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This summary report documents Stakeholder Working Session #1 held by Metrolinx on March 8th, 2012 as part of the Electrification project (the Project). The purpose of this working session was to present information and seek feedback on the Project, including the electrification design for the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors, as well as an environmental assessment for Phase 1: Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. See Appendix A for a copy of the Stakeholder Working Session #1 Agenda.

This session was the first in a series of working sessions to occur throughout the Project to provide project updates, seek feedback and input, as well as to answer questions from stakeholder participants. A range of stakeholders was invited to participate (see Appendix B for a copy of the e-mail invitation). There were fourteen stakeholder participants in attendance representing a range of organizations and interests, including: business, energy, crime and safety, environment, transit and urban planning. Key members of the Project Team were also in attendance.

The session opened with a half-hour presentation from the Project Team (see Appendix C for a copy of the presentation slides). Karen Pitre, Executive Director of Electrification spoke on behalf of Metrolinx, Kevin George, Vice President and Regional Business Manager, on behalf of Parsons Brinckerhoff, and Paul Draycott, Vice-President Environmental Global Business Unit, on behalf of Morrison Hershfield. Nicole Swerhun of Swerhun Consulting was the independent facilitator for the session.

The presentation summarized background information on the project, work completed to date, a summary of the technical/engineering design components, as well as an overview of the Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment) process being followed for Phase 1: Electrification of the ARL, and next steps. A group discussion followed the presentation.

The following summary of the discussion was written by Bianca Wylie of Swerhun Consulting and is intended to summarize the key themes discussed; it is not intended to be a verbatim transcript.
DISCUSSION

Following the presentation portion of the Agenda, the working session was dedicated to hearing from participants. This was an opportunity for people to ask questions, and also to respond to the following three focus questions posed by Metrolinx, including:

1. What are the key issues and opportunities you would like to see considered through the project?
2. Do you have any advice on other key stakeholders/constituencies to be engaged as part of the project?
3. Do you have any other advice for the Electrification Team at this point?

The following summary of the discussion is organized by theme (as opposed to chronologically). In some cases, participants asked questions, and in others comments and advice were provided. Responses from Metrolinx to questions posed are noted in italics.

1. **Commitment to Electrification**
   - Will diesel be an alternative considered in the Airport Rail Link (ARL) EA? *No, the focus of the ARL EA (TPAP) will be on potential impacts of electrifying the ARL corridor, not on assessing alternative ways to electrify or alternatives “to” electrifying (e.g., diesel). The EA for the Electrification of the ARL is focused on the impact assessment of implementing the project (e.g., what are the potential impacts associated with electrifying the ARL service).*
   
   - I’m concerned about the framing or set-up of the environmental health situations. Is Tier-4 diesel technology suitable? Do we need to electrify? When the ARL EA comes back to the funding discussion, these points will be raised. If the EA studies don’t show an advantage to electrification, is there still a reason to electrify? *Metrolinx made the decision to electrify because of transportation-related benefits, not because of health-related benefits.*
   
   - Beyond air quality, there is also the economics of the Electrification Study, as diesel was priced too low in the study. *We are not revisiting the decision to electrify – the decision has been made. The first phase of electrification is the EA for the electrification of the ARL Service. The economic benefits of electrification are not part of this scope of work. Metrolinx has already established the need/justification for electrification – this has already been done via the Electrification Study. In other words, we will not be doing it again.*
   
   - If the electricity cost is $1 then what is the relative diesel cost? *There is not a simple answer to this question. For more background, it would be best to review what was published in the Electrification Study. There was a sensitivity analysis done looking at different price points. There was an assumption made that the price of diesel will go up faster than the price of electricity, but we can’t predict the future.*
   
   - What can stop electrification? The Board of Metrolinx approved it, but there is not committed funding yet, is that correct? *Correct.*
   
   - I’m sensing angst around the notion that the idea of electrification is going to come off the table. I just want to provide a reminder that electricity is manufactured in Ontario and the Ontario Government has a smart-grid plan that is a key element of their future plans.* Budget
may have an impact on when electrification is implemented, but I don’t see them totally backtracking on their decision.

- What will it take to make sure this is not just an EA, to keep us on track to a design and build phase? This comes down to a prioritization exercise. We will develop an implementation plan with an EA, subject to approval. The question of funding will be determined as part of the capital budget process – like all other capital projects.

2. Rolling Stock

- I heard reference to the term EMU in the presentation – is the equipment issue being revisited? When we did the Electrification Study, the decision was made to eliminate the EMU because the cost of a whole GO fleet of EMUs was prohibitive. However we do know that EMUs have much greater benefits for travel-time savings. We have not closed the door on the appropriate rolling stock. It is not part of this scope of work, but the infrastructure built will support both, and we will need to revisit the rolling stock decision.

- Regarding the stock that was bought and whether it would be converted from diesel to electric, is this still part of the plan? Yes, Metrolinx is buying DMUs for the ARL service that will start in 2015. Part of that procurement process was that DMUs could be converted to EMU – that is still part of the plan.

- Bombardier has designed rolling stock with more advanced technology, but it will never see the rails until we have funding from two levels of government. We want to challenge people to realize that it can be done, but it’s a chicken and an egg scenario - we can’t get all the stakeholders around the table in order for it to happen. The Electrification Study did look at this topic. The Metrolinx Board directed us to plan using a commercially viable technology that will be able to happen in a five-year range.

3. Capacity of the grid

How does electricity capacity figure in to the project? When we did the Electrification Study and we had the modeling done and we reviewed it with the Ontario Power Authority, there did not seem to be any issue with the impact on the grid. We’ve talked to Hydro ONE on two separate occasions regarding the substations – both OPA and Hydro ONE are comfortable with the estimated power requirements. Hydro ONE is providing technical input on the high voltage connection and the design for the substation.

- What happens if the grid goes down? We look at the way the systems are built, but we try and make sure it’s not all coming out of the same place, so we can minimize the impact.

- Quick clarification on power – there is adequate system supply in Ontario; we actually have a surplus at night. One thing to consider however is that this system will demand electricity at its peak time, and there may be ways to design the system so it buys electricity at off-peak rates for use during peak times.

4. Catenaries

- What are the pinch points for building catenaries, and what impact are they going to have on design? That’s what we are trying to figure out – we need a certain distance to put up the catenaries outside of the tracks. There may be areas along the corridor that are quite constrained. Also, the USRC is one big pinch point – there is not a lot of room there. We need to
develop solutions. The consultants are designing performance standards. We will identify where
the pinch points are in the system and devise solutions.

- This is really ugly – why would we build something that looks like this? The question comes from
me as a consumer, regarding the impact on neighborhoods. If we wait for the ultimate solution
we’ll end up doing nothing. Electrification, using the technology described today, is a tested and
viable way for improving commuter rail. There is definitely an interest in learning about new
technologies, but to suggest we implement untested technology as part of a commuter rail
system where performance is important is very high-risk and not the direction we are taking.

- The pictures shown look out of date – I was wondering if some of the new systems could be
included in the presentations so that we’re not getting into a long aesthetics discussion when
we get to the neighborhood level.

5. Ownership

- Who will own the electrification infrastructure? Metrolinx. The Weston corridor is owned by
Metrolinx and the airport spur line will be built and owned by Metrolinx.

6. Study scope

- Is the base design principle at this time to plan an approach for the whole system and have
the ability to electrify other lines beyond the ARL? Yes, we’ve tasked our consultants with giving
us the best advice on how to phase this, based on both the ARL section only and the long-term
plan for full electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors. In some cases, for example,
the recommendation might be to put a portal structure over 8 tracks but only electrify 2 at the
moment.

- When you refer to the “Lakeshore” line, where does it end for the purpose of this study? We’re
not going through the tunnel to Hamilton. Right now it’s the Lewis Road layover in the West and
to Bowmanville in the East. In the Electrification Study it didn’t make sense to go to St.
Catharines.

- I would like to provide a clarification on the electrification of the ARL versus the entire system.
The pinch points for the ARL are much different than for the entire system electrification. We
are not going to rush off to Hamilton or Kitchener at this point.

7. Stations

- Regarding performance benefits along the route, are there any further thoughts about added
stops? For this project scope, we are assuming only the current stops are in place. Electrification
is not the issue with stops, it’s property – the flexibility for adding additional stops will not be
impacted by electrification.

- Part of the previous study had a potential station at Eglinton, is that involved in these
projections? No, we’re trying to deal with what is there – if it becomes a station, it’s not too
difficult to project for electrification.

8. Location of substations and other electrification facilities

- The maps presented showed potential locations for electrification infrastructure - have you
identified properties in these locations? We’ve identified properties near Richview and Horner
for the two substations – the next stakeholder working session is intended to review these potential locations. For the Switching Station, beyond identifying a need in the Bathurst area, the answer is no – we have to do more work, it’s a challenge to find real estate in this area. For the Maintenance and storage facility, we’re looking at Willowbrook and we are looking for other options along the corridor.

9. Freight
   • Would the freight rail on CN possibly be electrified? Freight rail really has no interest in electrifying their operations, can’t really answer in regards to those interests or intents.

10. Project Cost
    • If we were doing the work to electrify the ARL, what is the rough ballpark cost to build this piece specifically? The budget in the Electrification Study for the electrification of the ARL service was estimated at $450 million. There has been no further refinement on the Electrification Study cost estimates.
    • Is the costing of this project in the $50 billion estimated cost to implement the Big Move? Answer provided following the meeting: Yes, Electrification was considered as part of the Big Move estimate.

11. Project Timeline
    • Is there a date for delivery on electrification? And if so, what assumptions are built into that date? Assumptions have not changed from those stated in the Electrification Study. The Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the MOE in 2014. Then the project will require approvals and funding. Depending on the decision date, the estimated construction would be approximately 2-3 years from that date. We have estimated 2017 for the operation of an electrified ARL Service.
    • Your presentation featured a few projects that had been undertaken in the United States. How long did these US projects take to construct? While we can’t give a specific number because there is such a variance in scope, we can try to give you an idea of estimates per section of the project. The performance specifications can be developed in approximately six months, and please note that this is specific to the Air Rail Link. It would then take approximately another year to understand the infrastructure requirements required by the performance standards. Finally, the conceptual design would then take 12-18 months to get to a point that it would be ready to go to the EA.
    • As a follow-up, can you provide the timeline for a specific example from the US, say the Boston case? This particular case took five years total, for all of the elements and including construction.
    • Can we get through the EA more quickly as preliminary engineering can change elements of the EA? The pre-planning phase of the EA includes coordination of the environmental work with the engineering/design work. This pre-planning phase includes background environmental studies that will be completed prior to initiating the 120-day Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).
12. Connecting to work at Bathurst, Union Station and Eglinton Crosstown

- To what extent are you taking into account other studies that have occurred, at Bathurst Station and Union Station? The question is really that there are two other related studies that are either done or partly done. At Union station, capacity problems have been identified, and there will still be capacity problems – one of the proposals would be to turn Bathurst into Union Station West. When Metrolinx publishes the Big Move 2.0, will changes in this plan rejig the priorities of what gets electrified? *Firstly, about the Union Station capacity issue – we are not going to solve the Union Station capacity issues within the electrification project timeline. For the electrification of the ARL, we are sticking to what we know now so we can move ahead. We are definitely aware of this other work and connected to it. In essence, we are not waiting to resolve that problem to keep moving forward with the electrification project. Regarding the Big Move 2.0 – we are working with the Big Move 2.0 team to see how the electrification plans would be affected. We are making every effort to stay internally coordinated to understand and assess the impacts of changes on any concurrent project.*

SESSION WRAP-UP

As part of concluding the working session, Nicole Swehrun asked participants about any additional stakeholders that should be invited to future sessions. Suggestions were made to potentially include additional participants from the Energy Sector; with suggestions of the Ontario Power Authority or Hydro ONE (the project team noted that individual meetings are already underway with these organizations).

Karen Pitre of Metrolinx formally wrapped up the meeting and noted the e-mail address for submission of any further questions or comments is on the presentation handout (*electrification@metrolinx.com*) and that the draft summary notes would be circulated for review in the coming weeks. She also mentioned that part of the timing of future stakeholder working sessions would be defined by the timeline of the technical/engineering progress. There will also be a number of Public Meetings held throughout the ARL EA process.
The purpose of today’s working session is to:
1. Review the project background and context
2. Provide an electrification update
3. Deliver an overview of the electrification project, including:
   • Performance standards
   • Electrification design for Kitchener (previously Georgetown) and Lakeshore
   • Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) EA for the Airport Rail Link (ARL) Service
4. Seek feedback on the material presented

PROPOSED AGENDA

4:00 pm  Welcome
Metrolinx

4:05  Introductions, Agenda Review
Nicole Swerhun, Facilitator

4:15  Presentation
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Morrison Hershfield, Metrolinx

5:00  Discussion

Focus Questions:
4. What are the key issues and opportunities you would like to see considered through the TPAP process?
5. Do you have any advice on other key stakeholders/constituencies to be engaged as part of the TPAP?
6. Do you have any other advice for the team at this point?

5:50  Next Steps

6:00  Adjourn
Dear Colleagues:

Based on the findings from the Electrification Study, the decision was made to commence the electrification design and engineering of the power supply and distribution for the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors and to undertake the environmental assessment for Phase 1: the Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport.

In late 2011, a consultant team led by Parsons Brinckerhoff was hired to support this work. In addition to completing the electrification design for the ARL corridor, Metrolinx and their consultant team will also undertake the electrification design for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors as well as development of performance standards for electrification.

Between 2012 and 2014, Metrolinx will carry out an environmental Assessment via the Transit Project Assessment Process (known as TPAP) for electrification of the ARL service. Feedback and advice from stakeholders have made a valuable contribution to our work to date, and we are very interested in continuing our dialogue with individuals and organizations with a range of interests and perspectives on electrification.

We hope you will be able to join us on March 8, 2012 for a kick-off meeting with stakeholders to introduce and seek feedback on this project. This is the first in a series of meetings we intend to hold with stakeholders over the next two years. Meeting details include:

Date: Thursday, March 8th, 2012
Time: 4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
Location: Metro Central YMCA
20 Grosvenor Street,
2nd Floor Auditorium
Toronto, Ontario

Please reply by March 2nd, 2012 to our independent facilitation team by contacting Bianca Wylie at bwylie@swerhun.com or by calling (416) 572-4365. As part of your e-mail reply, please indicate whether you:

a) Are interested in receiving future invitations to participate in Stakeholder Sessions for the project; or

b) Would like to be a corresponding participant only (i.e., receive project updates via e-mail but are unlikely to attend Stakeholder Sessions); or

c) Are not interested in receiving any further communications or invites related to the project.

In addition, if there are other organizations you are aware of that may also be interested in participating in this Stakeholder Session, please let us know. For these meetings we are targeting umbrella organizations that represent broader constituencies interested in electrification. A number of public consultation meetings will also be held as part of the ARL EA process.

We’re looking forward to working with you on this important project.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2W3
20, rue Bay, bureau 600
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 2W3
Metrolinx Electrification

Stakeholder Working Session #1
March 8, 2012

1. Background and Context

Electrification Studies

- Numerous studies previously completed on electrification dating back to early 1980’s
- 2010 Electrification Study:
  - ToR developed by multi-stakeholder CAC
  - Considered entire GO Transit rail network (all seven corridors), including ARL
  - Stakeholder engagement and consultation
  - Considered wide range of factors, i.e., environment, health, economic, community, land use
2010 Electrification Study Findings

Key Findings of 2010 Electrification Study:

- Greatest benefits of electrification for Options 2 (Lakeshore), 3 (Kitchener/Lakeshore), and 11 (Kitchener/Lakeshore/Milton)
- More journey time savings can be achieved with electric locomotives compared to diesel locomotives
- Pursuing electrification of both the Kitchener and Lakeshore lines results in capital cost savings
- Annual operating and maintenance cost savings (cost of electricity is expected to increase at a slower rate compared to diesel)
Metrolinx Electrification Decision

- **Proceed with Option 3**: electrification of the combined Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors based on transportation benefits
- **Implementation of Option 3 - Phase 1 includes:**
  1. Development of Performance Specifications for electrification infrastructure
  2. Preliminary design and engineering for the electrification of the combined Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors
  3. Environmental Assessment for the electrification of the Air Rail Link (between Union Station and Pearson International Airport), and to the preferred Maintenance Facility
     - *ARL service can be electrified as stand-alone service*

2. Electrification Update

- As the next step to moving forward with the implementation of Phase 1, Metrolinx issued an RQQ
- As a result, the Parsons Brinckerhoff team was retained in November 2011 to carry out the project
Project Team

**Metrolinx:**
- Project Proponent

**Parsons Brinckerhoff**
- Engineering/Design Lead
- Electrification design and engineering for Kitchener, Lakeshore and ARL corridors

**Morrison Hershfield**
- EA Lead (TPAP for ARL Electrification)
- Environmental Studies (e.g., biophysical environment, noise/vibration, air quality, aesthetics, cultural heritage, etc.)

**Swerhun**
- Independent Facilitator

---

**Project Overview**

Project context includes construction and operation of an electrified commuter rail system in a mixed-used corridor.

The project is defined by three main components, including:

- **Performance Standards** for electrification infrastructure
- **Electrification design and engineering** for electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors
- **Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment Process - TPAP)** for electrification of the ARL service
3. Electrification Overview

- Traction Power Substation
- Paralleling Station
- Switching Station
- Traction Power Substation

4. Project Overview

- Performance Standards for Electrification
  - TPS (turbine supply and distribution)
  - Grounding
  - Signal Equipment
  - Safety Requirements
  - UMM
  - Maintenance Facilities
  - Control Centre

- Electrification Design (Kitchener and Lakeshore)
  - 3 rail corridors:
    - Kitchener
    - Including ARI
    - Lakeshore East
    - Lakeshore West
  - High voltage power from Hydro One's 250kV network, supplied from 6 traction power substations (TPS)
  - Locations and property requirements for substations

- Hydro One Class EA
  - Environmental Scoping (Phase 1, Aug - Sept 2017)

- ARL EA (TP00)
  - Environmental Investigations
  - Assessment of Alternatives
  - Impact Assessment
  - Mitigation / Monitoring
  - Environmental Project Report (EPR)
  - Consultation

- Potential CAA Trigger
  - ARI spur on federal airport lands (Hydro One EA screening not required)

- Hydro One, TP01 and Federal EA Processes

- Standard Refining Meeting Sessions
  - Public Open House
  - Online Survey (to be fielded)
  - Consultation with Indigenous Peoples
  - Project Website
  - Newsletters/Other Updates
Develop Performance Standards

- Traction Electrification System (TES)
  - Power supply, distribution and return system
- Grounding Requirements
  - Grounding of OCS components, TPS, SWS and PS, Station Infrastructure, Structures/Bridges, etc.
- Signal Equipment Compatibility
  - Train detection, signal circuitry
- System safety requirements
  - Safety protocols, maintenance activities
- Operational and Maintenance Requirements
  - OCS, TPS system, signal system
- Maintenance Facilities
  - Preventative, heavy maintenance
- Control Centre

Determine Infrastructure Requirements

New:
- Catenary
- Substations & Switching Stations
- Maintenance Equipment
- Maintenance Facility?

Modifications:
- Bridges/overhead structures
- Stations
- Track & Signals
- Maintenance Facility?
Designing for Electrification (Kitchener & Lakeshore)

- Electrification Study: electrification implementation at a high level
- Further Electrification Design of three rail corridors:
  - Kitchener, Lakeshore East, Lakeshore West (total of 264 route-km)
  - Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC) and Union Station part of design considerations
  - Apply performance standards to the corridor design to refine:
    - pinch points
    - budget
    - phasing strategy
Catenary – 2 Track

Maintenance Yard
The ARL Electrification EA will assess potential environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed electrification infrastructure based on the following factors:

- **Natural** (e.g., vegetation, wetlands, wildlife habitat, etc.)
- **Socio-Economic** (e.g., air quality, noise/vibration, EMF, aesthetics, etc.)
- **Cultural** (e.g., archaeological features, built heritage, etc.)
- **Built** (e.g., land use, utilities, transportation network, etc.)
Questions for Clarification

4. Discussion

Focus Questions

1. What are the key issues and opportunities you would like to see considered through the project?

2. Do you have any advice on other key stakeholders/constituencies to be engaged as part of the project?

3. Do you have any other advice for the Electrification Team at this point?
Next Steps

- Consider feedback heard today
- Prepare and circulate Stakeholder Working Session #1 Summary Report
  - Including responses to comments
- Future planned Stakeholder Working Sessions
- How to contact us:
  electrification@metrolinx.com

Thank you

www.gotransit.com
Appendix J2

June 2012 Public Update Meeting Materials
Metrolinx Electrification
Public Meeting
Wednesday, June 27, 2012 6:30 - 8:30 pm
Lithuanian House, 1573 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M6P 1A6

SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared for:
Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 901
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2N8

Prepared by:
SWERHUN | Facilitation & Decision Support
720 Bathurst Street, Suite 308
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1Z5
Dear Bruce and Gary:

**RE: Sharing feedback received at June 27, 2012 Electrification update public meeting**

Please find attached the summary report from our June 27th Electrification Update public meeting. As you’ll see from the summary, a number of participants expressed a strong interest in ensuring that the feedback they shared at the meeting be communicated with decision makers at the Ministry of Transportation and Metrolinx. They also requested that they be copied on the communication.

This letter follows up on the commitment I made at the meeting to fulfill these requests. I understand that you will be sharing the June 27th meeting summary with decisions makers at the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and the Board of Metrolinx.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
SUMMARY REPORT

Over 100 people participated in the Public Meeting held by Metrolinx on June 27th 2012 as part of the Electrification Project (the Project). The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the Environmental Assessment process for electrification of the ARL service along the Kitchener corridor, the Electrification design for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors and the development of performance specifications for electrification for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors.

