


November 27, 2006

MEMORANDUM

**TO: Hayley Berlin
Project Officer
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch**

**FROM: Ernie Hartt
Supervisor
Technical Support Section**

**RE: Central Region Comments
Terms of Reference
GO Transit: Georgetown South Corridor Service Expansion and Airport
Transportation Link
Our File No. EA 03-05-05**



This is in response to EAAB's memorandum of October 27, 2006 regarding the above-noted Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference (ToR). This project involves two components. The first component of the proposal is to examine possible infrastructure improvements to the Georgetown South rail corridor to meet the increasing demands for GO Transit service between Peel Region and the City of Toronto. The second component of the proposal is to examine alternatives, both within and outside of the Georgetown South rail corridor, for an airport transportation link between Union Station and Lester B. Pearson Airport. It is noted that this project was first initiated by GO Transit as a Group B project under the *GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA)*.

Scope of Review

The following documents have been considered in this review:

- *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.*

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.

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.

MOE Legislation and Guidelines

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:

- MOE's *Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual* (2003);
- *Guidelines for Evaluating Construction Activities Impacting on Water Resources* (Guideline B-6);
- *Land Use Compatibility* (Guideline D-1).

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.

Table 5-1

This section of the ToR identifies under the *Regional Air Quality* 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.

We suggest that the Air Quality Assessment Report shall, at a minimum include the following:

- 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);
- 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

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.

Section 6.2.1

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.

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.

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. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact Ross Lashbrook at (416) 326-4839.

Yours sincerely,



Ernie Hartt
Supervisor
Air, Pesticides and Environmental Planning
Technical Support Section

- c. Ross Lashbrook, Technical Support Section, MOE
Anne Neary, Technical Support Section, MOE
Central Region EA File
A & P File