document and the specific markets being served have been noted.  This section has been expanded in the final ToR  Bus service expansion is one of the options for expansion of the GO service. However, if it is selected as an option the service can be implemented without the need for an environmental assessment  This has now been included by referencing the impact on pedestrians and pathways.  This has been included in the ToR, The "Evaluation Method Discussion Paper" was an early paper for initiating discussion. The ToR has now been updated and supersedes anything in the discussion paper.</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>Terms of Reference would be the more current and complete version of the criteria and measures, we would draw this to your attention.</p> <p>Section 5.2, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, Table on Page 17- As part of the evaluation of both planning and design alternatives, specific criteria should be included under Socio-Economic Environment or as a separate criteria category, to assess an alternative's compatibility with municipal planning objectives, policy and initiatives. For the City of Toronto, this includes City Building and City Beautification initiatives in addition to the other encompassing policies within the Toronto Official Plan. Although the draft ToR includes municipal policy as a factor in selecting alternatives and developing a rationale, consideration should be given to including specific criteria in the evaluation criteria tables used during the EA (e.g. Page 17) assessing how an alternative supports:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Official Plan and other municipal planning and policy objectives ; Provincial policy</li> <li>2. Municipal urban design objectives (e.g. streetscape, public space, sidewalk improvement/expansion</li> <li>3. Community planning initiatives (such as ability to enhance public spaces, connections and safety); and guidelines consistency with municipal planning objectives, policy and compatible initiatives should be reflected as a separate</li> </ol> <p>Table on Page 18 – Under "Impacts to lands with Archaeological Potential", the corresponding Measure should read, "Areas affected that have previously been undisturbed by development".</p> <p>Section 6.2, Assessment and Evaluation of Design Alternatives - The design alternatives stage provides an important opportunity to consider the inclusion and/or integration of the railpath within the corridor. It would be reasonable to include the railpath as a consideration (e.g., in Table 6.1 on the basis of it as a recreational resource).</p> <p>Section 6.2.1 includes an evaluation component, "Impact on existing road, rail and pedestrian systems". It would be appropriate to include consideration of the rail path and other recreational trials by modifying the evaluation component on Page 23 as follows "Impact on existing and proposed road, rail, pedestrian and trail systems." It is recommended that the specific criteria related to assessing effects on community access and on community linkages be included under both the Social Environment and Transportation Effects evaluation categories to reflect the close interrelationship between the need to</p>	<p>We believe that this requirement is incorporated in Table 5.1 under Social Economic where the criteria reads : "Qualitative assessment of the degree to which the proposed transportation system supports or hinders existing and planned future land use and growth including recognition of growth management plans and policies as articulated in approved provincial and municipal plans and policy documents.</p> <p>ToR wording has been changed as requested</p> <p>In addition to following response , compatibility with" pedestrian networks" has been added under "Technical" in Table 6.1</p> <p>ToR wording in Section 6.2.1 changed to "Impact on existing and proposed road, rail, pedestrian and trail systems." as requested</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>maintain transportation routes and the need to maintain strong connections within and between neighbourhoods from a social and spatial perspective.</p> <p>Section 6.1, 6.2 - Municipal landscaping requirements, tree planting, and greening initiatives should be included among the technical and budget considerations during the generation of alternatives. Given this project's potential affect on built form and the public realm in neighbourhoods adjacent to the rail corridor, opportunities for incorporating public art is encouraged as part of the development of the preferred design alternative.</p> <p>Section 7.2, page 24 - Step (a) in the consultation process should include a review of the problem statement/rationale for the undertaking.</p>	<p>The interrelationship is recognized but including the same criteria under several categories would lead to double counting.</p> <p>Comment noted. These types of issues and many more will be considered during the development of the design alternatives. It is more appropriate to develop the actual considerations based on the option being developed at the time. There will be full consultation on this with TAC and the public.</p>
<p>City of Mississauga</p>	<p>The draft EA Terms of Reference includes a list of Planning Alternatives to the Airport Transportation Link in section 5.1.2. The City of Mississauga has been actively supporting development of the Highway 403/Eglinton Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor which is part of the GO Transit approved Inter-regional BRT program. In 2006, the Province contributed \$63 million to Mississauga for the development of BRT segments within the municipality with a commitment of an additional \$25 million to this project through GO Transit's budget. In addition, the Greater Toronto Airports Authority has been reviewing opportunities to protect for a link from the Renforth terminal to their facilities. The Mississauga BRT segment and airport link should be included in your review of Alternative iv, which is Rapid Transit service within the Eglinton corridor and connection to the airport.</p> <p>The approved EA for the Mississauga BRT segment includes a terminal station located near Renforth Drive/Eglinton Avenue. MTO is currently undertaking a study to examine transit priority measures along Highway 427 between QEW and Highway 401. Also, work is underway to develop a new transit terminal at Kipling station on the Bloor-Danforth subway system. Furthermore, it is our understanding that TTC received approval for the westerly extension of the Bloor-Danforth subway system in the early 1990's to include a station at East Mall and Sherway Gardens, and there is current interest in advancing this proposal to support development of the East Mall area. Although you have identified an option for rapid transit utilizing</p>	<p>The problem statement will have to be fully developed for inclusion in the final EA report based on additional data that will be collected during the study.</p> <p>The Project Team acknowledges the need for a potential Airport Transportation Link to integrate with local transit initiatives such as the Mississauga BRT Link, the Highway 427 transit priority measures south of Highway 401, the new transit terminal at Kipling subway station, and the potential westerly extension of the Bloor-Danforth subway line to the East Mall/Sherway Gardens area. Section 5.1.2 has been revised by the Project Team to reflect the City's comments. Although the main purpose of this study is focused on the deficiencies in GO Transit's infrastructure capacity to meet future demands along the Georgetown South Corridor, as well as the need for a better transportation connection between Lester B. Pearson International Airport and Union Station in Downtown Toronto, the Project Team is aware that there is a need to examine the implications an Airport Transportation Link could create on the surrounding transit network. During the analysis and evaluation of alternatives, the Project Team will ensure that the selection of a Preferred Alternative does not preclude current or future transit initiatives in the area.</p>

**Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and  
 Airport Transportation Link between Lester B. Pearson and Union Station  
 Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference**

**Responses to TAC Comments**

Submission Details	Comment	Response
	<p>GO Lakeshore and Highway 427 to the airport (vii), we recommend that you specifically consider rapid transit connections from the airport to the Bloor-Danforth subway system along Highway 427, which could inter-connect with the proposed Mississauga BRT segment. This alternative would build upon these proposed transit initiatives and would increase transit access opportunities to the Airport from both Toronto and Mississauga.</p>	