The meeting opened with a half-hour presentation from the Project Team (available online at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/docs/ElectrificationProjectUpdateMeeting_27June2012_FINAL-EN.pdf). The presentation summarized background information on the project and described the work completed to date, provided a summary of the technical/engineering design components of the Project, an overview of the Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment) process being followed for Phase 1 Electrification of the ARL, and next steps. The presentation was delivered by Karen Pitre (Executive Director of Electrification, Metrolinx), Kevin George (Vice President and Regional Business Manager, Parsons Brinckerhoff), and Amber Saltarelli (Environmental Planner, Morrison Hershfield). Nicole Swerhun and Bianca Wylie (Swerhun Facilitation & Decision Support) were the independent facilitators for the meeting.

Following the presentation, the floor was open for questions, comments and discussion. This summary report was written by Bianca Wylie (Swerhun Facilitation & Decision Support) and was circulated to participants in draft form for edits and comments prior to being finalized. Edits were made to the draft based on comments received. Note that this summary is intended to capture the key messages from the meeting and is not a verbatim transcript. Following the meeting at least two participants suggested that, given the nature of the meeting, a verbatim transcript would have been helpful.

This report is organized as follows
I. Key Themes from Feedback Received
II. Detailed Notes on the Discussion
III. Wrap Up and Next Steps

The appendices include:
Appendix A Copy of the e-mail invitation to the meeting
Appendix B Copy of the newspaper ad providing public notification of the meeting
Appendix C Supplementary sound wall information
Appendix D Feedback on draft summary report
Appendix E Presentation Slides

During the meeting several questions were raised regarding the sound walls on the Kitchener Corridor. Additional details on the sound walls can be found in Appendix D, including answers from Metrolinx that expand on the responses provided at the meeting.
I. KEY THEMES FROM FEEDBACK RECEIVED

There were five clear themes that emerged from the two hour discussion, and these themes are described on this page. These themes should be read along with the following five pages which provide a more detailed write-up of the questions, responses, and other comments from the meeting.

1. **The majority of participants expressed grave concern regarding the health impacts of running diesel trains on the ARL.** They strongly believe that electric trains would not have the same impact. They want the ARL to be electric immediately. There is extreme frustration on a number of fronts, including but not limited to the fact that: (i) Metrolinx is moving forward with electrification “on top of” a decision to give a green light to diesel, despite major objections within the community; (ii) there is total disbelief among the majority of participants regarding the results of the study regarding air quality impacts of diesel versus electric; and (iii) Metrolinx is unwilling to agree that diesel trains are more polluting than electric.

2. **The majority of participants expressed significant concern regarding the construction of sound walls in their communities.** Their frustration related particularly to: (i) the fact that the sound walls may not be needed once the ARL is electrified, (ii) they do not believe that the Metrolinx decision to build sound walls is based on defensible data, and they would like to see the data and (iii) the discussion about the walls is a “done deal” and community input is limited to “the colour of the walls”.

3. **There was considerable frustration that the Metrolinx staff and consultants at the meeting do not have the power to address the issues raised by the community.** Participants said that they wanted to see political leaders with decision making power (e.g. the Transportation Minister) attend these meetings, and if they can’t, they requested assurance/evidence from Metrolinx staff to ensure that they communicate community concerns to those in power (e.g. through a letter from staff to the government with community organizations cc’d on the letter). While a handful of participants expressed empathy regarding the difficult position that Metrolinx staff are in with respect to public consultation, there were many more participants who expressed considerable frustration with the Metrolinx staff and consultant team - both those at the meeting and those who participated in other community meetings.

4. **Participants repeatedly asked questions that sought to understand what exactly the obstacles were to accelerating the implementation of electrification, and how those obstacles could be overcome** (responses from the Metrolinx team and/or their consultants are noted in brackets). Participants were interested in the cost of electrification ($440M), the cost to convert diesel train units to electric train units (approx $1M/train car), what delay there would be in constructing electric on an active rail corridor running diesel trains (none), if it would be possible to electrify by 2015 (yes, but only if EA approvals and funding were both in place). **Note added by Metrolinx after the meeting: Completion of the Air Rail Link by 2015 will require construction of the spur line to the airport, stations, signalling and manufacturing of the ARL vehicles, as well as the current construction in the GTS corridor, which includes grade separations, corridor expansion, new signaling and upgrades to 16 bridges. To add the additional elements required for electrification would not allow for the completion of this work which is necessary for the operation of the ARL service by 2015. We have consistently stated that electrification of the Kitchener rail corridor (from Highway 427 to Union Station) cannot begin until the Georgetown South Project infrastructure and the Environmental Assessment are completed near the end of 2014. Given the three-year electrification construction timeline, the earliest electrification could be completed is for 2017.**

5. **Participants were concerned about the waste of effort and money involved in building the ARL to be a diesel system first if the end-goal is to have an electrified system.** Questions were posed around the specific incremental costs of conversion for rolling stock and re-construction efforts to make the changes to the system. **Note added by Metrolinx after the meeting: The ARL spur is designed for electrification.**

In addition, a handful of participants commented that any investment in transit is beneficial to air quality in Toronto because it creates the opportunity to remove cars from the road.
II. DISCUSSION

Following the presentation by the Metrolinx team, the floor was open for discussion. The following is a summary of the discussion in chronological order. In some cases, participants asked questions, and in others comments and advice were provided. Metrolinx responses to questions are noted in *italics*.

1. How did we get to the point of having the overhead catenary option for the electricity? Why are we not using a third rail? *Essentially, it was the requirement from Metrolinx that electrification happen through use of a proven and existing technology. One key reason the third rail approach is not being used is because of safety considerations and it would require all of the platforms to be re-built. The methodology and information regarding this decision can be found in detail in the Electrification Study.*

2. How long will it take to do the 30 kilometres of track? And is the ARL a priority project? Yes, the ARL is a priority project. If the EA is completed and approved on schedule in 2014, and if the funding is allocated for the project, the construction period will follow and is estimated to take 3 years.

3. Could the process speed up? *Potentially yes, however at the moment we have direction and approval to move forward only with the preliminary design of the electrified ARL. We would need funding and approval to proceed with the detailed design and tender documents required. It is not the construction of the overhead catenary system (OCS) infrastructure that takes the time; it is all of the peripheral activities (such as the construction of a control centre, a substation and a switching station, the establishment of operating procedures, the development of maintenance routines and the training of staff and emergency services) that will take approximately three years.*

4. Most of us want to see electrification first, with no diesel. If there are diesel trains running on the line, do you have a sense of whether that will complicate being able to do electrification? *No, it will not complicate our ability to construct the electrification infrastructure.*

5. Is there any possibility of delaying the ARL until electrification is in place? *The short answer is no, this is not our decision. Note added by Metrolinx after the meeting: This is not the decision of the Project team.*

6. How does this timeline (2 years for design, 3 years for approval) compare to other global examples of system construction? *For a “start-from-scratch” process, this is certainly comparable. Where the focus is on expansion of an existing system that is already electric, the process is typically much faster.*

7. I’m hearing that we’re studying electrification but there is no funding for it and no plan for it. Will we have to go through another political process to get funding for electrification? *Yes. This is no different than any other project which is funded based on the priorities of the government of the day – it is their decision to determine what will be funded. Many EA projects happen before the funding is committed to their implementation.*

8. In terms of the funding, is there an estimate as to how much this will cost? Secondly, there is a funding strategy coming out soon for the Big Move 2.0 – I’m wondering if electrification is covered in that? *As part of the Electrification Study, the cost estimate to electrify the ARL was $440 Million. We will be refining these cost estimates throughout the process. Yes, electrification is included in the Big Move 2.0 strategy.*
9. I am wondering about the 5 metre high noise walls and whether they will be necessary with the electric trains? The electrification study did compare the different noise levels that would result from running DMU versus EMU trains on the ARL line. The results showed that the difference in the noise levels from the two types of trains was not that significant. The electrification study did not look at any noise walls associated with electrifying the GO system.

10. I was surprised to learn about the 5-6 metre noise wall. I went to one of the neighbourhood sessions and the presentation was very vague with respect to the measures. The wall is coming whether wanted or not, and options for the community to influence the process were limited only to determining the colour of the walls, which is not what matters to us. We need more information on the sound walls, and evidence/data to back up the need for the walls.

11. If we switch from diesel to electric, will they consider adding stations along the ARL? The number of stations doesn’t impact the work being done during this project. Determining the number of stations is a separate decision.

12. The ARL could be part of the transit plan – why the rush to do this with diesel, when people are considering this part of a transit plan for the city? Why are we going to spend the money twice when we are in dire need of funding? Facilitator noted the frustration and that the Metrolinx team had already responded to similar questions (see points 3, 5 and 7 above).

13. Could the message be sent directly back to the government to have decision makers active in the consultation process – the team in the room can’t answer the questions we have. With all due respect to the bureaucrats and engineers, we are here to talk about how to make electrification happen, not the engineering process to create an electrified rail system.

14. The danger of diesel has been mentioned, will the diesel system that is going in have an impact on our health and the health of our children? We have looked at the air quality impacts of running electric vs. diesel trains on the ARL, and our study results show that both technologies perform well under World Health Organization (WHO) standards. There is also an issue with the air quality in the area, which we can’t solve through the GO Trains or the ARL link.

15. The WHO has just put out a 4-page press release stating that diesel is a carcinogen. The study clearly states diesel causes cancer. So in essence, they are saying diesel kills, which is the same thing we have been saying for the past 7 years. Why is this so hard for Metrolinx to understand?

16. When doing the assessment for the ARL, are you looking at how to integrate the new work into the existing system? Both for the trains and the system? Yes, understanding what would be required to move forward with the future electrification of the system as a whole is part of this project. And work is happening now, for example on the ARL spur to the airport, the construction firm involved in the current construction is building it so that it can also accommodate the electrification infrastructure.

17. If you don’t want diesel then what about diesel trucks that are already on the road - diesel trains remove a lot of cars, which would minimize emissions on a whole.

18. Today Peter Milczyn stated that using the ARL as a surface rail commuter train system was a new idea. When was the first time that you heard the proposal that the ARL should be a surface level commuter line vs. a dedicated line for air travelers? I have heard it for many years.
19. Are you starting the EA just for the airport link, or for the 20 miles for the parallel Kitchener line as well? The EA is for ARL section of the service only.

20. There is an emissions impact when you consider electric trains versus diesel trains. Electric trains are lighter, so vehicles stop and start faster. This would have an impact on the background pollution in the West end if there are more stops available.

21. The $440M dollar figure to electrify, is that the cost to go from diesel trains to electric trains, to electrify exiting track? Yes.

22. What would the cost be if you only bought electric cars, and never bought diesel - if you could skip this interim step? The cost of conversion is about $1M per car times 18 cars, so $18M dollars on the cars.

23. When you said that the projected emissions for diesel on the ARL are below WHO levels, was that assuming that Tier-4 diesel trains were in use? Yes.

24. Are Tier-4 trains in use today? No, but there will be Tier-4 trains in use when the service starts.

25. You said that it is not uncommon to have a capital cost decision made only after an EA is complete. In your experience, how common is it to build this type of expensive infrastructure and then to rebuild it? It’s not throw-away work. What’s being done now to expand the corridor, the bridges, the spur – this is all required for electrification as well.

26. There is clearly going to be an extra cost to rebuilding this – there has to be added cost, we don’t want to have a snow-job here, we were not born yesterday. What is the extra cost? The incremental cost of converting DMUs to EMUs is $1M per car x 18 cars = $18M on rail cars.

27. Are there any additional incremental costs? Yes, we’re not suggesting that there are not any incremental costs. Take the Eurostar from London to Paris, for example. The focus there was on creating the service first, followed by a focus on the infrastructure. Service is important and needs to be established regardless of the infrastructure used.

28. We’ve talked about a 3 year project getting trimmed down to 32 months for implementation, but we’re still talking about building “over” (or after) diesel. With 19 hours of service a day running in the corridor, does that not have an impact on getting the work done? No, the work can be done with access of less than 4 hours a night, we have worked within constraints before and the service in place will not have an impact on the construction.

29. We are here as a community trying to see if we can speed up the process, and while we respect the technical work that you are doing and those doing the community relations work, it is really important to understand that we have significant concerns about the incremental health costs of going electric only after there’s already been a green-light given for diesel. The starting point is diesel; we need to be clear on that. Our concerns need to be addressed by government, especially in regards to health, or else these issues will continue to be raised at these meetings.

30. I would like to acknowledge that we are here to raise our concerns about health impacts. We know about background smog, we know there are related issues, but can you just acknowledge that being near diesel is dangerous? We acknowledge that air quality is an issue. The expansion of transit assists with air quality.
issues. We are here to advance electrification. Your concerns have not gone unnoticed, we will be sure to deliver the clear message you are delivering tonight.

31. Are we to assume the EA on diesel trains has been done? Yes, the EA on running diesel trains on the GTS corridor is complete and it is available online.

32. In your study findings [referencing the Electrification Study] – why isn’t there a finding that electrification supports an improvement in air quality? How can you come to a neighborhood that will have the impacts of the increased diesel without being upfront about the health benefits of electrification when it would be one main issue of interest to the neighborhood? It’s a prime thing that people have interest in and has a massive impact on people and their health. The analysis done in the Electrification Study compared emissions from a Tier-4 diesel train to emissions from electric trains. Questions such as: how far do you live from the line, what happens if we reduce the number of trains, etc. were asked. The findings were that the difference in the impact of diesel versus electric was “likely to be relatively small”, and that electrification made everything slightly better.

33. We need to have specifics and numbers, where are those? The elements and variables are included in the Electrification Study.

34. Please share the health data in a different way and add it to the PowerPoint in future presentations.

35. This meeting shows that the government does not care about the opinion of the attendees. The fact that we have to fight you guys for clean trains or cleaner trains, that you’re using words like “the impact is going to be less” – I can’t believe the amount of BS that is being carried around here. I live 300 metres from the rail line, what is it going to do me? I am not about money, I am about morality and this is immoral (applause).

36. As I understand it, the analysis is comparing Tier-4 diesel to electrification – will the study eventually include the older trains? No because the commitment is to convert the MP40 to the Tier-4 diesel locomotives as well. That protocol is underway, and will be in effect in 2014, GO Transit has been aggressive pushing that development.

37. The comment made was “whether or not electrification will happen”, not “when”. There are trains all over the world that are electrified that serve as commuter trains and take people to the airport. Knowledgeable people, such as the engineers and bureaucrats, are not using their influence to push people who can make the decisions. Kevin, why did you use the word “whether” instead of “when”? (applause) We are using the word “whether” to reflect the current reality, as explained before.

38. I am fairly new to Toronto and I am a transportation professional. Generally speaking, every car that is removed from the roads improves the air quality. We want to remove vehicles from the road, which is the right direction, and yes, electric is better than diesel. But there will always be complaints. The long-term vision that should be considered is how to build capacity – that is the long-term vision and the way to improve air quality.

39. Regarding the EA process – is there a way to speed up the first year and a half of the process? Yes, we will try. We have a lot of design variables that need to feed into the EA process, such as field studies and facility decisions. If we can do it faster we will.
40. It has been suggested that you should do an EA to electrify the entire corridor. Since we all know that diesel trains are not healthy, is there not a simple way to look at the overall plan and take that initiative to the government bodies? Does Metrolinx have a responsibility to bring the issue that trains are not healthy for the community forward to the government? What is Metrolinx’ role in drawing government attention to the fact that diesel is not healthy? Maybe Metrolinx should take the responsibility to speed up the process and stop diesel. Does Metrolinx have an obligation to speed up the process and make it as efficient as possible? Metrolinx will convey your concerns and questions.

41. You say you are going to be relaying our feedback regarding the health issue to government (the Premier). How are you going to share our concerns with those making the decisions? Can you make a firm commitment to this room? Yes, I make that commitment. We will have to find out what the right mechanism is for conveying the feedback.

42. What is the right mechanism? I don’t know, we need to figure it out. We have clearly heard you.

43. Could we suggest that you send a letter, and cc [carbon copy] those organizations in the room? That is a good suggestion. We will find a way to take the feedback back to the organization. We will also have a summary report as part of the public record.

44. The Premier wants an ARL by 2015, correct? Yes.

45. Can we achieve what the Premier wants and what we want by 2015? Can it be electric by 2015? Yes, but only if EA approvals and funding were both in place. Note added by Metrolinx after the meeting: Completion of the Air Rail Link by 2015 will require construction of the spur line to the airport, stations, signalling and manufacturing of the ARL vehicles, as well as the current construction in the GTS corridor, which includes grade separations, corridor expansion, new signaling and upgrades to 16 bridges. To add the additional elements required for electrification would not allow for the completion of this work which is necessary for the operation of the ARL service by 2015. We have consistently stated that electrification of the Kitchener rail corridor (from Highway 427 to Union Station) cannot begin until the Georgetown South Project infrastructure and the Environmental Assessment are completed near the end of 2014. Given the three-year electrification construction timeline, the earliest electrification could be completed is for 2017.

46. It does not help to build a train using public money and to not use this investment as an opportunity to reduce the personal carbon footprint of the public. Also, in the context of a carbon footprint, the idea of having an air rail link service is detrimental as it normalizes air travel, making it something everyone thinks they can and should do. Just as there is a very narrow, healthy acid/base range (of 0.1, between 7.35 - 7.45 pH) for human blood for us to live and cycle our carbon dioxide, so too ocean life depends entirely on staying within the same order of magnitude change (8.1 - 8.2) on the pH scale.

47. Not being from the corridor, what does this community have as a legacy after the games? The legacy is more than the stop, and the desire to have a legacy after the games is part of the message that we can deliver.

48. Did the Premier notice that there are no longer Liberals represented in this area, the junction triangle?

49. Regarding the noise issue with the wall, when Metrolinx came to West Bend to explain the walls they stated that there was very little noise difference between diesel and electric. We need to know where those figures came from.
50. As an analogy, this is like comparing the noise of the subway to 3 or 4 buses, versus noise of the subway to MP40. The comparison we really need to get is EMU vs. diesel hauled by MP40. The Electrification Study did look at MP40 comparatively; we looked at electric locomotive vs. diesel locomotives which included GO trains and the smaller EMUs and DMUs. I would ask you to refer to the study in the Electrification Study for the analysis, it was electric vs. diesel locomotive. We are open to discuss whether the methodology was correct or not.

51. I have a family member who suffers from pulmonary fibrosis, what are the people who have lung illnesses, like asthma, supposed to do? Are we supposed to move? How does taking a car off the 427 improve the health of someone next to the corridor?

52. I understand that the noise impact study looked at rail on rail noise versus locomotive noise, can we reassess the method?

53. In the EA for the ARL, from the engineering side, are you looking at 8 tracks or the ARL only? We are looking at the whole corridor and how we would support GO trains as well.

54. There is a Bill in motion to go straight to electric trains and a campaign collecting signatures with petitions. We have the rest of the summer to come together and get involved in the campaign. September 20 is the date for the bill (comment from Jonah Schein).

III. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Nicole Swerhun formally wrapped up the meeting by thanking participants for coming, and noting that a draft of the summary report from the meeting would be distributed to participants for their review prior to being finalized. Nicole also confirmed that there was an opportunity to send additional comments in after the meeting until Friday, July 27th. Comments are welcomed by Metrolinx at any time, and you can reach the Electrification Project by email at electrification@metrolinx.com.
Please join us!

PUBLIC MEETING

Metrolinx is holding a public meeting to provide an update on the Electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors, including the new Airport Rail Link (ARL) service.

We hope you can join us to learn about the process and discuss it with us further.

Wednesday June 27, 2012
6:30pm – 8:30pm
Lithuanian House, 1573 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M6P 1A6
This venue is wheelchair accessible

At this public meeting project team members will provide information and an update on the:

- Environmental Assessment process for electrification of the ARL service along the Kitchener corridor
- Electrification design for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors
- Development of performance standards for electrification for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors

We’re hoping you will join us to learn more about the project, and to help the Metrolinx Electrification team understand your interests and concerns on the subject as we proceed with the project. An RSVP is encouraged but not required. If you can attend, please RSVP via email to electrification@metrolinx.com

PLEASE PASS ON THIS MEETING NOTICE TO ANYONE ELSE YOU THINK MAY BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING

Additional Information

For additional information on the project, please see http://www.gotransit.com/estudy/en/default.aspx If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the Electrification Project, please click here to e-mail the Project team.
APPENDIX B – Newspaper Ad

The following ad ran in the City Centre Mirror (including the Annex Guardian), the Parkdale Liberty Villager, the York Guardian and the Bloor West Villager on Thursday June 21st, 2012.
APPENDIX C – Supplementary Sound Wall Information

There were a number of questions and comments regarding the Georgetown South Project in regards to the sound walls along the corridor. This appendix, provided by Metrolinx to expand on the responses provided the June 27th public meeting, was included with the draft meeting report when it was distributed to participants for their review. Four participants submitted additional questions and comments relating to this appendix.

Consultation Process for the Sound Walls – Additional details provided by Metrolinx

The GTS Project team consulted with the community on the sound walls in November 2011 and February 2012. Feedback from the community was considered including installing the Future Build noise wall requirements for Opening Day 2015 to provide an additional noise mitigation benefit to the surrounding communities. The noise walls will be discussed with community advisory committees which will be formed later on this year. The community will have an opportunity to voice their concerns about the wall height and discuss what can be done to better integrate the walls into the surrounding community. The completed operational noise and vibration mitigation report is available online at gotransit.com/gts.

