

Agenda

Date: January 17, 2007
Purpose: Georgetown South - Environmental Assessment Process
Time: 1:00 PM
Location: AGM Boardroom
 7th Floor
 20 Bay Street, Toronto
Sponsor: AGM - Judy Knight, Program Manager
Phone: (416) 869-3600 ext. 5195
Attendees: Mohammad Murtaza, CEAA ✓
 Vasie Papadopoulos, AGM ✓
 Glen Pothier, GLP ✓
 Imants Hausmanis, AGM ✓
 Dennis Callan, MRC ✓
 Kees Schipper, AGM ✓
 Judy Knight, AGM ✓
 Greg Ashbee, GO ✓
 Kaarina Stiff, TC ✓
 Haley Berlin, MOE ✓
 Ian Upjohn, UPAG ✓
 Mike Bricks, EP ✓
 Bill Aird, CTA ✓
 Rachel Parkin, TC ✓
 Hank
Distribution: All attendees File: GN07_Meetings_IEA Process_Agenda

AGENDA

1.0 OLD BUSINESS (see attached action items from meeting #4, from November 1, 2006 meeting).

2.0 NEW BUSINESS:

- Carry forward { a) Roles for coordination of the EA Report and timelines for various agencies for EA Report
- b) Timing for inclusion of DFO/MOE/MNR in the EA Process meetings.
- Action - write out timeline ← c) CTA to review the internal process with respect to being an RA
- Carry forward { d) Scoping document - level of detail required and level of detail RA's will provide to the scoping document. Review and understanding of scoping document by the team.
- e) Level of detail which RA and FA staff will request in the EA Report.
- f) Public consultation - what, when, how much
- Carry forward { g) Process chart for submitting, reviewing, revising and finalizing sign off of the EA Report. Approximate time for each step.
- h) Schedule for Project.

Potential topics for discussion at Jan. 17 GO Transit GS/ETL project

Agenda Item	Description
Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often it means different things to different people, and if we don't talk about that early on, we will all be trying to achieve different goals. • Related to discussions on timelines and the preparation and review of the EA Report.
Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to have lots of face-to-face meetings, so keep this up; eventually will likely want FAs represented around the table as well, and the agendas may also sometimes include technical issues. • Discuss possibility of including technical staff from MOE/MNR, as appropriate, at meetings where issues of interest to them will be discussed.
CTA's Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTA to explain their process: the fact that they can't make an EA decision until the proponent has filed an application; requirements for posting of final EA or screening report; etc.
Scoping and Level of Detail	<p>Discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of detail RAs will provide in scoping document (needs to be discussed with entire federal team); and what guidance, if any, could be included with scoping document. • Process for ensuring proponent has good understanding of what is required. Options: meet to discuss scoping document once finalized; have proponent prepare work plan or annotated ToC showing how they will address scoping requirements. • Level of detail RAs and expert FAs need/want to see in EA Report; if proponent anticipates difficulty in acquiring that level of detail, consider other options for meeting RAs' needs (e.g. PEMP). • How to scope and write an EA Report that will not require re-opening the EA decision every time the proponent (or construction contractor) wants to make a minor adjustment to the project.
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on current status of federal noise discussions. • Discuss how to deal with this issue concretely on this project (has already been done, at least partially)
Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm RAs will require consultation under 18(3). What specifically is likely to be required, timing of that and coordination with consultation required for provincial EA. • Desire of federal team to receive all info from proponent and MOE related to their consultation activities
FN Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss what may be required, and/or what needs to be done to determine what might be required.
EA Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfirm process for submitting, reviewing, revising, and resubmitting EA Report. Consider options of writing and submitting for review chapters of the EA Report one at a time, and/or submitting technical studies for review and comment as they are

	<p>available, reducing amount of work (and therefore timelines) associated with reviewing draft EA Report..</p> <p>Mention that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on scoping and level of detail early on will help ensure that the first draft of the EA Report will be a strong one, and will help ensure that the review and revision period is kept to a minimum. • Meetings to discuss the federal comments on draft EA Report might be useful, to help ensure that the revisions that the proponent will make to the document will address the comments fully. • The EA Report should: include a section describing how project changes will be handled; and be submitted in 8.5X11 format.
Follow-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is likely to be required?
Timelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General timeline, such as when proponent hopes to have EAs completed and when they want to start construction. • Detailed timeline-related issues, such as, When should proponents submit proposed work plan for bird studies to EC in order to be sure of getting feedback from EC prior to the field season starting?