Additional details for questions asked at the June 27th public meeting. All details in italics provided by Metrolinx, notes additional to the meeting notes are bolded:

- Not being from the corridor, what does this community have as a legacy after the games? The legacy is more than the stop, and the desire to have a legacy after the games is part of the message that we can deliver. The communities along the corridor will have improved traffic flow with the removal of 6 GO level rail crossings replaced by underpasses/overpasses, expanded GO service and ARL service at the Weston and Bloor stations, and an improved station and mobility hub at the Bloor Station and a brand new station in Weston.

- Regarding the noise issue with the wall, when Metrolinx came to West Bend to explain the walls they stated that there was very little noise difference between diesel and electric. We need to know where those figures came from. What was explained at the West Bend Community Association meeting on May 16 is that there is still residual noise from the steel wheel to rail interaction. Electrified rail is not a completely silent system. The difference in noise between diesel and electric propulsion for the Air Rail Link Service will be further reviewed during the ARL electrification EA.
APPENDIX D – Feedback on Draft Summary Report

The draft summary report from the public meeting report was distributed to participants for their review prior to being finalized (all participants who signed in at the meeting and provided an email address received the draft report). A total of five participants provided feedback on the draft report, with some also providing additional information for Metrolinx consideration. The submissions are included in their entirety here. All participants agreed with their names being associated with the comments submitted. Submissions were received from:

1. Scott Dobson
2. Paul and Tracy Marques
3. Timothy Norhona, Chair, The West Bend Community Association
4. Suri Weinberg-Linsky
5. Peter Shepherd

FEEDBACK 1. Scott Dobson

Here are three documents, two from rail authorities and one produced by the Professional Engineers of Ontario (which is very good). They are among the many documents and EA’s and other research that leaves little doubt about why electric is a better transit solution. The amount of research is so overwhelming as to be almost comical. Government findings and even private run rail networks all sound like they are Clean Train Coalition. Serious.

1. Network Rail operates transportation infrastructure in the UK
   The full report report:  http://www.networkrailmediacentre.co.uk/imagelibrary/downloadMedia.ashx?MediaDetailsID=2802

2. Auckland Rail in New Zealand
   The main page on electrification http://www.kiwirail.co.nz/projects/major-projects/auckland-rail-electrification.html. The FAQ from the electrification of a rail line in Auckland, note the quote "A safety awareness programme will be launched prior to the introduction of electrified services to educate the community on the dangers of electrification, quieter trains and general rail safety." http://www.kiwirail.co.nz/auckland-s-electrification---frequently-asked-questions#electricdiesel

3. Report from the Professional Engineers of Ontario
   Note that this study says that:
   a) page 19: "Future U.S. Tier 4 emission standards and other recent advances in diesel engine technology will make diesel fuel almost “clean” by removing soot and converting tailpipe emissions into harmless gases. However, diesel emission is, in fact, dirty when compared to the "life- cycle emission" of electric trains, a significant policy gap that leads to misinterpretation of air pollution standards."
   b) page 20 "Electric trains have another health benefit: they are quieter. A GO Transit study found the noise from electric locomotives to be five to 10 decibels lower than from diesel (CPCS, 1992)."
   c) page 18 "In addition, Metrolinx launched another study (May 2009) on the possible electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system, which is expected to be finished by the end of 2010. Despite these initiatives, there appears to be no fundamental policy shift among decision-makers to realize rail electrification’s potential. As Les Benjamin (1981) indicates, the barriers to electrification in Canada appear to be psychological rather than technical or financial."
   The full report: http://members.peo.on.ca/index.cfm/document/1/ci_id/42969/la_id/1
FEEDBACK 2:  Paul and Tracy Marques

Thank you for putting together this summary draft. It is well put together and does a good job summarizing the comments of the residents. The only issue my wife and I have are the comments surrounding the building of the sound protection walls.

Although, some of the comments regarding the publics limited participation in designing the walls were true, I would like to add that I've spoke to no one who does not want the walls. The noise levels tests clearly show the need for some sort of noise mitigation and we would like to add the from an appearance point of view a stone wall in some form is much more desirable to the community than the sight of trains roaring by every 10-15 minutes.

We would appreciate it if you could also include our point of view.

FEEDBACK 3:  Timothy Norhona, Chair, The West Bend Community Association

I want to follow-up on the Draft Summary Report for the Metrolinx Electrification Public Meeting held on June 27th. I wasn't personally at the meeting, but I can relay some of the questions and identify points of confusion I was made aware of afterwards from members of my community -- specifically around the issue of the sound mitigation walls.

The biggest point of confusion may be around Metrolinx' position on the wall. At some point in time, the official position changed from "sound mitigation will be deployed as required by the noise protocol" to "walls will be built for opening day". This was apparently done in response to public feedback, but the specific inputs that informed this decision are still not clear.

A Community Relations representative from Metrolinx made a presentation to the West Bend Community Association in May and stated that "the walls are coming whether you want them or not". However, a follow-up communication stated that if the community did not want walls for opening day the construction could be deferred. There remains plenty of confusion as to what is actually open for discussion during the community consultation meetings, and what is already established based on consultations of the past. I have heard several people concerned that the consultation is effectively limited to "choosing the colour of the walls".

What has not been addressed is whether only diesel trains would necessitate the wall given the current noise protocols. If the line is electrified before service reaches the modeled "full build" scenario, it is probable that there are sections of the corridor that will never require a noise mitigation wall. There has been no comparison of noise levels between diesel and electric trains. In fact, I've had difficulty obtaining information about the noise profile of a single GO train.

Some people were confused by the methodology by which Metrolinx calculated the noise levels. It stemmed from how the sound is averaged over time, and how that average contributes to the 'perception' of more noise. The point was that no individual trains will be louder, but that overall average corridor noise would increase with traffic volumes. Conspicuously absent was any mention of mitigating noise through the use of quieter trains.

Some questions that still remain with regards to the wall:
1. Are walls the only means available to mitigate sound?
2. Do the walls provide any benefits beyond sound mitigation? (physical security was mentioned)
3. What potential negative impacts of the walls have been identified/considered?
4. Is it conceivable that the negative impacts could outweigh the noise mitigation benefits of the wall in some places? (there are sections of the corridor where cost or engineering difficulties outweigh the noise benefits)

I recognize that the meeting was about electrification and not walls, but I think there needs to be acknowledgement from Metrolinx that the two issues are indeed closely related.
FEEDBACK 4. Suri Weinberg-Linsky

To Metrolinx,

My (herewith elaborated) question to Metrolinx at the June 27 Air-Rail Link meeting was:

How, if the Ontario government has a Climate Action Plan goal to reduce emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050 (1), does using public funds to build an air-rail link, diesel or electric, help Ontarians fit that mitigation curve (2)? The average Ontario per capita emissions rate in 2010 was 13 tonnes/annum (3); with non-ICI domestic-only emissions usage at 5.3 tonnes per person (4). We need to get that down to the maximum allocation of 2 tonnes per capita per annum. Flying is clearly one of the fastest ways to over-shoot any chance of climate mitigation, and should no longer be seen as a public good, natural right or hospitable act facilitating an innocent sporting event. Air transport is projected to grow up to fourfold by 2050 (5).

Further, as Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation is bound to act within these legal (6) and biophysical laws, has anyone at either Provincial government or Metrolinx, done a well-to-wheels carbon budget on the transit system, including air travel, using our stated provincial emission reduction targets? International air travel is not counted in national carbon inventories, however Nature sees emissions, not countries.

The reason I say this is because without more attention to de-incentivize emission growth, it appears to me that Metrolinx’s air-rail link plan is helping sell Ontarians tickets to a climate with far greater odds of crashing than a plane anyone would ever consider flying. (7) At what odds of crashing would you still buy a ticket for air travel? Is Metrolinx acting as a sane, moral public corporation that knows or care what those odds are, for either the current or next generations? Even reducing by 80% will only give us a 50% chance of staying below 2 C.

If 9.5% of a typical barrel of oil goes into making jet fuel (8), doesn’t the Provincial government have a responsibility to reduce this use?

Does Metrolinx read the law under which it operates? While the environmental clauses in these two founding acts are weak and few, it would be wise for Metrolinx to accord them the full weight of what they carry. A growing economy will never execute a successful takeover and subordination of the environment. The economy is a subsidiary of the environment.

Please send me a systemic analysis using explicit carbon budget allocations for Metrolinx’s current plan, and how it fits with the government’s emissions reduction plan.

Note from Facilitator’s Office: Additional information relating to the bolded number references in Peter’s letter are available on request from the Facilitator’s office through Bianca Wylie, Swerhun Facilitation & Decision Support, bwylie@swerhun.com or 416 572 4365.
Metrolinx Electrification

Electrification Project Update
June 27, 2012
Purpose of the meeting

Meeting purpose:

• Provide an overview of the work completed to date: Electrification Study and the Metrolinx recommendation;

• To introduce the public to the electrification team and the work that is currently underway; and

• To seek feedback on the key issues and opportunities related to this work, and on the consultation process.
Previous Studies

Numerous Electrification Studies previously completed dating back to early 1980s

2010 Electrification Study:
- Terms of Reference developed by multi-stakeholder Community Advisory Committee
- Considered entire GO Transit rail network (all seven corridors), including Air Rail Link service
- Looked at multiple options for electrification of the corridors
- Stakeholder engagement and consultation
- Considered wide range of factors, i.e., environment, health, economic, community, land use
Key Findings of 2010 Electrification Study:

- Of the final 18 options studied, the greatest benefits of electrification were found in the Options 2 (Lakeshore), 3 (Kitchener/Lakeshore), and 11 (Kitchener/Lakeshore/Milton).

- More journey time savings can be achieved with electric locomotives compared to diesel locomotives.

- Electrification of both the Kitchener and Lakeshore lines results in capital cost savings due to some shared/overlapping electrification infrastructure.

- Annual operating and maintenance cost savings (cost of electricity is expected to increase at a slower rate compared to diesel).
Proceed with Option 3:

Electrification of the combined Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors based on transportation benefits. The Province agreed to fund Phase 1 of Option 3.

Option 3 - Phase 1 includes:

i. Development of Performance Specifications for electrification infrastructure

ii. Preliminary design and engineering for the electrification of the combined Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors

iii. Environmental Assessment for the electrification of the Air Rail Link between Union Station and Pearson International Airport (*Air Rail Link service can be electrified as stand-alone service*)
Where are we now?

**Moving forward with Phase 1**

- Metrolinx issued a Request for Qualifications and Quotations (RQQ)
- Parsons Brinckerhoff team was retained in November 2011 to carry out the project
- Development of Performance Specifications for electrification is in progress
- Coordination/liaison with Hydro One is ongoing
- Initiating conceptual design

**Engagement & Consultation**

- Held Stakeholder Session #1 – March 8\(^{th}\), 2012
- Electrification update via Metrolinx website – March 2012
- Outreach to organizations and communities along the corridor for this public meeting
Project Team

Metrolinx
- Project Proponent

Parsons Brinckerhoff
- Electrification Design/Engineering Lead

Morrison Hershfield
- Environmental Assessment Lead

Swerhun Facilitation
- Independent Facilitator
Project Scope and EA Process

Performance Specifications for Electrification
- Traction Electrification Supply System (TES)
- Traction Power Distribution System/Overhead Catenary System
- Electromagnetic Interference and Compatibility
- Signal Equipment Compatibility
- Operational and Maintenance Requirements
- Maintenance Facilities
- Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System Control Centre

Electrification Design (Kitchener and Lakeshore)
- 3 rail corridors:
  - Kitchener (including Airport Rail Link)
  - Lakeshore East
  - Lakeshore West
- High voltage power from Hydro One’s 230kV network, supplied from 6 traction power substations (TPS)
  - Locations and property requirements for new substations

ARL Electrification
- Preliminary design for electrification of ARL services:
  - Overhead Catenary
  - Maintenance
  - Substations, Switching Stations
  - ARL spur
  - Airport Station
  - USRC

ARL Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment Process)
- Environmental Inventories
- Assessment of Alternatives
- Impact Assessment
- Mitigation / Monitoring
- Environmental Project Report (EPR)
- Consultation
- Ongoing Hydro One coordination

Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)
- ARL spur on federal airport lands (Federal EA may be required)

TPAP and CEAA Processes
- Stakeholder Working Sessions
- Public Open Houses
- Review Agency Meetings
- Consultation with Aboriginal Peoples
- Project Website
- Project Email Address
- Newsletters/Notices/Letters
Develop Performance Specifications

- Traction Electrification Supply System (TES)
- Traction Power Distribution System/Overhead Catenary System
- Grounding and Bonding Requirements
- Electromagnetic Interference and Compatibility
- Signal Equipment Compatibility
- Operational and Maintenance Requirements
- Maintenance Facilities
- Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System
- Control Centre
Develop Conceptual Design

Determine Infrastructure Requirements:

New:
- Overhead Catenary
- Substations, Switching and Paralleling Stations
- Maintenance Equipment

Also:
- Develop a maintenance plan/facility for the electric trains
- Confirm power requirements
- Identify constraints or pinch points along corridor
- Refine cost estimates
- Refine a phasing strategy
- Determine operations/safety and maintenance
- Develop a System Assurance and Safety Plan

Modifications:
- Bridges/overhead structures
- Stations
- Track & Signals
Power Supply and Distribution

![Diagram of Power Supply and Distribution System]

- Traction Power Substation - a
- Paralleling Station - b
- Switching Station - c
- Traction Power Substation - a
Power Supply and Distribution

Take power from high voltage lines and get it to a substation that translates power into the lower voltage necessary to run trains.
Power Supply and Distribution

Paralleling Stations boost the power to the train in areas farther away from Substations.

Traction Power Substation - a
Paralleling Station - b
Switching Station - c
Traction Power Substation - a
Switching Stations create ability to turn the power off to certain portions of the track.
Power Supply and Distribution

The Overhead Catenary system powers the train along the corridor.

- **Traction Power Substation - a**
- **Paralleling Station - b**
- **Switching Station - c**
- **Traction Power Substation - a**

The Overhead Catenary system powers the train along the corridor.
Catenary - Multi-track
Catenary – 4 Track
Catenary – 2 Track
Maintenance Yard
Typical Substation
Typical Paralleling Station
Project Scope and EA Process

Performance Specifications for Electrification
- Traction Electrification Supply System (TES)
- Traction Power Distribution System/Overhead Catenary System
- Electromagnetic Interference and Compatibility
- Signal Equipment Compatibility
- Operational and Maintenance Requirements
- Maintenance Facilities
- Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System Control Centre

Electrification Design (Kitchener and Lakeshore)
- 3 rail corridors:
  - Kitchener (including Airport Rail Link)
  - Lakeshore East
  - Lakeshore West
- High voltage power from Hydro One’s 230kV network, supplied from 6 traction power substations (TPS)
  - Locations and property requirements for new substations

ARL Electrification
- Preliminary design for electrification of ARL services:
  - Overhead Catenary
  - Maintenance
  - Substations, Switching Stations
  - ARL spur
  - Airport Station
  - USRC

ARL Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment Process)
- Environmental Inventories
- Assessment of Alternatives
- Impact Assessment
- Mitigation / Monitoring
- Environmental Project Report (EPR)
- Consultation
- Ongoing Hydro One coordination

Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)
- ARL spur on federal airport lands (Federal EA may be required)

TPAP and CEAA Processes
- STAKEHOLDER WORKING SESSIONS
- PUBLIC OPEN HOUSES
- REVIEW AGENCY MEETINGS
- CONSULTATION WITH ABORIGINAL PEOPLES
- PROJECT WEBSITE
- PROJECT EMAIL ADDRESS
- NEWSLETTERS/NOTICES/LETTERS
Metrolinx will follow the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) under O. Reg. 231/08 for the Airport Rail Link (ARL) Electrification project.

The TPAP regulation applies to dedicated facilities or services that are used exclusively for transit.

The TPAP is an environmental assessment process that consists of two phases:
- Pre-Planning Phase
- 120-Day Assessment Phase
Environmental Assessment Process (TPAP)

The TPAP will assess potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the proposed ARL electrification infrastructure based on the following broad factors:

– Natural
– Socio-Economic
– Cultural
– Built

Examples of specific studies to be carried out:

– Air Quality
– Noise & Vibration
– Electromagnetic Fields
– Visual / Aesthetics
Overview of TPAP Steps

1. Metrolinx Electrification Recommendation – Option 3: Phase 1 (Electrification of ARL)
2. Carry out Background Environmental Studies
3. Identify Siting Options (TPS, SWS, PS, MF)
4. Describe Preferred Transit Project
5. Impact Assessment & Mitigation Measures
6. Prepare Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR)
7. Notice of Commencement of TPAP
8. 30 Day Public Review of EPR
9. Respond to Comments
10. Notice of Completion & Final EPR
11. 35 Day Minister’s Decision Period

Pre-Planning Phase (2012 – 2013)

120-Day TPAP (2014)
Overview of Environmental Assessment Consultation

Tentative Meeting Dates:

- **2012**
  - Q1: Carry out Background Studies
  - Q2: Identify Siting Options
  - Q3: Stakeholder Meetings
  - Q4: Public Meetings

- **2013**
  - Q1: Carry out Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures
  - Q2: Stakeholder Meetings
  - Q3: Public Meetings
  - Q4: Website Email Feedback

- **2014**
  - Q1: Draft Environmental Project Report
  - Q2: Stakeholder Meetings
  - Q3: Public Meetings

Submission of Environmental Project Report to the Minister of the Environment
Consultation with the Public (including property owners), agencies, and Aboriginal Peoples is an important part of the EA process.

Consultation activities for this project will include:

• Stakeholder Working Sessions
• Public Meetings
• Review Agency meetings
• Website updates & Newsletters

Feedback is welcome at any point during the project through:

• Project website
• Project e-mail address (electrification@metrolinx.com)
• Georgetown South Community office
Continue with key pieces of work, including:

- Carrying out background environmental studies
- Determining infrastructure requirements (new and modified)
- Confirming power requirements
- Identifying constraints or pinch points along corridor
- Refining cost estimates
- Planning future consultation activities
- First round of Public Information Sessions to be held in the fall of 2012
Questions & Discussion

1. What are the key issues and opportunities you would like to see considered through this project?

2. Do you have any advice on other key stakeholders that should be engaged?

3. Do you have any other feedback or comments regarding the proposed consultation approach?

4. Do you have any other advice for the Electrification team at this point?
Thank you

www.gotransit.com
METROLINX

Union Pearson Express Electrification EA
June 2013 Public Open Houses
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1. Overview

As part of the consultation process for the Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA), four public open houses were held at various locations along the UP Express route (from just west of Union Station to Pearson Airport) between June 4th and June 11th, 2013. Four different venues were selected as follows, in order to provide locations that were distributed along the 25 km length of the UP Express route:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd.</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga, ON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Purpose

The purpose of the June 2013 Public Open Houses was to share a project update on the work completed to date, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

3. Notification

The public open houses (POH) were advertised broadly including: Parkdale Liberty Villager, City Centre Mirror, Etobicoke Guardian, York Guardian, Mississauga News, Bloor West Villager, North York Mirror, Metro News Toronto, L'Express de Toronto, Toronto le Metropolitain (Brampton) so that neighbours were made aware of the multiple date and location options. In addition to newspaper ads, the open house notice was posted on Metrolinx’s website, invitation emails were sent to the project contact list including: elected officials, review agencies, stakeholders, and first nations. In addition, letters were mailed directly to identified property owners within the EA study area.

Copies of the Newspaper Ad, e-mail Invitation, and Notification Letters are contained in Appendix A.
4. Open House Format

Attendees were welcomed by the project team, asked to sign-in, and were given a comment sheet and were encouraged to provide comments and feedback. The format of the meeting was an open house session, with 39 presentation boards displayed around the room with members of the project team on-hand to answer questions and provide further detail about the project.

Following the open house sessions, a copy of the display board material was posted on Metrolinx’s website: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/UPExpress_June2013POH_DisplayBoard.pdf

Appendix B contains a copy of the POH Sign-in Sheet, POH Comment Form, and POH Display Panels.

5. Attendance

A total of 95 people attended the four open houses including: local politicians, local business owners, professional/educational interests, stakeholders and members of the public.

6. Summary of Comments/Feedback

In general, the key themes of the comments/feedback received at the POHs included but were not limited to the following:

- Commitment to electrification and timing of implementation
- Cost of electrification
- Potential construction – related nuisance effects along the corridor (e.g., noise)
- Air quality effects (diesel vs. electric powered trains)
- Overhead contact system vs. third rail
- Additional venue considerations/locations for next round of POHs
- Locations and size of electrification facilities
- Inquires related to EA process and timelines
- Opportunities for more stations and for future integrated transit system
- Distinction between scope of GTS construction project and UP Express Electrification project
- General support for electrification

In addition, Appendix C (Table C-1) contains a detailed summary of the comments received and how they were considered by Metrolinx as part of the UP Express Electrification EA.
Appendix A

June 2013 Public Open House Notification Materials
Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO rail corridor and the Kitchener GO rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 (Toronto Pearson). The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

The scope of the project includes engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for UP Express service and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map). The transformer stations will be supplied from the Hydro One network.

Metrolinx is carrying out an EA to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

- **Tuesday, June 4, 2013**
  - Toronto Pearson International Airport
  - Viscount Station
  - 6100 Viscount Road
  - Mississauga, ON L4V 1B4
  - Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

- **Monday, June 10, 2013**
  - Metro Hall
  - Room 314
  - 55 John Street
  - Toronto, ON M5V 3C6
  - Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

- **Tuesday, June 11, 2013**
  - Mimico Presbyterian Church
  - 119 Mimico Avenue
  - Etobicoke, ON M8V 1R6
  - Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

- **Wednesday, June 12, 2013**
  - Weston Legion
  - 1050 Weston Road
  - Toronto, ON M6N 3S2
  - Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question or receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an e-mail to the project team at: electrification@metrolinx.com.

Pour plus de renseignements, veuillez composer le 416-869-3200 ou le 1 888 GET ON GO (438-6646).
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification EA – Public Open Houses June 4, 10, 11 & 12

As part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd.</td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the EA for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).
Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, please email the project team at: electrification@metrolinx.com or Karen Pitre, Executive Director, Electrification, at: karen.pitre@metrolinx.com. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
May xx, 2013

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Public Open House

Dear xxx:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</td>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd., Mississauga ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, June 10, 2013</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
<td>6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on this project, please visit: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an e-mail the project team at: [electrification@metrolinx.com](mailto:electrification@metrolinx.com)

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx  
20 Bay St., Suite 600  
Toronto, Ontario  
Phone: (416) 874-5910  
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:  
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
Key Map
Dear xxx:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed areas for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section along the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

We wish to advise that you are receiving correspondence related to this project as your residence/business has been identified as a property situated in the vicinity of the EA study area (see key map below).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall Room 314 55 John St. Toronto, ON</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church 119 Mimico Ave. Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion 1050 Weston Rd. Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station 6100 Viscount Rd., Mississauga ON</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on this project, please visit: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an e-mail to the project team at: electrification@metrolinx.com

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
Appendix B

June 2013 Public Open House Materials
Please sign in with your contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation (if any)</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email &amp; Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background:
Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO rail corridor and the Kitchener GO rail corridor. Public consultation is a key part of the EA process.

Purpose of the Open House:
To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment; and to seek feedback on:
- Opportunities to be considered as part of the UP Express electrification project;
- The conceptual design components of the UP Express electrification project; and
- Criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations.

How does the Open House work?
Display boards that explain the UP Express Electrification Project are located throughout the room. Please review the boards, ask questions, and share your thoughts with project team members. Please answer the questions on the inside of this booklet and leave your responses at the registration table. The Metrolinx team will be reviewing all of the feedback as we move forward with the UP Express electrification project.

Thank you for participating in the process, we appreciate your feedback.

Please forward all feedback by June 30, 2013.

www.metrolinx.com
electrification@metrolinx.com
FEEDBACK FORM

1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations?

Additional comments. (additional space on reverse)
UNION PEARSON EXPRESS ELECTRIFICATION EA

Public Open House - June 2013
Welcome to Public Open House #1 for the Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment!

- Please sign in
- Comment sheets are available
- Staff are on site to answer your questions
The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.
Scope of the Project

Electrification of approximately 25 km of rail corridor:
- Beginning west of the Union Station Train Shed;
- Along portions of Union Station and Kitchener rail corridors;
- Along spur to the airport (currently under construction);
- Ending at Terminal 1 – Toronto Pearson International Airport.

- Electrification requires electrical power supply and power distribution along the corridor, and an EMU maintenance facility.

- An Environmental Assessment (EA) is being carried out to assess the potential environmental effects of converting the UP Express from diesel (DMUs) to electric power (EMUs).

- Metrolinx and Hydro One are following an integrated EA process.
Integrated EA Process

Conceptual Design Phase
- Define Study Area
- Establish Baseline Conditions/Inventory Environment
- Identify & Assess Alternative Facility Sites
- Establish Recommended Facility Sites
- Carry Out Impact Assessment/Identify Mitigation Measures

Preliminary Design Phase
- Prepare Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR)
- Pre-Submission Review of Draft EPR (Government Review Team)

TPAP Phase
- Issue Notice of Commencement
- Receive Public/Review Agency/First Nations Comments
- Prepare Final Draft EPR
- Issue Notice of Completion & EPR

Final Review
- 30-Day Public Review of EPR
- Objections/No Objections Submitted
- 35-Day Minister’s Review/Decision

Minister Gives Notice:
1) Proceed
2) Proceed with Conditions
3) Proponent must conduct additional work
4) Part II Order request granted

Submit Statement of Completion to MOE

Addendum Process
Proceed with Undertaking

2012
- May – June
- July
- August - September
- September - October
- November

2013
- January

2014
- June
- July

Requirement of Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities process
- Requirement of O. Reg. 231/08 (TPAP process)
- Requirement common to both Class EA and TPAP processes
Where Are We Now?

Conceptual Design:
- Preparing conceptual design of electrified UP Express
- Performance Specifications for electrification have been established
- Coordination with Hydro One is ongoing

Environmental Assessment:
- Collected baseline environmental conditions information
- Established proposed criteria for identifying and assessing alternative facility locations
- Identified potential paralleling station and switching station facility locations
- Ongoing Public, Stakeholder, Review Agency, First Nations Consultation
Electrification Infrastructure Requirements

POWER SUPPLY
- Transformer Stations
- 230 kV Connection Cables

POWER DISTRIBUTION
- Catenary (OCS)
- Switching Station
- Paralleling Station
- Gantries
- Electrical Connection Route
- 25kV Feeders

MAINTENANCE
- EMU Maintenance Facility
MODIFICATIONS
- Bridges/Overhead Structures
- Train Stations
- Track & Signals

UP EXPRESS ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT

METROLINX
An agency of the Government of Ontario
Une agence du gouvernement de l'Ontario
Assessment of Potential Electrification Facilities

Step 1 • Electrification System Modelling (Completed)

Step 2 • Identification of Potential Facility Locations (Partially completed – potential transformer station locations to be identified in coordination with Hydro One)

Step 3 • Assessment of Potential Facility Locations (To be completed)

Step 4 • Establish Recommended Facility Locations (To be completed)
LTK Engineering Services modelled train operation simulations and electrification system load flow to determine:

- The number and type of traction power facilities required for UP Express electrification; and
- The approximate geographic area for siting the required traction power facilities for UP Express electrification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Recommended General Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Up to 2 Transformer Stations    | • 1 in vicinity of the existing Richview Hydro One substation (southeast corner of Highway 27 and Dixon Rd)  
  • 1 in vicinity of the existing Horner Hydro One substation (Kipling Ave. just north of Horner Ave.)  |
| 1 Switching Station             | • Vicinity of Eglinton/Black Creek Dr. and existing UP Express route (rail corridor)         |
| 1 Paralleling Station           | • Vicinity of Bathurst St. and existing UP Express route (rail corridor)                      |
Step 1 – Recommended General Areas for Electrification Facilities
Step 2 - Identify Potential Facility Locations: Transformer Stations

The purpose of Step 2 is to identify potential viable facility locations based on the followed proposed criteria. The potential facility locations identified in Step 2 will be carried forward for more detailed assessment in Step 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Criteria (Step 2)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proximity to Hydro One’s existing high voltage network | 230 kV 3-phase circuits need to be drawn from the existing Hydro One network to the new transformer station. Transformer stations should be located in close proximity (i.e., ≤1km) to Hydro One’s network for the following key reasons:  
  • Avoids duplication of high voltage equipment; and  
  • Real estate/easement requirements associated with the 230kV circuits are minimized. |
| Property size requirements                            | The approximate footprint size required for a transformer station is approximately 60m X 50m. Therefore, potential locations need to be able to accommodate a minimum footprint size of 60m X 50m.                                      |
Step 2 - Identify Potential Facility Locations: Paralleling and Switching Stations

The purpose of Step 2 is to identify potential viable facility locations based on the followed proposed criteria. The potential facility locations identified in Step 2 will be carried forward for more detailed assessment in Step 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Criteria (Step 2)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Proximity to existing UP Express route/rail corridor** | 25 kV feeders between the new PS/SWS and OCS will be required in order to distribute electrical power from the PS/SWS to the catenary along the UP Express route. Therefore, PS/SWS locations should be located in close proximity to the existing UP Express route/rail corridor for the following reasons:  
  • Shorter 25kV feeders minimize real estate/easement requirements;  
  • Shorter 25kV feeders minimize maintenance requirements;  
  • Shorter 25kV feeders minimize the potential utility conflicts; and  
  • The gantry can be located within the fenced in area of the PS/SWS, which minimizes real estate/easement requirements, cost, and visual impacts. |
| **Property size requirements** | The approximate footprint sizes required for constructing a PS is approximately 35m X 20m. The approximate footprint size required for constructing an SWS is approximately 50m X 30m. Therefore, potential locations need to be able to accommodate the respective minimum footprint sizes. |
Step 2 - Identify Potential Facility Locations: Paralleling and Switching Stations

Potential Paralleling Station Location

Potential Switching Station Locations
Step 3 – Assessment of Potential Facility Locations: Proposed Criteria

The purpose of Step 3 is to assess the relative advantages and disadvantages (based on the proposed criteria) associated with the potential facility locations identified in Step 2 in order to arrive at the recommended locations for each facility type (Step 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformer Stations, Paralleling and Switching Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Criteria (Step 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical – Property Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical – Development Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical – Site Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EMU Maintenance Facility Options

Three viable options for locating the EMU Maintenance Facility (MF) were identified:
- **Willowbrook Rail Maintenance Facility (WRMF) - Existing**
- **East Rail Maintenance Facility (ERMF) - Under construction**
- **Purpose-built EMU Maintenance Facility (EMU MF) along UP Express route - New**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>WRMF</th>
<th>ERMF</th>
<th>EMU MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong> – Does the site avoid the need to construct/implement additional electrification infrastructure (catenary, traction power facilities, etc.)?</td>
<td>No – the WRMF is not located along the UP Express route/rail corridor, therefore significant additional electrification infrastructure would be required to get to WRMF.</td>
<td>No – the ERMF is not located along the UP Express route/rail corridor, therefore significant additional electrification infrastructure would be required to get to Whitby.</td>
<td>Yes – since the purpose-built EMU MF is directly along the UP Express route/rail corridor, no additional electrification infrastructure would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Constraints</strong> – Can the site accommodate the electrification infrastructure required for storage and maintenance of the EMU’s?</td>
<td>No – the WRMF currently services diesel trains and is currently operating close to capacity.</td>
<td>Yes – the ERMF is being constructed to service diesel trains and could accommodate the infrastructure required to maintain electric EMUs.</td>
<td>Yes – the purpose-built EMU MF along the UP Express route will be designed to accommodate the required infrastructure to maintain EMU trains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong> – Is the maintenance facility currently set up to provide for a safe work environment required for the storage and maintenance of the EMU’s?</td>
<td>No – WRMF has been designed and operated as a diesel rolling stock facility, and the current MF set up would not allow for safe storage and maintenance of EMU’s</td>
<td>Yes – the ERMF is not yet operating, therefore staff could be trained to perform EMU maintenance.</td>
<td>Yes – the EMU MF along the UP Express route would service electric trains exclusively, therefore staff would be trained and dedicated to EMU maintenance activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMU Maintenance Facility (Recommended Option)

Purpose-built EMU Maintenance Facility:
- New purpose-built, dedicated facility
- Recommended location: Resources Rd.
- EMU Maintenance Facility components:
  - EMU Maintenance Shop
  - Storage yard for EMUs and Electrification Maintenance of Way (MOW) Equipment
  - Sustainable Facility (LEED)
The OCS (or Catenary) is comprised of portal structures along with an assembly of wires, which connects to the pantograph on top of the electric train to supply power to it.

As part of the preliminary design phase, OCS designs will be considered for each section of the UP Express route.

Location: Rugby Station - west coast main line (UK)
A paralleling station contains an autotransformer which helps boost the OCS voltage.

A switching station is required approximately midway between transformer stations to split the electrical sections.

A gantry is a supporting structure required at each traction power facility.
Station Modifications

- Protection of bridge overpasses for pedestrian safety and security
- Protection barriers approx. 6’ 6” high made of solid material

Bridge Modifications

- Portal structures
- Grounding and bonding
EA Study Area (5 Sections)
Section 1 – West of Union Station to Bloor Station

Key Existing Features:
- Union Station Rail Corridor
- West Toronto Railpath

Key Design Considerations:
- # of tracks to be spanned
- UP Express Union Station platform
- Bloor Station platform
- 6 overhead bridge structures
- Paralleling Station
Section 2 – Bloor Station to Weston Station

Key Existing Features:
- West Toronto Diamond
- Black Creek Bridge
- West Toronto Railpath

Key Design Considerations:
- # of tracks to be spanned
- Weston Station
- 4 Bridges
- Switching Station
Section 3 – Weston Station to Highway 427

Key Existing Features:
- Humber River Bridge

Key Design Considerations:
- # of tracks to be spanned
- 2 bridges
- Highway 401 tunnel
- EMU Maintenance Facility
- Northern Transformer Station
Section 4 – Highway 427 to Terminal 1 (Pearson Airport)

Key Existing Features:
• UP Express Spur (under construction)

Key Design Considerations:
• 2 tracks to be spanned
Section 5 – Proposed Electrical Feeder Route (Lakeshore West corridor)

Key Existing Features:
- Lakeshore West GO Corridor

Key Design Considerations:
- Placement of hydro poles approx. every 15 - 18 m
- No bridge modifications anticipated
- OCS supports not required
- Southern Transformer Station

- Traction power needs to be conveyed from the southern transformer station to the paralleling station
- A low voltage electrical feeder route is proposed along the Lakeshore West GO corridor
EA Studies

- **NATURAL ENVIRONMENT** (Terrestrial, Aquatic)
- **CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT** (Built Heritage, Archaeology)
- **BUILT ENVIRONMENT** (Existing/Planned Land Use)
- **SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT** (Noise, Vibration, Air Quality, EMF)
Natural Environment – Terrestrial/Aquatic Features

Terrestrial / Wildlife Features:
- Predominantly urban setting
- Vegetation Communities:
  - Deciduous Forest (FOD):
  - Cultural Meadow (CU):
  - Cultural Thicket (CUT):
- No wetlands identified within Study Area
- No Species at Risk (SAR) identified within the Study Area

Aquatic Features:
- Black Creek
- Humber River
- Mimico Creek
Land Use Features: 

- Land use along the UP Express route portion of the Study Area generally consists of developed/redeveloped residential and industrial/commercial areas, with some recreational areas and cycling trails (e.g., West Toronto Railpath).

- Social facilities in the vicinity of the Study Area include schools, child care centres and long-term care centres.

- Public parks and recreational trails within and adjacent to the Study Area:
  - West Toronto Railpath
  - Sorauren Park
  - Keelesdale Park
  - Cruikshank Park
Cultural Environment – Heritage / Archaeological Features

**Built Heritage Features:**
- Fort York
- Bathurst Street Bridge
- Wallace Street Pedestrian Bridge
- Toronto Hydro Junction Substation
- Weston Heritage Conservation District
- Kodak – Building 9
- Humber River Bridge

**Archeology:**
- Archaeological Assessments have been previously completed along the rail corridor as part of the Georgetown South EA.
- Stage 1 Archaeological Assessments will be carried out as part of the UP Express Electrification EA at the preferred locations identified for electrification facilities.
Operational Noise and Vibration Assessment completed in February 2012 as part of the Georgetown South project. This was required to develop noise mitigation measures to address the increase in noise levels associated with increased GO service (including new UP Express).

- Base case scenario is defined as DMUs operating along the UP Express route. UP Express DMUs will be replaced with EMUs as part of the UP Express Electrification project.

Noise levels associated with an EMU will be slightly lower than DMU noise levels.

- Since noise mitigation measures (noise walls) will be implemented along the rail corridor (as part of Georgetown South project) to ensure compliance during DMU operation, no net adverse noise effects are anticipated by replacing DMUs with EMUs.
EMU Maintenance Facility

- Noise modeling will be carried out to determine the potential noise effects associated with the proposed EMU Maintenance Facility.

Transformer Stations:

- In accordance with MOE requirement and Acoustic Assessment will be prepared. The AAR will:
  - assess whether acoustic abatement measures (typically noise barrier walls) are required to meet MOE Sound Level Limits.
  - support the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) application that will be submitted to MOE

Switching Station SWS), Parallelining Station(PS):

- Proposed locations for the SWS and PS are in areas that are expected to have high background noise levels due to existing urban hum.

- Noise emissions related to the SWS and PS are anticipated to be negligible, therefore no net adverse noise effects are anticipated.
Base case scenario for the UP Express Service is defined as:

- DMUs operating along the UP Express service; and
- UP Express DMUs will be replaced by EMUs as part of the UP Express Electrification project.

UP Express Service

- Vibration impact assessment is based on a comparison of the DMU mass and EMU mass, as this is the dominant factor in the prediction of ground vibration effects.
- **No net adverse vibration effects are anticipated** as a result of conversion to EMUs.

Transformer Stations, Switching Station, Paralleling Station and EMU Maintenance Facility

- Stationary facilities are not expected to represent significant sources of vibration, **therefore no net adverse vibration effects are anticipated.**
Social Environment – Air Quality

**UP Express Service**
- Base case scenario is defined as Tier 4 DMUs operating along the UP Express service.
- UP Express DMUs will be replaced by EMUs as part of the UP Express Electrification project.
- Since conversion from DMUs to EMUs removes air emissions from diesel combustion, the net effect is considered to be positive (i.e., predicted improvement on air quality).

**EMU Maintenance Facility**
- Air Quality modeling will be carried out to determine the potential air quality effects associated with the proposed EMU Maintenance Facility.

**Transformer Stations, Switching Station, Paralleling Station**
- AQ emissions related to these facilities are anticipated to be negligible, therefore no net adverse air quality effects are anticipated.
Health Canada’s Position on EMFs:
- Health Canada does not consider guidelines for EMFs exposure necessary, because scientific evidence is not strong enough to conclude that typical exposures cause problems.
- The overall opinions from most national and international scientific bodies is there is no compelling scientific evidence that EMFs in living and school environments, regardless of distance from power transmission lines, cause ill health.

Source: Health Canada submission to the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office on the Vancouver Island Transmission Reinforcement Project; 2006. www.hc-sc.gc.ca

EMF Study for UP Express Electrification EA:
- Existing EMF intensities (due to man-made EMF sources) at specific areas within the study area will be documented.
- Potential EMF emissions from the electrified UP Express will be established.
- Predicted EMF field intensities will be compared to industry standards/limits; mitigation measures will be established, as appropriate.
Electromagnetic Interference and Electromagnetic Control Plans

**EMI - Electromagnetic Interference**

- Electromagnetic Interference does not pose any potential effects on human health and is solely an electromagnetic disturbance that affects and is solely associated with devices using electricity or electronic equipment.

**EMI Immunization Plan**

- An EMI inventory will be completed to gather information along the corridor.
- In-design mitigation measures as well as an EMI immunization plan will be developed to ensure EMI effects are minimized/mitigated.

**EMC - Electromagnetic compatibility**

- Electromagnetic compatibility is the term used to describe the ability for multiple electronic systems to function harmoniously within their electromagnetic range without affecting each other’s performance.

**EMC Plan**

- An EMC Plan will be prepared and implemented throughout the operational phase.
- A post construction audit will be completed prior to commissioning the electrified UP Express to ensure that mitigation measures are functioning as expected.
Comments/Feedback

Tell us what you think…

- Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?
- Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification project?
- Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations?
- Anything else?
Next Steps

- Confirm/finalize criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations
- Identify potential transformer station locations in coordination with Hydro One
- Assess potential facility locations to arrive at recommended facility locations
- Undertake Preliminary Design
- Carry out EA Impact Assessment Studies
- Consider feedback from today’s POH
- Prepare and circulate POH #1 Summary Report
www.metrolinx.com
electrification@metrolinx.com
Appendix C

June 2013 POH – Summary of Comments Received
### Table C1 - Summary of Comments Received and How they were Considered

**June 2013 Public Open Houses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Topic / Issue Raised</th>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>How Comment was Considered by Metrolinx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>EA of Diesel takes 6 months. EA of electric will take over 3 years.</td>
<td>The Environmental Assessment process (Transit Project Assessment Projects) that needs to be followed for electrification of the UP Express includes a 120 day regulated timeline. To provide clarification, the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) involves two phases: the first is a pre-planning phase where background studies are undertaken such as collection and documentation of existing environmental conditions in the study area, as well as conceptual engineering work and preparation of performance specifications, and pre-TPAP consultation/engagement activities with review agencies, public, stakeholders, First Nations and Metis communities. Following the pre-planning phase, the second phase involves a 120 day TPAP phase which includes: completion of environmental impact assessment studies, preparation of the Environmental Project Report (EPR), additional public/agency consultation activities, as well as more detailed preliminary engineering design and technical studies. Following the TPAP phase, there is a 30-day review period for the public to review the Final EPR that is submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 –</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>UP Express should be built right the first time – electrify now.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 –</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Is the budget finalized? / Why do people think it will never happen?</td>
<td>As part of the Electrification Study, the cost estimate to electrify the UP Express (formerly ARL) was $440 Million. We will be refining these cost estimates throughout the process. Electrification of the UP Express is included in the “Next Wave” of Metrolinx priorities and funding is subject to the Investment Strategy. It is not unusual that Environmental Assessments are completed and approved before funding is committed to their implementation. Upon confirmation of funding, the project can proceed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 –</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>When will the electric trains actually start operating?</td>
<td>Given the three-year electrification construction timeline, and the fact that the EA will not be complete until 2014, the earliest electrification could be completed is 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Why not start the service as electric?</td>
<td>The 2009 Georgetown South Service Expansion &amp; Union-Pearson Rail Link EA did not study electrification and therefore did not include MOE approval for electrification of the UP Express service. The UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the MOE in 2014. Then the project will require approvals and funding. Depending on the decision date, the estimated construction phase would be approximately 3 years from that date. Based on this, we have estimated 2017 for the operation of an electrified UP Express Service. These assumptions were also presented as part of the 2010 Electrification Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>How many tracks will be electrified</td>
<td>Based on preliminary design for UP Express Electrification, it is currently anticipated that a minimum of three tracks within the rail corridor will be electrified and two tracks will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>What are the plans for the electrification of the whole GO network system?</td>
<td>A full study of electrification of the GO network was conducted in 2010 and assessed electrification of the network, phased in over time. The decision of the Metrolinx Board of Directors was to begin by electrifying the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors, subject to funding. The first phase is the EA for the electrification of the UP Express (which will operate on the existing Kitchener rail corridor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Switching from diesel to electric: how will that happen? What will happen to the diesel vehicles? If you have rolling stock that claims to do both, I understand it’s not easy.</td>
<td>The vehicles are designed and constructed to be easily convertible from diesel to electric propulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>When will electrification of the UP Express be completed?</td>
<td>The UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the MOE in 2014. Then the project will require approvals and funding. Depending on the decision date, the estimated construction phase would be approximately 3 years from that date. Based on this, we have estimated 2017 for the operation of an electrified UP Express Service. These assumptions were also presented as part of the 2010 Electrification Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Mimico</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>What type of technology will be used for the rolling stock for the UP Express? Will there be dual locomotives?</td>
<td>The UP Express will launch with Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs). Upon electrification, the rolling stock will be Electric Multiple Units (EMUs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Mimico</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Is this the first time GO Transit will have an electric line?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Would like this electrification to happen before the diesel trains start running.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Would like to know what other city in the world could possibly be comparable to study or be nearly equitable to our situation in Toronto, every other city is electric, not nearly so densely populated or as busy; this will be the busiest rail corridor on the planet.</td>
<td>There are a number of places in North America, Europe, Asia, Australia and Africa where electrified commuter railways of a much higher capacity have been in service for a number of years. In Canada, a similar railway system exists and was built to serve the Montreal area. In the U.S., a comparable example of an electrified rail system is the North East Corridor in New Jersey and Chicago’s and Metra Electric Commuter Rail in Chicago Illinois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>This should be built as EMU from day one, not DMU to convert later, and make it happen; it’s long overdue in Canada to have 20th century transit built (we need 21st century transit)</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>If no money is committed to Electrification, then this is all another PR exercise to calm the communities along the corridor.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Don’t know how it got to this point when Toronto’s former chief city (urban) planner declared it must be done and must be electric. He and thousands were ignored by McGuinty.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Suggest that Metrolinx tax each businesses $5/employee/month in the GTA; if</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mount Dennis  Implementation  2 employees = $10/month, 2,000 employees = $10,000/month etc... would ensure that Metrolinx got the money needed and business would get their employees to work on time and with less stress.

Open House #4  Mount Dennis  Project Timeline and Implementation  Why is it a separate project? Why not electrify as part of the current UP Express project?

The 2009 Georgetown South Service Expansion & Union-Pearson Rail Link Environmental Assessment (EA) did not include MOE approval for electrification of the UP Express service. As a result, an EA is required to be completed by Metrolinx for electrification of the UP Express service. Specifically, the conversion of the UP Express service from diesel to electric power falls under Schedule 1, Subsection 2 (1) 7 of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings which applies to transit projects including: “Electrification of rail equipment propulsion on existing commuter rail corridor and associated power distribution system.”

In addition, electrification of the UP Express will necessitate new electrical connection facilities, which will be provided by Hydro One. Hydro One will be responsible for connecting a new transformer station via 230kV connection lines to their existing grid. These particular project components fall within the scope of Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992).

As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out parallel EA processes to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) (O. Reg. 231/08) as well as Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA).

Regarding timing, the UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the MOE in 2014. Then the project will require approvals and funding. Depending on the decision date, the estimated construction phase would be approximately 3 years from that date. Based on this, we have estimated 2017 for the operation of an electrified UP Express Service. These assumptions were also presented as part of the 2010 Electrification Study.

Open House #4  Mount Dennis  Project Timeline and Implementation  Recent announcement of establishing a new airport in Pickering has the CP rail line to Peterborough running through it, opening the possibility of GO service from Milton to Pickering and possibly to Peterborough. Will electrification of this line result in redundant or extra costs with regard to the electrification being undertaken?

If the question is whether there is a need for an air rail link to Pearson Airport (versus Pickering Airport), no it will not be redundant. The need for the UP Express service was demonstrated as part of the Georgetown South Corridor Expansion – Union Pearson Rail Link Environmental Assessment.

Open House #2  Metro Hall  Project Timeline and Implementation  Why can’t the EA process be carried out together with procurement? Will the procurement process delay a potential 2017 date for electrification?

Procurement will occur once funding is confirmed for the UP Express Electrification project,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Support for the Project</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>I am in full support of the electrification of the rail system in the GTA. I welcome further developments in this direction, as burning diesel fuels for transportation in a populated urban setting, is just plain wrong.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Support for the electrification of Go Transit and the Union Pearson Express. In my opinion it will not only be environmentally acceptable, it is much better than diesel power.</td>
<td>Thank you, comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>Overall – this project is very high value to the broader community and I hope that individual or local objections can be overcome quickly and efficiently. I fully support.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>Glad/hopeful electrification of commuter rails will be built in our world class city.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>General support for the project; do not remember the same work being done for the diesel train</td>
<td>Thank you. Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Consultation Process</td>
<td>How about having a meeting location at Lithuanian Hall near a lot of people affected by this? And can we have more notice on these meetings in the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Consultation Process</td>
<td>I’m just wondering why there is not going to be an EA Open House meeting in the Junction. Many of the residents who live there have expressed their concern around electrification with regards to the UP Express. From what I understand, the UP Express does not go through Mimico nor Metro Hall, so I don’t understand why these two locations would have been chosen as priority locations for an Open House for the UP EA when there are other locations closer to the affected residents that would seem much more suitable.</td>
<td>The scope of this EA begins west of Union Station and travels along the GO Union Station and Kitchener rail corridors, then along the UP Express rail spur to Terminal 1 at Pearson International Airport. The power supply also covers part of the GO Lakeshore line from about Bathurst St. to connect to a substation near our Willowbrook rail maintenance facility in Etobicoke. MetroLinx’s goal is to reach as many people as possible. The locations for the UP Express Electrification public open houses were chosen to cover as much of the EA study area as possible and reflect the locations of proposed electrification infrastructure such as power stations. We appreciate that there is no public meeting location in your Junction neighbourhood but that is the case for several other neighbourhoods along the rail corridor. The Mount Dennis Weston Legion location is in relatively close proximity to the Junction area, and we would encourage you to attend this session to share your comments/feedback on the project. We hope to see you at this meeting. The scope of the UP Express Electrification EA begins west of Union Station and travels along the GO Union Station and Kitchener rail corridors, then along the UP Express rail spur to Terminal 1 at Pearson International Airport. The power supply portion of the project also covers part of the GO Lakeshore line from about Bathurst St. to connect to a potential substation near GO’s Willowbrook rail maintenance facility in Etobicoke. MetroLinx’s goal is to reach as many people as possible. The locations for the UP Express Electrification public open houses were chosen to cover as much of the EA study area as possible and reflect the locations of proposed electrification infrastructure such as power stations. We appreciate that there is no public meeting location in your Junction neighbourhood but that is the case for several other neighbourhoods along the rail corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mount Dennis Weston Legion location is in relatively close proximity to the Junction area, and we would encourage you to attend this session to share your comments/feedback on the project. We hope to see you at this meeting.

You can still participate in the public consultation as the materials from these public meetings will posted online and you can share your thoughts by contacting the project team at electrification@metrolinx.com.

| Via email | Consultation Process | I would like to attend the open house tonight. Is there free parking available near 6100 Viscount road? If so, where is it, I cannot locate it on the map. | Additional information was provided on how to access the parking.
There is no unpaid parking at the venue, however there are additional Poh’s being held at other venues along the UP Express Electrification Study Area, where unpaid parking is available. |
|------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport) | Consultation Process | Hold more community meetings west of Weston Station | We recognize that there are many interested neighbourhoods along the Union Pearson Express route to the airport. As you know, in June, four open houses were held at various locations along the route that would be accessible to the community: at Toronto Pearson International Airport (June 4), Metro Hall (June 10), Mimico Presbyterian Church (June 11), and Mount Dennis Legion (June 12). These venues were selected in order to provide locations that were distributed along the 25 km length of the UP Express route from Union Station to Pearson Airport.
The open houses were advertised broadly including: Parkdale Liberty Villager, City Centre Mirror, Etobicoke Guardian, York Guardian, Mississauga News, Bloor West Villager, North York Mirror, Metro News Toronto, L’Express de Toronto, Toronto le Metropolitain (Brampton) so that neighbours were made aware of the multiple date and location options.
In addition to newspaper ads, the open house notice was posted on our website, notification emails were sent to the project contact list including: elected officials, review agencies, stakeholders, and first nations, and letters were mailed directly to property owners along the corridor.
We have received several suggestions for areas in which to hold our next round of public open houses and will endeavour to accommodate these requests. Metrolinx is committed to keeping the public informed throughout the EA process. We appreciate your feedback and invite you to join us during our next round of consultation. Please also note that a copy of the June 2013 Public Open House display panels has been posted to our website: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/. |
| Open House #4 Mount Dennis | Consultation Process | Very impressed with the level of professionalism shown to me as all of my present concerns were answered; the coffee was also very good. | Thank you. Comment noted. |
| Via email | Information request | I will try to enjoy one of your presentation next week and I would like to receive information about the UP project. I will appreciate if you send me more information by mail. | Additional information was provided as requested. |
| Via email | Information request | I have just received your notice of proposals for the facilities that you intend to build. | In response to this email inquiry, additional information on the proposed EMU Maintenance Facility was provided for reference purposes. |
The map variance in shading makes this difficult to read. I am unable to locate your proposed EMU Maintenance Facility? I am requesting the address or an updated clearer key map so I can review this before the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1</td>
<td>Viscount Rd</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Diesel pollutants - concerns about particulates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Union Pacific Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment Project. To whom it may concern. For your information regarding the need for electric trains, over cheaper, more extremely dangerous 'diesel option's which assure cancers and various harms to the communities. Diesel Exhaust Chemicals: - There is a need to use environmental science to understand human biology and human diseases. - Fetal origins of diseases need scientific clarification and much more discussion. - The science is not 100%, but it is suggested that Diesel Exhaust (DE) may play a causal role in asthma, autism, Huntingtons Disease, Parkinsons Disease, various cancers, ischemetic disorders, myocardial infarctions, arterial vasidilation, and fetuses aborting before coming to term. - When a person is subject to (DE), arterial vasoconstriction occurs that is -- the arteries constrict in response, shying away from the exposure. - This causes less blood flow to the fetus in the case of a pregnant woman, and decreases lung size and function, possibly leading to asthma and other possible respiratory ailments such as autism, Huntingtons disease, or Parkinsons disease. - There is a basic biological need to determine public health by using interdisciplinary research, that is -- Health officials at all levels of government along with all agencies should unite. In working together, this research and the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the UP Express Electrification project is to convert the Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) to Electric Multiple Units (EMUs). As a result, diesel powered UP Express trains will be replaced by electric powered trains. In addition, an air quality impact assessment will be undertaken as part of the EA to assess the potential air quality effects (positive and negative) of UP Express electrification.

Regarding implementation of an electrified UP Express Service, please note the following: - We're committed to delivering the UP Express service in an environmentally responsible manner. The service will launch with state-of-the-art Tier 4 diesel multiple units. Tier 4 is the strictest non-road engine emissions standard set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). - In addition, UP Express will take up to 1.2 million car trips off the road in the first year alone – reducing congestion and improving air quality. - Metrolinx is moving forward with an environmental assessment (EA) for an electrified ARL. Preliminary design and engineering is already underway. - The EA is a critical step toward electrification and the study is expected to be completed in 2014. - The vehicles which have been purchased for UP Express are fully convertible to electric, and infrastructure improvements currently underway on the Georgetown South Corridor are being built to allow for electrification.
articles are submitted and peer-reviewed by scientists. Pending approval, submissions would then be published. The information would then be more available for dissemination to the public.

- There needs to be a focused understanding of the chemicals and biologics in the environment, and how this affects humans.
- There is a need to develop local issues regarding microbial environmental disruption on human growth cells.
- There needs to be very clear and concise research before developing any new transportation systems, which accurately reflect all of the potential harm that is imposed on the communities.
- Ischemetic diseases, - blood spurts (uneven blood flow) in arteries and veins.
- Myocardial infarction, - irregular and uneven heartbeats.

New areas of research will include:
- Environmental Epigenetics: Environmental Stress-Gene Expression and Human Fetal Development, including DNA Methylation, Genomic Imprinting, Histone Modification.
- Cumulative affects of environmental and all other exposures (home, diet, lifestyle, exercise).
- Endocrine disruptors that negatively impact gene growth.

All of these areas will contribute to developing diseases in populations, especially regional populations.

Specific to Cancer:

Agencies such as the World Health Organization’s – International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the United States National Toxicology Program follow a scientific process and consider the weight of scientific evidence to determine whether a substance or chemical causes cancer.

Class 1: exposure causes cancer in humans.

Class 2A: exposure probably causes cancer in humans.

Class 2B: exposure possibly causes cancer in humans.
Class 3: scientists are unable to determine or classify whether exposure does or does not cause cancer in humans.
Class 4: exposure probably does not cause cancer in humans.
Please let me know if I can help in any discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #4</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>No diesel trains because of smoke and smell; wait and do electric only.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td>Economic Impact/Jobs</td>
<td>Career initiative program to engage those in the area with opportunities on the project. / What are the job opportunities/impact on job opportunities/ Remember when tendering to consider community benefits-- leveraging local access to jobs and economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td>Economic Impact/Jobs</td>
<td>Lack of Canadian manufacturing involvement in UP Express locomotives: manufactured in Japan, assembled in US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td>Economic Impact/Jobs</td>
<td>Check with CUE and Ryerson Engineering on training specialist for the Maintenance and Storage Facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Mount Dennis-Weston Network have been working for 4 years to get jobs on that site and to have small businesses along Industry St and Ray Ave; it will not help the local economy or the streetscape to have a switching station there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment noted.

Open House #4 Mount Dennis

Class 3: scientists are unable to determine or classify whether exposure does or does not cause cancer in humans.
Class 4: exposure probably does not cause cancer in humans.
Please let me know if I can help in any discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #4</th>
<th>Mount Dennis</th>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
<th>Mount Dennis-Weston Network have been working for 4 years to get jobs on that site and to have small businesses along Industry St and Ray Ave; it will not help the local economy or the streetscape to have a switching station there.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Mount Dennis-Weston Network have been working for 4 years to get jobs on that site and to have small businesses along Industry St and Ray Ave; it will not help the local economy or the streetscape to have a switching station there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment noted. As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, a site assessment process was carried out to identify potential facility sites to ensure reliable system operation. One of the factors considered as part of the assessment process was to minimize potential property requirements associated with implementing the switching station that are not Metrolinx owned.

We are aware of the community’s efforts to grow local employment in the area and this is referenced in Metrolinx’s mobility hub study for the Mount Dennis station on the Eglinton Crosstown line.

Additional information on this study is available online: http://thecrosstown.ca/Online-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3</td>
<td>Economic Impact (Property</td>
<td>Impact of construction and increase in rail traffic on property values.</td>
<td>It is noted that no additional capacity (tracks/rail traffic) are proposed as part of the UP Express Electrification project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimico</td>
<td>Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td>With regard to potential construction related effects, as part of the EA process, potential effects related to both the construction and operations phase of the UP Express electrification project will be considered and assessed as part of the impact assessment phase of the project. Mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential adverse effects will be developed as required. The results of the impact assessment studies will be presented at the next public consultation round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Economic Impact (Property</td>
<td>Many of us will be asking for compensation, if when we move our properties are devalued.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Values)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding the Weston Station stop and related connections, demand for the UP Express service is not part of the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3</td>
<td>Economic Impact (Revenue</td>
<td>Projections regarding the demand for the UP Express (how many people will take it) and particularly regarding the expected usage of the Weston stop, especially considering the lack of further connections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimico</td>
<td>generation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Open House #4  | Environmental Effects/Economic Impact | Studies show more cars will be taken off the road in electric than diesel, this whole project will fail miserably financially, be an environmental disaster and in ridership.         | When the UP Express service starts we expect about 5,000 riders per day, and take up to 1.2 million car trips off the road in the first year alone. This ridership level will mean a greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction in private cars travelling to and from the airport every year. Metrolinx is committed to reducing its carbon footprint and minimizing the impact on the environment by removing vehicles from the highways and roads and by using the most efficient technology available for its locomotives.  
- UP Express will launch with Tier 4 compliant diesel multiple units.  
- By using these leading edge trains, emissions in the corridor from GO Transit vehicles are expected to be no higher than today, in spite of a significant increase in service along the corridor. |
| Mount Dennis   | Environmental Effects        | Missing the trees and nature aspects already.                                                                                                                                                               | A Natural Environment Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of the UP Express Electrification EA that will assess potential environmental effects (aquatic and terrestrial) related to implementation of the electrified UP Express system, including establishment of mitigation/compensation measures to either minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects. |
| Open House #4  | Environmental Effects        | This facility has the potential to leach substances (unless regularly maintained and audited to environmental standards) into the soil and possible the water-table.                                         | As part of the EA process, potential effects on the natural environment (including groundwater) will be considered and assessed as part of the impact assessment phase of the project. Mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential adverse natural environmental effects will be developed as required. The results of the impact assessment studies will be documented in the Environmental Project Report, which will be made available for public review. |
| Mount Dennis   | Environmental Effects        |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                          |
| Open House #1  | EMF                          | EMF emissions from electrification facilities?                                                                                                                                                              | As part of the EA process, potential effects related to Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) and Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) will be considered and assessed as part of the impact assessment phase of the project. Mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential adverse effects related to EMI and EMF will be developed, as required. The results of the impact assessment studies will be documented in the Environmental Project Report, which |
| Open House #2  | EMF | Are there concerns for the noise with the projected levels of trains? We assume that projected level of trains means increased number of trains in the corridor. It is noted that no additional level of trains are proposed as part of the UP Express Electrification project, rather the Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) that will initially operate along the UP Express route will be replaced by Electric Multiple Unit trains once electrification of the UP Express is implemented. A noise impact assessment is being carried out as part of the EA and will be made available upon completion. |
| Open House #4  | EMF | No mention of catenary voltage; since this will be a source of EMF radiation all along the ROW, it should be stated clearly. For clarification, the overhead voltage is 25kV, 60Hz. |
| Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)  | Facility Siting | There is a Toronto Hydro Substation Yard at Old Weston Road south of Junction Road, north west corner of the Junction diamond. Hope it still exists. Might be ready made for a switching station. The existing Toronto Hydro Substation Yard at Old Weston Road was reviewed and compared with the recommended location for the SWS at 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. (Kodak). The following provides a summary of the comparative evaluation of the two sites:  
Proximity to Rail Corridor and Property Size Requirements:  
Although the Old Weston Rd. site is located in close proximity to the existing rail corridor (UP Express route), the site has very limited space to accommodate a standard and reliable SWS facility design, compared to the Kodak site.  
Technical and Cost:  
As a result of the space constrained site at Weston, complex engineering solutions would be required in order to implement the facility such as: locating heavy equipment (e.g. autotransformer) underground which would make the equipment very difficult to maintain throughout the operational phase. In addition, since the size of the site is constrained, the facility equipment would need to be stacked and enclosed in a building. This type of design is not typically applied in Ontario as it is less reliable and significantly more costly than the more standard, proven design proposed for the SWS at Kodak which reflects the optimal configuration of equipment on the site.  
Property Availability:  
The Old Weston Rd. site is not owned by Metrolinx. Therefore, development of the site would be more costly compared to the Kodak site which is currently owned by Metrolinx. |
| Via email  | Facility Siting/Project Timeline and Implementation | If the Kodak site is chosen, can we open discussion with Hydro through you on a renewable energy installation for the site and connecting into the grid at this point? Lastly, we spoke about the Minister saying we are in the 80 per cent certainty range for delivery by 2017 and he is pushing for sooner...can you give me an outline of what you think the 20 percent items that are holding electrification back from happening sooner The function of the proposed paralleling station at 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. will be to boost the OCS voltage. It will be a Metrolinx facility. Renewable energy options will be reviewed at the detailed design stage of the project. Regarding implementation and timing, the UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the MOE in 2014. Then the project will require approvals and funding. Depending on the decision date and confirmation of funding, the estimated construction phase would be approximately 3 years from that date. Based on this, we have estimated 2017 for the operation of an electrified UP Express Service. |
| Open House #2  | Facility Siting  | Electrification facilities need to be as far away from residential as possible. Can Burying railway electrification facilities is not safe and is not compliant with the |
| Metro Hall | they be buried? | specifications of International standards and codes; for this reason, it is not industry practice in North America and other places around the world. UP Express electrification facilities are designed based on the proven design solutions that safely operate on many electrified railways. Furthermore, it is noted that several criteria will be considered as part of identifying the preferred facility locations, as follows:  
- **Natural Environment** - consideration of sensitive natural features in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Built/Social Environment** - consideration of existing/planned land use (including residential) in the vicinity of the facility location/consideration of social features (i.e., schools, daycares, etc.) in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Cultural Environment** - consideration of sensitive cultural/archaeological features in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Technical** - consideration of Property Availability, Development Cost, Site Accessibility  

The preferred facility locations will be presented as part of the next consultation round for the EA. |
| Open House #2 Metro Hall | Facility Siting | Is there going to be a paralleling station or any other facility in Peel Region? | With regard to UP Express Electrification, there will not be a paralleling station in Peel Region. |
| Open House #2 Metro Hall | Facility Siting | Who owns the ordnance site near the proposed Fort York Bridge? | Metrolinx currently owns the Ordnance site. |
| Open House #2 Metro Hall | Facility Siting | How did you choose the sub-station locations? | The assessment of potential traction power facility locations is based on a four step process as follows:  
- **Step 1** - Background study involving computer-aided train operation simulations to determine the number and type of traction power facilities required to electrify the UP Express Service  
- **Step 2**: Generate Potential Facility Locations  
- **Step 3**: Assess Potential Facility Locations  
The following criteria will be considered in order to assess potential facility locations:  
- **Natural Environment** - consideration of sensitive natural features in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Built/Social Environment** - consideration of existing/planned land use in the vicinity of the facility location/consideration of social features (i.e., schools, daycares, etc.) in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Cultural Environment** - consideration of sensitive cultural/archaeological features in the vicinity of the facility location.  
- **Technical** - consideration of Property Availability, Development Cost, Site Accessibility |
### Accessibility

- **Step 4: Identify Recommended Facility Locations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3 Mimico</th>
<th>Facility Siting</th>
<th>What are the criteria used to determine siting of the maintenance facility? / Preference to locate facilities away from residential areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of generating initial maintenance facility options for EMUs, the following criteria were considered/applied:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Location</strong> – Does the site avoid the need to construct/implement additional electrification infrastructure (catenary, traction power facilities, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Site Constraints</strong> – Can the site accommodate the electrification infrastructure required for storage and maintenance of the EMU’s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Operations</strong> – Is the maintenance facility currently set up to provide for a safe work environment for the storage and maintenance of the EMU’s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Following identification of the three maintenance facility options (i.e., Existing Willowbrook Maintenance Facility, Purpose-Built EMU Maintenance Facility at Resource Rd., and East Rail Maintenance Facility (under construction)), the following additional criteria are to be considered in order to confirm the recommended maintenance facility option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Natural Environment</strong> - consideration of sensitive natural features in the vicinity of the facility location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Built/Social Environment</strong> - consideration of existing/planned land use in the vicinity of the facility location/consideration of social features (i.e., schools, daycares, etc.) in the vicinity of the facility location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Cultural Environment</strong> - consideration of sensitive cultural/archaeological features in the vicinity of the facility location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Technical</strong> - consideration of Property Availability, Development Cost, Site Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is noted that the Built/Social Environment criterion includes consideration existing land uses in the vicinity of potential facility sites, including residential areas. Based on application of the criteria listed above, recommended facility locations will be identified based on the relative advantages and disadvantages associated with each siting option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</th>
<th>Facility Siting</th>
<th>Regarding the two sites being considered as alternatives to the Kodak site for the Switching station: one has an approval in place for residential development, and would be a very unpopular site for this type of utility; the other is about to approved by the City for a gas station.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted. The initial step to identify possible SWS locations was based on applying the following key criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Criterion A - Proximity to existing UP Express route/rail corridor:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 kV feeders between the new SWS and OCS will be required in order to distribute electrical power from the SWS to the catenary along the UP Express route/corridor. Therefore, TPS sites should be located in close proximity to the existing UP Express route/corridor for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shorter 25kV feeders minimize real estate/easement requirements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shorter 25kV feeders minimize maintenance requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion B - Property size requirements:

The approximate footprint size required for constructing the SWS is anticipated to be 50m X 30m. Therefore, potential SWS sites need to be able to accommodate a minimum footprint area of 50m X 30m.

Following identification of potential facility locations, the sites will be further assessed according to consideration of the following additional criteria:

- **Natural Environment** - consideration of sensitive natural features in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Built/Social Environment** - consideration of existing/planned land use in the vicinity of the facility location/consideration of social features (i.e., residences, schools, daycares, etc.) in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Cultural Environment** - consideration of sensitive cultural/archaeological features in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Technical** - consideration of Property Availability, Development Cost, Site Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</th>
<th>Facility Siting</th>
<th>Switching station: 3 possible sites proposed in Mount Dennis, but former Kodak site most likely, this makes more sense but find a site within that space, not on the periphery.</th>
<th>Comment noted. To provide clarification, the proposed SWS at Kodak would be located within the existing Kodak property boundary, not outside of it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Facility Siting</td>
<td>Would hope that large critical systems buildings and major tourist attraction locations not be considered as locations for transformer stations, looking at the display boards in the open house presentation, this has been considered.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Facility Siting</td>
<td>What will be the location of the switching station on the Kodak lands?</td>
<td>It is noted that two other potential SWS sites are being considered for locating the SWS (one at the southwest corner of Black Creek Dr. and Eglinton Ave. W. and one at 955 Weston Rd.). Following the June 2013 POH, the preferred facility location will be determined. If the Kodak site is identified as the preferred SWS site, more specific locations on this site will be determined as part of the preliminary design phase. In addition, coordination with the Eglinton Crosstown LRT team will be required to establish viable SWS locations within the Kodak site that can accommodate the proposed Eglinton Crosstown LRT Maintenance and Storage Facility as well as the SWS facility. The preferred facility locations will then be carried forward for a more detailed impact assessment as part of the UP Express Electrification EA and documented in the Environmental Project Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #2 Metro Hall</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>What is the function of a switching station?</th>
<th>A Switching Station is a traction power facility equipped with the electrical equipment that allows for switching power between one power source and another. A switching station is required when more than one traction power supply station feeds the same railway system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>How big will the actual substation be at Strachan Avenue?</td>
<td>To provide clarification, there is no traction power substation proposed at Strachan Avenue, rather there is a Paralleling Station proposed at Ordnance Street. The approximate footprint size of the PS facility is 45 m X 20 m. It is also noted that gantries and duct banks containing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Mimico</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Purpose of the Traction Power Station.</td>
<td>The purpose of traction power facilities is to provide electricity to the OCS along the rail corridor, which then powers electric trains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Interested in understanding what a substation is, what it does, and if it looks like a hydro substation. /How will the traction power facilities look?</td>
<td>The Traction Power Substation (TPS) will house two transformers that will step-down the voltage that comes in from a connection to the existing 230kV transmission line. The voltage will be converted from 230kV to 25kV, and then distributed along the rail corridor to the trains. There will be other electrical equipment at the TPS such as circuit breakers and switches. The TPS will be similar to some of the smaller Hydro One Transformer Stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Mimico</td>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Can the VIA Maintenance facility be used for electric trains.</td>
<td>One of the maintenance options considered by Metrolinx was to modify the existing GO Willowbrook Maintenance Facility (WRMF) in order to perform maintenance on the electric UP Express trains. Because the WRMF is currently at capacity, the adjacent VIA Rail TMC facility would need to be used to perform certain EMU train maintenance functions. However, this option would require significant shop modifications to both the WRMF (i.e., electrifying a portion of the GO Lakeshore West corridor in order to transport EMUs to the WRMF, implementation of new yard OCS infrastructure, etc.) and VIA facility (i.e., installing an electric train power pick-up at VIA’s TMC to enable EMU train testing) that would introduce operational complexities and would entail a higher cost (capital and operating) compared to the purpose-built Resources Rd. Maintenance Facility option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Current proposed site; maintenance facility; does this location cover ‘heavy’ and ‘preventative maintenance’?</td>
<td>The EMU Maintenance Facility will primarily provide preventative maintenance (e.g., daily/weekly inspections, service, train washing, repair functions including interior wheel truing, railcar truck change-outs, storage of EMU trains). Heavy maintenance (i.e., engine or train body repairs) will generally occur off site at appropriate repair facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Is this going to be the facility to also handle the ‘T4 diesel cars’ prior to EMU usage?</td>
<td>No. DMU trains will be maintained at Willowbrook Maintenance Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td>Alternative Energy</td>
<td>If Kodak site, can we talk how it might relate to a solar farm on the LRT MSF+Yards.</td>
<td>The function of the proposed paralleling station at 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. will be to boost the OCS voltage. It will be a Metrolinx facility. Renewable energy options will be reviewed during the detailed design stage of the project. The function of the proposed paralleling station at 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. will be to boost the OCS voltage. It is not practical to replace the PS with solar panels since the capacity of the energy source required to boost the OCS voltage at the 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. site significantly exceeds the capacity of solar panel farms. In addition, solar panels do not provide a reliable energy source to boost the OCS voltage, as they are dependent on weather/climatic factors that are out of Metrolinx’s control (e.g., number of sunny days in a year). As a result, there is a risk that train service could be negatively affected by the unreliable solar energy source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Operations</td>
<td>How will you deal with power outages?</td>
<td>The UP Express system will be connected to two 230kV electrical circuits, which are part of the provincial high voltage grid. Although the project only requires one circuit, a second...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td>one will provide a back-up. High voltage circuits were chosen for connections because they supply more reliable power than distribution voltages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Would like more information on the fail safe features for the signals and trains in the event of a power outage.</td>
<td>In the event of utility power failure all safety critical communication, signaling and control equipment will still function since this equipment is fed from emergency power sources. Without power, the train will safely stop. The train service will be resume once the power comes back based on applying safe operating and failure management procedures. In the event of longer outages, alternative means of transportation such as shuttle busses or GO Transit trains will be provided to bring passengers to their final destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>If the signals are still working but the power to the rails are not, will there be a back up battery supply for the trains; perhaps to have the train reach the next station instead of the train being potentially stranded?</td>
<td>The trains are not provided with the onboard propulsion back up batteries. In the event of unlikely loss of traction power, trains will safely come to a stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>How many people can go on one train and what is the waiting time for the train?</td>
<td>Trains will depart Union Station and Toronto Pearson every 15 minutes. The total journey time between Union Station and Toronto Pearson is 25 minutes. The UP Express schedule is expected to coincide with Pearson’s passenger flight schedule. Each unit will provide comfortable and spacious seating for up to 60 people, and each vehicle will consist of two to three units, meaning that every 15 minutes we will have seating for up to 180 guests onboard the Union Pearson Express. In the event of longer outages, alternative means of transportation such as shuttle busses or GO Transit trains will be provided to bring passengers to their final destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>Concerned with the early and late (05:30 to 01:00) hours of operation of the UP Express. They indicated that particularly the last train at 01:00HRS was excessive, and that technically airplanes were not allowed to land at Pearson International (without penalty) beyond 12:00 midnight, so why would UP Express be operating beyond 12:00 midnight. Frequency and number of trains on the corridor was also a concern, particularly for residence close to the rail corridor.</td>
<td>Trains will depart Union Station and Toronto Pearson every 15 minutes. The total journey time between Union Station and Toronto Pearson is 25 minutes. The UP Express schedule is expected to coincide with Pearson’s passenger flight schedule. More information related to the schedule will be available closer to the inaugural launch date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Energy Supply</td>
<td>Would like to understand the availability of volume of electricity that will be required when trains are electrified. Every summer at some point we receive warnings of brown-outs. Reasonably the rail system will have a priority place to receive power but what if any impacts should we expect and again is there sufficient power?</td>
<td>The high-voltage (230 kV) grid of Hydro One has very high capacity as compared to the power and energy requirements of UP Express railway electrification; therefore electrification of the UP Express service is not anticipated to cause adverse effects on the power quality supplied to other customers (commercial and residential).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Infrastructure Coordination</td>
<td>Coordinate with Fort York bridge proposal re paralleling station on Ordnance Road</td>
<td>As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is coordinating with the City of Toronto in relation to the proposed bridge modifications along the corridor that will be required as part of electrifying the UP Express. The design of the Ordnance Rd. paralleling station will be developed as part of the preliminary design phase and discussed with the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Infrastructure Integration</td>
<td>Will the proposed Fort York Bridge be feasible if electrification happens?</td>
<td>Yes. We are working with the City of Toronto to ensure compatibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Infrastructure Integration</td>
<td>If it’s a healthy corridor electrify it, then add a bike path if possible – it would make sense.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Infrastructure Integration</td>
<td>If it’s a healthy corridor electrify it, then add a bike path if possible – it would make sense.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Question/Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Construction Impacts</td>
<td>What will the construction impacts of electrification be? For example, digging piles for the poles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed construction method for installing OCS poles is via auger excavation, which is commonly used in the UK and in other parts of the world. It is noted that potential short term construction related effects (e.g., noise, dust, vibration, etc.) will be assessed and mitigation measures established as appropriate, as part of the Impact Assessment phase of the EA process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise walls are planned, but what mitigation is available for people living in high rise condominiums and apartment buildings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the EA process, a noise impact assessment will be carried out to assess the potential noise effects related to UP Express electrification. The results of the noise impact assessment will be presented at the next public consultation round for comments/feedback/discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>How much noise will come from the hum of the wires?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of the EA, a noise impact assessment will be carried out to assess the potential noise effects related to UP Express electrification, including potential noise effects related to the catenary/pantograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>Do something with the noise, vibration and of course safety as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>UP Express Stations</td>
<td>Will there be a stop at Eglinton LRT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently there are four stops/stations associated with the UP Express service: UP Express Union, UP Express Bloor, UP Express Weston, and UP Express Pearson. Connecting to the Eglinton Crosstown LRT line is an important future consideration for UP Express.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>UP Express Stations</td>
<td>Why are there only 4 stations on the UP Express?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>The design and project scope for the opening day of the service in 2015 has been determined. UP Express will connect Union Station and Terminal 1 at Toronto Pearson Airport, with two station stops at Bloor and Weston stations along GO’s Kitchener corridor (formerly known as the Georgetown line). The 25-minute trip will offer residents, tourists and business travellers with a high-quality connection to the airport that is fast, reliable, convenient and comfortable. Adding more stations stops along the UP Express route will increase the total travel time, therefore taking away from the purpose of the service as being direct and express.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>UP Express Stations</td>
<td>Make sure the train stations are well designed and have the best of amenities, plus provision for new services, also make each station as “green” as possible; e.g. LEED certified and lessen environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide clarification, no new stations are being proposed/design as part of the UP Express Electrification project. Additional information related to UP Express stations is contained online: <a href="http://www.upexpress.ca/en/project/stations.aspx">http://www.upexpress.ca/en/project/stations.aspx</a> GO recognizes the decisions we make today will have a major impact on the world we live in tomorrow. Changing attitudes and shifting mindsets are putting the environment at the forefront of GO’s plans – both today and in the future. Transit is a clean, sustainable transportation option and GO believes the environment should be a key consideration for future growth strategies and development. Going green is just one of the many ways GO Transit is leading the way, both in the transportation industry and in the eyes of its customers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Can you do 3rd rail? What are the advantages of catenary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3</td>
<td>Mimico</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>How will the overhead catenary system be installed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Clarification needed in the displays on the size/frequency of the catenaries along the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Presume that the bridges spanning the ROW supporting the catenary will span all tracks but not necessarily have a catenary wire along each track – this, if needed, could easily be added later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>We need to deal with the eye pollution to save the lung pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Questions about the portals and why they need to look the way they do (does Metrolinx have to use the ugly ones?)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Rolling Stock and OCS</td>
<td>Interest in understanding the technology that would be used for the rolling stock, the speed of the rolling stock, and general questions about the traction power system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>What safeguards will Metrolinx impose on properties adjacent to electrified</td>
<td>As part of the EA process, impact assessments will be carried out to assess the potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>catenary system?</td>
<td>effects (e.g., land use, noise, vibration, etc.) related to UP Express electrification, and to identify mitigation measures as required. The impact assessment studies will consider potential construction related effects as well as operational effects and will be based on the preliminary design for UP Express electrification. Mitigation measures will be developed as required in order to minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>So long as it is safe for everyone, we have no comment on that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>May need to rebuild Wallace Ave bridge when installing the bridge barrier for electrification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>John/King/Church, where it comes out of the tunnel, need a bridge barrier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>City/MX: need a pedestrian connection between Weston Rd and the No Frills/Rec Centre; would like a bridge instead of proposed tunnel – may need bridge barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>I liked the bridge protection and railway crossing safety concerns are critical so no one sees it as an opportunity to 'jump'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Electrical Supply</td>
<td>What are the possible drains on the electrical grid in relation to the power used for the railway?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other - GTS Project</td>
<td>I am certain that you have noticed a perimeter fence around the property erected by Metrolinx Project. In addition, the entire corner is used to load and unload gravel, sand and other materials. It's unsightly! My doctors and residential tenants are complaining. The dust, sand, gravel and dirt flows along the road and gutters and is rarely cleaned. Mud is being tracked into the building. Patients, especially the disabled are having a difficult time accessing doctor’s offices. Why must the front of the property be used as a construction centre? Can it be moved to the railway lands? There is plenty of space there! We have tolerated the noise and dirt and filth for months. Tenants are threatening to leave! Please do something or inform me who to contact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that this comment pertains to the Georgetown South project, and is not included in the UP Express Electrification project scope.

This comment was forwarded to the Metrolinx Community Office in Weston, who followed up directly with the interested person to discuss their comments/concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #1</th>
<th>Viscount Rd (Airport)</th>
<th>Other - GTS Project</th>
<th>Pollution from construction equipment on the GTS corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is noted that the UP Express Electrification EA will consider and assess potential effects related to construction activities. The effects assessment and proposed mitigation measures will be documented within the Environmental Project Report. The results of the impact assessments will be presented as part of the next consultation round for feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #2</th>
<th>Metro Hall</th>
<th>Other – GTS Project</th>
<th>Current trains have horns going off. Will the level of horns etc. decrease when the level crossings are removed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes however, please note that all train crews are governed by the Federal Canadian Railway Operating Rules (CROR) to sound the horn in the interest of public safety. The need to blow the horn, its noise level and frequency, is federally regulated by Transport Canada. Please note that all train crews are governed by the Federal Canadian Railway Operating Rules (CROR) to sound the horn in the interest of public safety. The need to blow the horn, its noise level and frequency, is federally regulated by Transport Canada.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3</th>
<th>Mimico</th>
<th>Other - GTS Project</th>
<th>Noise impacts related to GTS construction—participants expressed concerns related to ongoing noise impacts along the corridor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction related impacts of the GTS project are outside the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the potential construction related effects due to UP Express electrification will be assessed as part of the EA and mitigation measures will be developed to reduce or eliminate potential adverse effects on nearby residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3</th>
<th>Mimico</th>
<th>Other – GTS Project</th>
<th>There were issues with noise from existing trains in the Mimico area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted. It is noted that this comment does not pertain to the UP Express Electrification project scope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3</th>
<th>Mimico</th>
<th>Other – GTS Project</th>
<th>Request for more information regarding the location of the new noise walls.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is noted that this comment pertains to the Georgetown South project, and is not included in the UP Express Electrification project scope. There were Noise Wall Advisory Committees to help guide the design of noise walls in each neighbourhood. Eight Community Advisory Committees (CACs) have been established along the corridor, from Bathurst Street to the Humber River Bridge. Each of the eight Community Advisory Committees is comprised of individuals who work or reside within 200 metres of the GTS corridor, representative(s) from local organizations such as BIAs, City of Toronto staff and local elected officials. Additional information is available on Metrolinx’s website: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3</th>
<th>Mimico</th>
<th>Other – GTS Project</th>
<th>Confusion over current GTS construction and UP Express Electrification EA consultation process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide clarification, the Georgetown South (GTS) project is currently under construction at various locations along the existing GO Kitchener rail corridor. The implementation of the new UP Express service from Union Station to the Airport is one component of the GTS project. In contrast, the purpose of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) project is to convert the UP Express trains from diesel power to electric power. The Public Open Houses held in June 2013 were part of the consultation process being carried out for the UP Express Electrification EA project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #4</th>
<th>Mount Dennis</th>
<th>Other – GTS Project</th>
<th>Weston revitalization of our core should try to compensate for the loss all businesses along Weston are suffering at the moment with no access for residents to try to navigate the blockages to get there presently.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is noted that this comment pertains to the Georgetown South project. It is recommended that the GTS team be contacted directly at: Georgetown South Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>Do you really need a 4th track? 3 tracks should be enough even for off peak</td>
<td>The electrified UP Express service will operate on the same tracks as the non-electrified service. The need for a 4th track will be evaluated as part of considering future service expansion within the Kitchener corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>Would like to see a soundproofing wall built along Weston Road beside the tracks north of Rogers Rd; would like to use the latest technology to decrease the noise and vibration when building the tracks and trains.</td>
<td>It is noted that this comment pertains to the Georgetown South project and is not included in the UP Express Electrification project scope. However, it should be noted that there were Noise Wall Advisory Committees to help guide the design of noise walls in each neighbourhood, eight Community Advisory Committees (CACs) have been established along the corridor, from Bathurst Street to the Humber River Bridge. Each of the eight Community Advisory Committees is comprised of individuals who work or reside within 200 metres of the GTS corridor, representative(s) from local organizations such as BIs, City of Toronto staff and local elected officials. Additional information is available on Metrolinx’s website: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other - GTS Project</td>
<td>Extreme concern with carcinogens and particulate matter; the 25% tier 4 will not catch, is lethal and a seriously compromised air quality for the health of cancer patients, children with smaller lung capacities and the elderly.</td>
<td>To provide clarification, the scope of the UP Express Electrification project is to replace the diesel powered trains that will initially operate on the UP Express line with electric powered EMU trains. As a result, no adverse air quality impacts are anticipated in relation to the UP Express electrification undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>Air quality stations must be manned for measuring and strictly enforced service cuts if they exceed an already dangerous situation for those of us breathing this air 24/7.</td>
<td>Comment noted. It that this comment pertains to air quality monitoring stations currently operating within the Georgetown South Corridor. With this in mind, Ambient Air Monitoring and Reporting Plan here: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/AAMRP_Final.pdf">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/AAMRP_Final.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We’re committed to delivering the UP Express service in an environmentally responsible manner. The service will launch with state-of-the-art Tier 4 diesel multiple units. Tier 4 is the strictest non-road engine emissions standard set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Tier 4 technology reduces airborne particulate emissions by 90% and nitrogen oxides (NOx) by 80%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition, UP Express will take up to 1.2 million car trips off the road in the first year alone – reducing congestion and improving air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>Live in the area and very concerned with the noise and all the street closures and wonder when it will all end</td>
<td>Metroxinx committed to completing the GTS Project as soon as possible with as little disturbance as possible to our neighbours. We are in the home stretch of the project with completion scheduled for the end of 2014. If you have any concerns, please contact the Weston community office at 416-241-2300 or <a href="mailto:gts@gotransit.com">gts@gotransit.com</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>House was damaged by construction, the garage and some cracks inside the house; they say that they are going to do it, or fix it or replace it if necessary and we’re looking forward to that; main concern now is what if something happens in my house in the future, due to so much vibration; can we assume that your company will be responsible for that?</td>
<td>This comment pertains to a previous/ongoing GO construction project. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that these types of claims are handled through GO Transit’s established process to receive and review claims related to construction damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>There is a health concern because my brother-in-law is a diabetic and had heart surgery a couple of years ago.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other – GTS Project</td>
<td>Worries about vibration from GTS construction.</td>
<td>It is noted that this comment pertains to the Georgetown South project, and is not included in the UP Express Electrification project scope. It is recommended that the GTS team be contacted directly at: Georgetown South Project 20 Bay Street, Suite 600 Toronto, ON M5J 2W3 416-406-0489 <a href="mailto:gts@gotransit.com">gts@gotransit.com</a> Additional information is also available on Metrolinx’s website: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/default.aspx</a> Also, GTS Noise and Vibration Report can be accessed online: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/GTS_Operational_Noise_and_Vibration_Assessment_Main_Report.pdf">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/GTS_Operational_Noise_and_Vibration_Assessment_Main_Report.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Summary of Recommendations General</td>
<td>Information can be obtained via the website links provided below. Metrolinx’s vision for the Big Move: <a href="http://www.bigmove.ca/what-is-the-big-move">http://www.bigmove.ca/what-is-the-big-move</a> Investment Strategy information: <a href="http://www.bigmove.ca/report">http://www.bigmove.ca/report</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 – Viscount Rd (Airport)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Environmental impacts of shipping locomotives from Japan</td>
<td>This topic is outside the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Opportunities for more stations for future integrated transit system e.g.</td>
<td>The design and project scope for the opening day of the UP Express service in 2015 has been determined. UP Express will connect Union Station and Terminal 1 at Toronto Pearson Airport, with two station stops at Bloor and Weston stations along GO’s Kitchener corridor (formerly known as the Georgetown line). The 25-minute trip will offer residents, tourists and business travellers with a high-quality connection to the airport that is fast, reliable, convenient and comfortable. Adding more stations stops along the UP Express route will increase the total travel time, therefore taking away from the purpose of the service as being direct and express.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eglinton Crosstown</td>
<td>Consideration of new methods/programs to increase public transit usage of the regional rail network are part of additional studies which are underway but are outside the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Clair TTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Islington / Kipling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can the electrification be leveraged for Downtown Relief Line (subway etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2 Metro Hall</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Proposal of a regional rail network approach to increasing public transit usage, comparable to those found in Zurich and Stuttgart. The submission makes a case for using existing rail corridors in the GTA to increase public transit facilities and capacity. Three rail corridors suggested: 1. The Downtown Relief Line 2. Mid Town Line: Etobicoke – Junction – Summerhill – Don Mills – Agincourt – Markham 3. Bramalea – Markham</td>
<td>Comment noted. Consideration of new methods/programs to increase public transit usage of the regional rail network are part of additional studies which are underway but are outside the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to co-ordinate with West Toronto Rail Path to maximize Rail Path potential, including possible pedestrian/cycle bridge connecting ward 14 and 18 in Lansdowne/Sorauren Park area</td>
<td>As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is coordinating with the City of Toronto to assess potential effects on current land uses as well as how future/planned land uses (e.g., Railpath) will be considered. Furthermore, Metrolinx is engaging with the West Toronto Railpath group, the City of Toronto and other community organizations to help accommodate the Railpath’s plan to build its path adjacent to GO’s Kitchener corridor, where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                      |       | Why are current diesel locomotives noisier that the older ones? | The newer locomotives do have a distinctive sound. Especially if a person is used to hearing the F59 model locomotives, it is understandable that the new sound will be noticed. There are many variables that can influence sound levels such as environmental conditions, surrounding buildings, acceleration/deceleration, etc. Specific to the new MP40 engines, GO Transit has voluntarily complied with the latest noise level standards set for locomotives used in the United States, as Canada does not currently stipulate standards for railroad use. These new engines do have a different sound signature (pitch) and may appear to be nosier than the older model engines, however the noise emission level is comparable between the old model engines and the new MP40 locomotives. The new engines are 20 percent more powerful and are not outputting/ emitting any additional sound pollution over our older model. These have been introduced to improve on time performance as well as provide GO Transit the ability to response to
increased customer demand by carrying more passengers per train.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #2</th>
<th>Metro Hall</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>What is the timing to electrify Lakeshore?</th>
<th>The electrification of Lakeshore is dependent on funding, which is part of the Investment Strategy that is currently under review. Therefore, the timing is dependent on this review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Another stop in south Bathurst to serve Toronto Island Airport, considering service and connectivity in and out of both airports will likely increase as more airlines create new local routes, this will make easy transfers between airports; e.g. Windsor/Sarnia to Island, train to YYZ to Paris, etc.</td>
<td>The design and project scope for the opening day of the service in 2015 has been determined. UP Express will connect Union Station and Terminal 1 at Toronto Pearson Airport, with two station stops at Bloor and Weston stations along GO's Kitchener corridor (formerly known as the Georgetown line). The 25-minute trip will offer residents, tourists and business travellers with a high-quality connection to the airport that is fast, reliable, convenient and comfortable. Adding more stations stops along the UP Express route will increase the total travel time, therefore taking away from the purpose of the service as being direct and express.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Make future provisions for green energy, solar and wind (like small ones used on Boston Airport).</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>The Minister of Health calls it a danger, David Suzuki expressed on record his concern; thousands of members of the community have expressed outrage from Day one.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>When will we know if $400 million will even be committed and budgeted and designated for electrification of the Georgetown Line; it is needed ASAP.</td>
<td>Based on the Electrification Study, the estimated incremental capital cost to electrify the UP Express corridor is approximately $440 million (2010 dollars). This estimate will be refined during the preliminary design that is currently underway. Funding has not yet been confirmed and is subject to the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Mount Dennis</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Residents will not hold out for long after diesel opens.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UF Express/Electrical project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UF Express/Electrical project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential faculty, student, and employer engagement with the UF Express/Electrical project?

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)
I would like to use the last of Rogers Road. I could be beside the track. North of 41st West Road is a soundproofing wall. I would like to see.

The noise and vibration when building the tracks and trains.

Also I like to use the last of Rogers Road. I could be beside the track. North of 41st West Road is a soundproofing wall. I would like to see.

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

FEEDBACK FORM

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

3. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?
In our world, clean city of communities needs will be built.

Transport built.
To have sustainable (reduction of cars) community.
Not long, service to change later. And less make it happen.
From day one, not dump to correct.
This should be built as early.

Additional comments (additional space on reverse).

Do you have any feedback for the proposed team regarding the project concept?

Express Electrication

1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the U.P. Express Electrication project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the proposed team regarding the project concept?

3. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the U.P. Express Electrication project?
Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the

For the railway [electrical] grid?

Grid in relation to the power used

What are the possible drain on the

sections?

Proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility

In the event a power outage occurs what

and trains?
Additional comments (additional space on reverse):

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

Do you see any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

I would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.

I appreciate your input on the UP Express Electrification project.

Concealed designs components of the UP Express Electrification project would be beneficial to the team.

Concealed designs could benefit the project.

Confidential information along the line.

Project:

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

Do you see any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

I would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.

I appreciate your input on the UP Express Electrification project.

Concealed designs components of the UP Express Electrification project would be beneficial to the team.

Concealed designs could benefit the project.

Confidential information along the line.

Project:

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

Do you see any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

I would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.

I appreciate your input on the UP Express Electrification project.

Concealed designs components of the UP Express Electrification project would be beneficial to the team.

Concealed designs could benefit the project.

Confidential information along the line.

Project:

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

Do you see any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

I would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.

I appreciate your input on the UP Express Electrification project.

Concealed designs components of the UP Express Electrification project would be beneficial to the team.

Concealed designs could benefit the project.

Confidential information along the line.

Project:

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

Do you see any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

I would like electrification to be implemented as soon as possible.

I appreciate your input on the UP Express Electrification project.

Concealed designs components of the UP Express Electrification project would be beneficial to the team.

Concealed designs could benefit the project.

Confidential information along the line.

Project:
1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations?
   
   **Current Proposed Site:**
   
   Maintenance Facility - Does this location cover "Heavy" and "Preventative Maintenance"?

   Is this going to be the facility to also handle the "14" diesel cars"? Prior to EMU usage?

   This facility has the potential to leak substances (unless regularly maintained and audited to environmental standards) into the soil and possibly the water table.

Additional comments. (additional space on reverse)
FEEDBACK FORM

1. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

   - [ ] IS TUNNEL BETWEEN CHURCH ST. & KING ST. CURRENTLY BEING BUILT TO ACCOMMODATE ELECTRIFICATION, NOW OR IN THE FUTURE?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations?

   - [ ] WHY SEPARATE PROJECT?
   - [ ] WHY NOT ELECTRIFY AS PART OF CURRENT UP EXPRESS PROJECT?
Dear [Name],

I believe that the proposed changes to the product would be beneficial. The current design is lacking in certain areas, and with these modifications, I think we can achieve a more refined result. Additionally, I would like to see some additional features added to make it more user-friendly.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this project.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
My name is John Doe. I have a question about the course content this semester. I was hoping to get some guidance on my project. My current progress is [insert progress details].

I am working on a project about [insert project topic]. I would appreciate any feedback or suggestions you might have on it. I am working on [insert specific aspect of the project].

Please let me know if there are any areas I should focus on. I appreciate your time and feedback on this.
I suggest that we do this.

I understand the need for the money, but this would ensure that even if 2000 employees left, there would still be 17,000 remaining. I don't know if 2000 employees is a good number for the business. I think the number is too high. I suggest we revise this.

Additional comments (additional space on reverse):

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the proposed design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Are there any opportunities you would like to see considered as part of the UP Express Electrification project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the location and staffing of the project team?
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

4. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

5. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

6. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

7. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

8. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

9. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

10. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

11. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

12. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

13. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

14. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

15. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

16. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

17. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

18. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

19. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?

20. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project?
Thank you for participating in this project. We appreciate your feedback.

Please forward all feedback by June 30, 2013.

The Registration table on the way out.

Please leave your completed Feedback Form at

1. Write this number on...
2. Write your comments...
3. Write your name...
4. Write your address...

Additional comments:

Welcome to the Open House!
Welcome
An agency of the Government of Ontario
Metrolinx

The Metrolinx team will be answering all of the questions on the inside of this booklet and leave your responses at the locates throughout the room. Please review the boards. Ask questions. Display boards that explain the UP Express Electrification Project are located throughout the room. Please review the boards. Ask questions. Display boards that explain the UP Express Electrification Project are located throughout the room. Please review the boards. Ask questions.

How does the Open House Work?

Criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations
The conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification Project
Opportunities to be considered as part of the UP Express

To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment;
Purpose of the Open House:

Public consultation is a key part of the EA process.
The Union Station GO rail corridor and the Kitchener GO rail corridor underwriting involves Electrification of approximately 25 km of track along with examining electrification of the existing GO Transit rail system as a whole. Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010.

Background:

Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Please forward all feedback by June 30, 2013.
Thank you.

Please leave your completed feedback form at the Registration Table on the way out.
Thank you for participating in the process. We appreciate your feedback.

feedback as we move forward with the UP Express Electrification project.

regulation. The MetroLink team will be reviewing all of the
registration tables. The MetroLink team will be reviewing all of the
questions on the inside of this booklet and review your responses at the
and share your thoughts with project team members. Please answer the
located throughout the room. Please review the boards, ask questions,
freight boards that explain the UP Express Electrification Project and

How does the Open House work?

• Criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations;
• The conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification
• Opportunities to be considered as part of the UP Express
• To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment;

Purpose of the Open House:

Public consultation is a key part of the EA process.

The Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Kitchener GO Rail Corridor
underwent involvement electrification of approximately 25 km of track along
Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed
Union Station to Toronto Pearson (UP) Express Service from
Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express Service from

findings of this study, MetroLink initiated the Environmental Assessment
which examines Electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a
MetroLink completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010.

Background:

Public Open House, June 2013

Welcome

An agency of the Government of Ontario

MetroLink
Thank you for participating in the process, we appreciate your feedback.

Feedback as we move forward with the UP Express electrification project.

Reflect feedback on the UP Express electrification project.

Registration deadline: The Metrolink team will be reviewing all of the
guests at the UP Express electrification project.

Questions on the inside of this booklet and leave your responses at the
display boards. Ask questions.

How does the Open House work?

- Criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations

The conceptual design components of the UP Express

Electrification Project.

Opportunities to be considered as part of the UP Express

To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment.

Purpose of the Open House:

Public consultation is an integral part of the EA process.

The Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Kitchener GO Rail Corridor

underlying involves electrification of approximately 25 km of track along

the Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed

UP Express electrification project is shown in the Environmental Assessment

which examines electrification of the existing GO Rail system as a

Southern Corridor (SC) electrification study in December 2010.

Background:

Public Open House, June 2013

Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Welcome
Thank you for participating in the process. We appreciate your feedback.

Feedback is how we move forward with the UP Express Electrification project.

To register, please go to the Metrolinx website.

This is an open forum where all attendees can share their thoughts with project team members and answer the questions on the inside of this booklet. Read and respond to the questions at the back of this booklet and share your feedback with the project team members. Please answer the questions,

How does the Open House work?

- Criteria for identifying and assessing potential facility locations.
- The conceptual design components of the UP Express Electrification Project.
- Opportunities to be considered as part of the UP Express.
- How to seek feedback on:

To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment:

Purpose of the Open House:

Public consultation is a key part of the project.

The Union Station GO rail corridor and the Richmond GO rail corridor.

Uninterrupted services electrification of approximately 25 km of track along

Understanding impacts, electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express, from

The proposed Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed

UP Express Electrification Study in December 2010,

Additional comments?
Appendix J4

Notice of Commencement
NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into Toronto Pearson (see map below). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously. The Environmental Project/Study Report will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electricity to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

TRACTION POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e. portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries which provide power to the OCS, and are located in the vicinity of each PS. A new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

TRACTION POWER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV, to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply system is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Members of the public, agencies and other interested parties are encouraged to participate in the EA process by attending consultation opportunities or contacting the project team directly with information, comments or questions. Consultation opportunities are planned and will be advertised on the project websites, in local newspapers and via direct mail. A second round of joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to present and seek feedback on both the TPAP (Metrolinx) and Class EA (Hydro One) project components.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and First Nations and Métis communities is a key component to the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an email to the project team at: electrification@metrolinx.com or contact:

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON  M5J 2W3
tel: 416-874-5910
e-mail: electrification@metrolinx.com

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON  M5G 2P5
tel: 416-345-6799
e-mail: Community.Relations@HydroOne.com

Pour plus de renseignements, veuillez visiter le site gotransit.com ou composer un des numéros ci-dessus.
November 28, 2013

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometers of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the future UP Express Pearson Station (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

We are sending notification to people who have been identified as property owners in the vicinity of the project study area (see attached map).

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).
**Traction Power Distribution System**

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the *Transit Project Assessment Process*, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial *Environmental Assessment Act* approval in accordance with the *Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities*.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation with the public, adjacent property owners, review agencies, First Nations and Métis communities is a key component to the UP Express Electrification EA. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to present a project update and seek feedback on both the TPAP (Metrolinx) and Class EA (Hydro One) project components and will be advertised on the project websites ([www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification), [www.HydroOne.com/Projects](http://www.HydroOne.com/Projects)), local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail.

If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification project, please visit our project website(s) or contact us directly via e-mail or phone:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3  
Tel: 416-874-5910  
electrification@metrolinx.com  
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite  
Environmental Planner  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
483 Bay Street TCT6  
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5  
Tel: 416-345-6799  
Community.Relations@HydroOne.com  
mailto:patricia.staite@hydroone.com  
www.HydroOne.com
Good morning,

I am writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. As you may know, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system. Metrolinx and Hydro One have initiated a simultaneous EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as well as Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). This process will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report, produced by both Metrolinx and Hydro One, which will be made available for public review and comment.

Metrolinx and Hydro One will be providing notification of this EA process by placing an ad in local newspapers the first week of December 2013 and mailing a notice to adjacent property owners along the corridor. Attached is a copy of the notice for your information. We are also planning Public Open Houses towards the end of January/early February 2014 and will provide you with details after the dates and locations are established.

We look forward to working with you on this important project and would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project.

For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification or www.HydroOne.com/projects

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre

Marylena Stea
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Electrification</td>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
<td>20 Bay St., Suite 600</td>
<td>(416) 874-5910</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.pitre@metrolinx.com">karen.pitre@metrolinx.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>Hydro One Networks Inc.</td>
<td>483 Bay Street TCT 7</td>
<td>416-345-6799</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Community.Relations@HydroOne.com">Community.Relations@HydroOne.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please find attached the Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment for the Union Pearson Express Electrification Project.

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA).

Consultation with the public, review agencies, First Nations and Métis communities is a key component to the UP Express Electrification EA. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to present a project update and seek feedback on both the TPAP (Metrolinx) and Class EA (Hydro One) project components. In the meantime, if you have any comments/feedback for the project team or would like additional, more detailed information, please contact us via e-mail or phone:

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Donna Big Canoe
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
R.R. #2, P.O. Box 13
Sutton West, Ontario
LOE 1R0

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Big Canoe:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

Traction Power Supply System

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Please find attached the Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment for the Union Pearson Express Electrification Project.

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx's requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One's requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA).

Consultation with the public, review agencies, First Nations and Métis communities is a key component to the UP Express Electrification EA. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to present a project update and seek feedback on both the TPAP (Metrolinx) and Class EA (Hydro One) project components, and will be advertised on the project websites, local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail.

In the meantime, if you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification project, please our project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects) or contact us directly via e-mail or phone:

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
electrification@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
Community.Relations@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Union Pearson Express Electrification EA
January/February 2014 Public Open Houses
Summary Report
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1. Overview

As part of the consultation process for the Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA), four public open houses were held at various locations along the UP Express route between January 30 and February 10, 2014. Four different venues were selected as follows, in order to provide locations that were distributed along the study area, and based on consideration of comments/feedback received from the June 2013 round of POHs regarding potential venues/locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, January 30, 2014</td>
<td>Islington Evangel Centre</td>
<td>49 Queen’s Plate Drive</td>
<td>6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 3, 2014</td>
<td>Locus 144 Restaurant</td>
<td>171 East Liberty Street</td>
<td>6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 4, 2014</td>
<td>York West Active Living Centre</td>
<td>1901 Weston Road</td>
<td>6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 10, 2014</td>
<td>Lithuanian House</td>
<td>1573 Bloor Street West</td>
<td>6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Purpose

The purpose of the January/February 2014 Public Open Houses was to share a project update on the design and environmental assessment work completed since the previous June 2013 Open Houses, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Preliminary Design for Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification:
  - Traction Power Supply (Hydro One)
  - Traction Power Distribution
  - Maintenance Requirements
  - Construction Activities

- EA Studies (including potential environmental effects, mitigation measures)

- Next Steps/Timelines

3. Notification

The public open houses (POH) were advertised broadly including so that neighbours were made aware of the multiple date and location options:
In addition to newspaper ads, the open house notice was posted on Metrolinx’s and Hydro One’s websites. Invitation emails were also sent to the project contact list including: elected officials, review agencies, stakeholders, and first nations. In addition, letters were mailed directly to identified property owners within the EA study area.

Copies of the Newspaper Ad, e-mail Invitation, and Notification Letters are contained in Appendix A.

4. Open House Format

The January/February 2014 Public Open Houses were held jointly by Metrolinx and Hydro One.

As the Traction Power Supply components of the UP Express Electrification project are being assessed by Hydro One under the Class EA for Minor Transmission, it was beneficial to hold joint Public Open House sessions with Metrolinx in order to provide the public with a complete understanding of the project, including how the power supply and power distribution components will be implemented.

For a summary of the information and materials presented by Hydro One at the open house, please refer to: Hydro One Union Pearson Express Traction Power Substation Class Environmental Assessment - Draft Environmental Study Report.

With respect to the format of the sessions, attendees were welcomed by the project team, asked to sign-in and provided with a comment sheet. Attendees were encouraged to discuss questions with the project team and to provide written comments and feedback via the comment sheets. A total of 50 Metrolinx/Hydro One presentation boards were displayed around the room with members of the project team on-hand to answer questions and provide further detail about the project.

Following the open house sessions, a copy of the display board material was posted on Metrolinx’s website: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/UPExpress_Jan%202014POH2_DisplayBoard.pdf

Appendix B contains a copy of the POH Sign-in Sheet, POH Comment Form, and POH Display Panels.
5. Attendance

A total of 117 people attended the four open houses including: local politicians, stakeholders and members of the public.

6. Summary of Comments/Feedback

In general, the key themes of the comments/feedback received at the POHs included but were not limited to the following:

- Commitment to electrification
- Timing of implementation/why was electrification not included into the 2015 time frame
- Cost of electrification
- Inquires related to EA process timelines
- Suggestions for opportunities for more stations (e.g., Mt. Dennis, Liberty Village)
- Can we include additional areas/components in this EA to fast-track future electrification?
- Questions related to how the system would be protected in the case of inclement weather (e.g. ice storm of 2013)
- Questions regarding EMI and EMF effects
- Would like to see more visuals/renderings of the electrified system
- Suggestions to consider alternative technologies (e.g., wind power, “steam motion” technology)
- General support for electrification

In addition, Appendix C (Table C-1) contains a detailed summary of the comments received and how they were considered by Metrolinx and Hydro One as part of the UP Express Electrification EA.
Appendix A

January/February 2014 Public Open House
Notification and Newspaper Ad
Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment Public Open Houses

Electrification of Union Pearson (UP) Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan to dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

Metrolinx and Hydro One Networks Inc. invite you to their joint Public Open Houses to learn more about the plans to electrify UP Express. At the Open House, interested members of the community can receive a project update and provide feedback on the preliminary design components, environmental effects and mitigation and next steps/timelines.

The UP Express route and proposed locations for electrification components are shown on the map below.

The Open Houses will provide you with an opportunity to view displays and speak one-on-one with project staff. We look forward to seeing you there!

Thursday, January 30, 2014
Islington Evangel Centre
49 Queens Plate Drive
Etobicoke, ON M9W 6P1
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Tuesday, February 4, 2014
York West Active Living Centre
1901 Weston Road
Weston, ON M9N 3P5
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Friday, February 7, 2014
York West Active Living Centre
1901 Weston Road
Weston, ON M9N 3P5
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Monday, February 3, 2014
Locus 144 Restaurant
171 East Liberty Street
Unit 144
Toronto, ON M6K 3P6
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Monday, February 10, 2014
Lithuanian House
1573 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON M6P 1A6
Time: 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

For more information, please contact:

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
tel: 416-874-5910
e-mail: electrification@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street, South Tower, Floor 6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
tel: 416-345-6799
e-mail: Community.Relations@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/Projects

Pour plus de renseignements, veuillez composer le 416 869-3200 ou le 1 888 GET-ON-GO (438-6646).
We are writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx and Hydro One are holding joint Public Open Houses at the end of January/early February 2014 to provide a project update and receive feedback on the preliminary design components, environmental effects and mitigation and next steps/timelines. Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islington Evangel Centre</td>
<td>Locus 144 Restaurant</td>
<td>York West Active Living</td>
<td>Lithuanian House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Queens Plate Drive</td>
<td>171 East Liberty St.,</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>1573 Bloor St. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke, ON M9W 6P1</td>
<td>Unit 144</td>
<td>1901 Weston Rd.</td>
<td>Toronto, ON M6P 1A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Toronto, ON M6K 3P6</td>
<td>Weston, ON M9N 3P5</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please find attached a copy of the notice for your information.

In the meantime, if you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification project, please visit our project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects) or contact us directly via e-mail or phone:

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3  
Tel: 416-874-5910  
electrification@metrolinx.com  
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite  
Environmental Planner  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
483 Bay Street TCT6  
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5  
Tel: 416-345-6799  
Community.Relations@HydroOne.com  
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Appendix B

January/February 2014 Public Open House
Comment Form and Display Panels
WELCOME
Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
Public Open Houses, Jan/Feb 2014

Background:
Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO rail corridor and the Kitchener GO rail corridor. Public consultation is a key part of the EA process, this is the second of two rounds of public consultation.

Purpose of the Open House:
To update on the public on the status of the environmental assessment; and to seek feedback on:
- The preliminary design components;
- Environmental effects and mitigation; and
- Next steps/timelines

How does the Open House work?
Display boards that explain the UP Express Electrification Project are located throughout the room. Please review the boards, ask questions, and share your thoughts with project team members. Please answer the questions on the inside of this booklet and leave your responses at the registration table. The Metrolinx team will be reviewing all of the feedback as we move forward with the UP Express electrification project.

Thank you for participating in the process, we appreciate your feedback.

www.metrolinx.com
electrification@metrolinx.com
FEEDBACK FORM

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?

Additional comments. (additional space on reverse)
UNION PEARSON (UP) EXPRESS ELECTRIFICATION ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Public Open House #2: January/February 2014
WELCOME!

Public Open House #2

UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

- Please sign in
- Please use the comment sheets to submit your feedback/questions
- The project team is on site to answer your questions
Project Overview

Purpose: Convert the UP Express service from diesel to electric

- Achieved through Traction Electrification System which will provide electricity to the trains:
  - Traction Power Supply System → Hydro One Class EA
  - Traction Power Distribution System → Metrolinx Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)

- New Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) Maintenance Facility
Project Components

TRACTION POWER DISTRIBUTION
- Overhead Contact System (OCS)
- Two Paralleling Stations
- Gantries
- Underground Cable

TRACTION POWER SUPPLY
- Traction Power Substation
- 230 kV Connection Cable

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE
- EMU Maintenance Facility
- Bridges
- Train Stations
- Track & Signals
Environmental Assessment Process

Hydro One
- Traction Power Supply
- Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA)
- Environmental Study Report (ESR)

Metrolinx
- Traction Power Distribution and Maintenance Facility
- Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)
- Environmental Project Report (EPR)
**Electrification Project Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>THE BIG MOVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOVEMBER 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>First-ever Regional Transportation Plan for Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Calls for transformed regional transportation system, including greatly-expanded regional rail system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Identified electrification as &quot;likely&quot; to be part of GO Transit expansion but left specifics for subsequent study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY 2009</td>
<td>Community Advisory Committee Appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY 2010</td>
<td>Metrolinx assumes responsibility for UP Express project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 2010</td>
<td>Metrolinx completes the “Electrification Study”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>SPECIALIZED STUDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY 2011</td>
<td>Metrolinx Board Direction: Begin with UP Express as a logical starting phase, conceptual design for Lakeshore/Kitchener corridors for future expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>DEVELOP SPECIFICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 2012</td>
<td>Develop the Electrification Performance Specifications: detailed technical report that sets out the criteria for design and implementation of a traction power electrification system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER 2011</td>
<td>Design team start up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2013</td>
<td>Conceptual design for Electrification project is for Kitchener/Lakeshore with UP Express as Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2013</td>
<td>Preliminary Design initiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed Environmental Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified preferred facility locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenced preparation of the Environmental Project Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Facts – UP Express Electrification

Traction Power Supply System:
- 1 Traction Power Substation (Hydro One)
- 2 x 25 kV ac autotransformer fed electrification system
- 1 x 25 kV system along airport spur

Traction Power Distribution System:
- Overhead Contact System
- 2 Paralleling Stations
- 3 sets of gantries/underground feeders (duct banks)

560 OCS Support Structures*:
- Typical spacing up to 65m
- Height (Main line corridor) → 7.6m-12m above track
- Height (Spur to airport) → approx. 7.6m above track

Type of Structure: (depends on number of tracks)
- Portal
- Cantilever

Bridge Protection Barriers:
- Pedestrian safety

*Based on preliminary design. During the detailed design phase, additional refinements will be made to the OCS design (portal/cantilever locations will be confirmed). Since OCS support structures are required approximately every 50-65 metres, substantive changes to portal/cantilever locations beyond a five metre range are not anticipated.
Power Distribution: Overhead Contact System

Location: Rugby Station (west coast main line (UK))

*The OCS (or catenary) is comprised of portal/cantilever structures along with an assembly of wires, which connects to the pantograph on top of the electric train to supply power to it.
Overhead Contact System Requirements

Based on Preliminary Design:

- Either portal or cantilever structures
- Heights of the structures range from 7.6m to 12m
- Spacing between structures ranges from 50m to 65m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Length (km)</th>
<th># of Structures*</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Union to Bloor</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7.6 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Bloor to Weston</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Weston to Hwy 427</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Hwy 427 to Airport</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>~ 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25km</strong></td>
<td><strong>560</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6 – 12m</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on preliminary design. During the detailed design phase, additional refinements will be made to the OCS design (portal/cantilever locations will be confirmed). Since OCS support structures are required approximately every 50-65 metres, substantive changes to portal/cantilever locations beyond a five metre range are not anticipated.
**Paralleling Station: Ordnance Street (Triangle)**

**Gantry:** a supporting structure required at each traction power facility

**Duct Bank:** high voltage cable will be routed in underground duct banks from paralleling station to the gantries

**Paralleling Station:** contains an autotransformer which helps boost the OCS voltage
- Gantries located at Ray Avenue
- Paralleling Station to be incorporated into the site plan for Eglinton Crosstown LRT Maintenance and Storage Facility at 3500 Eglinton Avenue West
- High voltage cable will be routed in underground duct banks (along Industry Street and Ray Avenue) from the paralleling station to the gantries
Proposed Traction Power Substation

- 175 City View Drive site (refer to Hydro One display panels)
- Gantries (13m (H) X 14m (L)) are required to provide power to the OCS
- High voltage cable will be routed in underground duct banks from traction power substation to the gantries
- Access road to be constructed to provide maintenance access to gantries
Facility Components:

- Three (3) Yard Track
- Train Washing Facility
- Parking Lot
- Train Maintenance Buildings
  - Progress Maintenance Tracks
  - Heavy Repair
  - Wheel Maintenance
- OCS Storage and Maintenance Facility
Grounding and bonding systems serve two primary functions:

- Provide for the safety of passengers, operating personnel and general public
- Carry electric currents into the earth under normal and fault conditions without exceeding any operating and equipment limits or affecting service

*Fault conditions are defined as conditions where a system malfunction occurs (e.g., broken insulator, wire rupture); these conditions are considered rare and in-design mitigation measures such as fault protection will be in place to further mitigate any risk*
Grounding and Bonding

As part of the detailed design phase, the following will be undertaken:

- Undertake inventory of all structures, buildings, fences within 10 m of the outermost track on the corridor

- Based on the inventory results, determine the requirements for installation of grounding and bonding (e.g., install grounding rod)

- Install grounding and bonding where necessary during construction phase

- Beyond 10 m of the corridor, additional grounding and bonding is not anticipated for structures, buildings, fences in compliance with the Ontario Building Code provides adequate protection/mitigation for public safety
Environmental Assessment Studies

- **NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**
  (Terrestrial, Aquatic)

- **BUILT ENVIRONMENT**
  (Existing/Planned Land Use)

- **CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT**
  (Heritage, Archaeology)

- **SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT**
  (Noise, Vibration, Air Quality, EMF)
Natural Environment

Vegetation

- **Potential Effects:** Minor removals required within the rail corridor and at facility sites
- **Mitigation Measures:** Implement a restoration and enhancement plan as appropriate to offset vegetation losses

Wildlife

- **Potential Effects:** Potential for bird collision/perching on OCS wires
- **Mitigation Measures:** Design OCS to maintain appropriate clearance between wires of different electrical potential; if necessary, wires will be made visible with markers

Watercourses

- **Potential Effects:** OCS support structures to be attached to Black Creek and Humber River overpasses; no adverse effects to watercourses anticipated
- **Mitigation Measures:** Best management practices during construction such as: Use shrouding to trap and prevent concrete and other bridge materials from entering the watercourse

Contaminated Soils

- **Potential Effects:** Disturbance of contaminated soils and/or groundwater during construction
- **Mitigation Measures:** Soils will be managed in accordance with Provincial legislation and best practices; an excess materials management plan shall be developed
Cultural Heritage

The following cultural heritage resources are to be further evaluated as part of detailed design:

1. Bathurst Street Bridge
2. Fort York Garrison Common National Historic Site and Heritage Conservation District
3. King Street Underpass
4. Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge
5. Rogers Road Bridge
6. Jane Street Bridge
7. Humber River Bridge
Cultural Heritage

Bridges

- **Potential Effects:** Attachment of grounding grid and/or bridge protection barrier and/or addition of OCS foundation attachments to bridge
- **Mitigation Measures** (to be completed as part of Detailed Design Phase):
  - **Step 1:** Complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER)
  - **Step 2:** Review of CHER by the Metrolinx Heritage Committee
  - **Step 3:** If necessary, conduct Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and detailed design to ensure that heritage features are conserved/protected

Fort York and Garrison Common National Historic Site and Heritage Conservation District

- **Potential Effects:** Potential disruption to visual setting of Fort York due to proximity of proposed Paralleling Station at Ordnance Street
- **Mitigation Measures** (to be completed as part of Detailed Design Phase): Consider carrying out a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) prior to construction
Archaeology

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: Completed
- Included background study and property inspections for Paralleling Station and the Maintenance Facility sites

Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment recommended for Ordnance Street Paralleling Station Site (during Detailed Design). This will include:
- More detailed survey of the land to identify any archaeological resources on the property
- Dig test pits at regular intervals and sift soil to look for artifacts
- Determine whether any archaeological resources found are of sufficient heritage value or interest to require a Stage 3 Assessment
Land Use

Existing Land Use

- **Potential Effects:** Both the Paralleling Station sites and EMU Maintenance Facility site are compatible with current land use zoning
- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required

Future Land Use (Considerations)

- Ordnance Triangle Mixed-use Development Proposal
  - Ongoing coordination with developer and City of Toronto Environmental Assessment
  - The Paralleling Station is not anticipated to adversely affect the proposal

- Proposed West Toronto Railpath Extension
  - Ongoing coordination with City of Toronto Environmental Assessment

- Proposed Eglinton Crosstown Maintenance and Storage Facility at Mount Dennis
  - Ongoing coordination with Eglinton Crosstown project team
OCS Foundations/Support Structures

- **Potential Effects:**
  - Majority of OCS structures located within Metrolinx-owned rail right-of-way
  - Limited property acquisition/easements may be required
  - Construction staging areas to be determined during detailed design

- **Mitigation Measures:** Metrolinx will obtain all required easements/property acquisition

High Voltage Cable (via underground duct banks)

- **Potential Effects:**
  - Property acquisition/easements may be required in order to install duct banks

- **Mitigation Measures:** Metrolinx will obtain all required easements/property acquisition
Noise

UP Express Route/Rail Corridor

- **Potential Effects:** No net adverse noise effects due to change from diesel to electric trains. Potential noise effects from pantograph have been found to be primarily associated with High Speed Rail systems (>200km/hr), a speed much higher than the design speed for UP Express. Therefore, no adverse noise effects are anticipated due to pantographs.

- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required beyond existing or planned noise walls

Paralleling Stations

- **Potential Effects:**
  - Only source of noise at the Paralleling Stations will be the autotransformer
  - Typical sound levels of the autotransformer are below MOE criteria

- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required beyond existing or planned noise walls
Noise

EMU Maintenance Facility

- **Potential Effects:** Noise modelling was completed; residential area to the south (opposite side of the golf course)
- **Mitigation Measures:** A noise barrier of at least 4.5m high and 190m long proposed along south side of Maintenance Facility
Vibration

UP Express Route/Rail Corridor
- **Potential Effects:** No adverse vibration effects due to change from diesel to electric trains
- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required

Paralleling Stations and EMU Maintenance Facility
- **Potential Effects:**
  - Neither the Paralleling Stations nor the EMU Maintenance Facility contain equipment that is considered a significant source of vibration
  - No adverse vibration effects are anticipated during operation
- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required
Construction Activities: Facilities

Paralleling Stations/EMU Maintenance Facility:
- Site clearing
- Install building foundations, construct buildings
- Rail and track construction (EMU Maintenance Facility)
- Grounding and bonding

Underground Cable:
- Excavate via open cut method to install duct banks
  - Temporary traffic disruption impacts
  - Temporary noise/dust/vibration
- Install underground cables (25 kV feeders) within duct banks
- Connect cables to main gantry
- Backfill/restore road(s)
Construction Activities: OCS

OCS Foundations
- Spaced up to 65m apart along corridor / approximately 4m deep
- Cantilevers: only one foundation required
- Portals: foundations to be installed on either side of tracks

OCS Support Structures
- Installation of OCS support structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) are pre-assembled and ready to lift using rail crane
  - Cantilevers: can install brackets on the poles before sending to site
  - Portals: more complex to install, requires access to all lines (like a signal bridge)
Noise and Vibration: Construction

- **Potential Effects:** Construction activities that have potential to cause noise or off-site vibration during the night-time hours will be avoided, where possible
  - Due to a limited construction window some construction activities will need to be completed at night

- **Mitigation Measures:** Best management practices will be applied
  - Ensure construction equipment is well maintained/operating with effective muffling devices that are in good working order
  - Metrolinx Community Relations staff will communicate construction work and respond to inquiries from residents
Air Emissions

UP Express Route/Rail Corridor

- **Potential Effects:** Positive effects on air quality within the rail corridor based on displacement of DMU emissions to emissions from the electricity generation associated with EMUs. Reduction of emissions within the rail corridor based on displacement of DMU emissions to emissions from electricity generation associated with EMUs. Replacing DMUs with EMUs amounts to approximately a 0.01% reduction in regional GHG emissions.

- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required

Paralleling Stations

- **Potential Effects:** No air emissions from Paralleling Station(s) operation anticipated

- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required

EMU Maintenance Facility

- **Potential Effects:** No adverse air quality effects anticipated from EMU Maintenance Facility

- **Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures required
Social Environment – EMF

What are EMFs?

- EMFs are invisible forces that surround electrical equipment, power cords and power lines. You cannot see or feel EMFs.
- Every time you use electricity and electrical appliances, you are exposed to EMFs at extremely low frequencies. EMFs produced by both power lines and use of electrical appliances, belong to this category.
- EMFs are strongest when closest to the source. As you move away from the source, the strength of the fields fades rapidly.

Health Canada’s Position on EMFs:

- Health Canada does not consider guidelines for EMFs exposure necessary, because scientific evidence is not strong enough to conclude that typical exposures cause problems.
- The overall opinions from most national and international scientific bodies is there is no compelling scientific evidence that EMFs in living and school environments, regardless of distance from power transmission lines, cause ill health.

Source: Health Canada submission to the British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office on the Vancouver Island Transmission Reinforcement Project; 2006. www.hc-sc.gc.ca

EMF Study for UP Express Electrification EA:

- Existing EMF intensities (due to man-made EMF sources) at specific areas within the study area will be documented.
- Potential EMF emissions from the electrified UP Express will be established.
- Predicted EMF field intensities will be compared to industry standards/limits; mitigation measures will be established, as appropriate.
Visual: Artist Renderings

FROM BATHURST STREET FACING WEST
BLOOR STATION LOOKING NORTH

TYPICAL SIGNAL BRIDGE
PORTAL STRUCTURE
OCS
PORTAL FOUNDATIONS
Looking East at Ray Avenue Underpass

- Gantry

Ray Avenue
Electromagnetic Interference (EMI)

- EMI is an electromagnetic disturbance that is solely associated with devices using electricity or electronic equipment

- **Work completed to date:**
  - Inventory of existing equipment/neighbouring facilities possibly susceptible to EMI within 100m of the corridor
  - Beyond 100m, electromagnetic fields (EMFs) decrease
  - Estimations of electric and magnetic field strength levels of the electrified UP Express will be at an acceptable level, and will not degrade the performance of existing/future equipment or systems
  - An Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC) Control Plan is being developed to outline the process for ensuring that existing systems and new systems installed within the railway environment are electromagnetically compatible with each other
Next Steps/Timelines

1. **Prepare POH #2 Summary Report and post on website**
   - JANUARY 2014

2. **Hold follow-up meetings with Review Agencies and Stakeholders**
   - APRIL 2014

3. **Comments and feedback considered in EPR**

4. **Issue Notice of Completion and submit Final EPR**

5. **30 day Public Review of EPR**

6. **35 day Minister’s Review**

PUBLIC INPUT
Commitments to Future Work

- Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment at Ordnance Paralleling Station site
- CHERs/HIAs (where appropriate)
- Environmental Compliance Approval for EMU Maintenance Facility
- Ongoing coordination with City of Toronto Planning/Urban Design Group
- Confirm/obtain all property acquisition/easements prior to implementation
- Confirm/obtain all additional approvals/permits
- Ongoing coordination with Eglinton Crosstown LRT MSF design team
- Confirm utility impacts/relocations and implement mitigation/relocation plans based on detailed design
- Ensure that all mitigation measures are transferred to detailed design contract documents for implementation
Thank you for your participation today!

If you wish to leave feedback, please fill out a comment form.

OR

Send the project team an e-mail: electrification@metrolinx.com
Appendix C

Summary of Comments Received and How They Were Considered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Topic /Issue Raised</th>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>How Comment was Considered by Metrolinx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>I must congratulate you on a very comprehensive design and on beginning a project to fruition that was long overdue, i.e. the downtown to airport rail link. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>A very good explanation and understanding of the different obstacles, especially at bridges. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>Looks good! Glad to see serious planning for electrification. Now I'm hoping for funding and moving on, very soon, into the building phase. Thanks for the open house! Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>It makes me happy to see that Metrolinx is looking at electrifying the tracks. Diesel is such an old and dirty way of fuelling. Now if only you would consider joining the express with the Eglinton LRT and Bloor subway line! To me it doesn’t make sense to not join the lines now. It is inevitable that it will be done. It would be far more cost efficient to do it now rather than 5-10 years from now. Comments noted. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Comments noted. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>I think that the UP Express was a very good idea because it takes over an hour to get to the airport by TIC. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Support for the Project</td>
<td>If it is indeed decided by the powers that be in the case of the Metrolinx rail system to be used in Toronto chose to utilize diesel commuter trains, as opposed to the safer, healthier electric technology which already has been selected- this would indeed be a ‘wrongdoing’ regarding public health, safety and security. Comments noted. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
<td>Comments noted. Thanks for your support for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>We are decades behind most other countries in infrastructure projects (I’ve just come back from Hong Kong and weep at our inability to get things done). Why on earth is an environmental assessment necessary to erect electricity wires over an existing railway track? And what on earth does it have to do with First Nations people? Electrical rail traction is known throughout the world to be vastly superior to diesel in terms of environmental impact. All those living close to the track will benefit from reduced noise. Travellers will benefit from faster times (better acceleration) and the air will benefit from less diesel fumes. SO JUST DO IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! The only political issue is, and should be, cost. The only reason it was built as a diesel line in the first place was cost, and the fact that finally (several decades late) politicians realized that we needed to do it fast to avoid being the laughing stock of the world (or at least the Americas) by having no rail link to the airport in time for the Pan Am Games. If this were Beijing, or Hong Kong, or Singapore, or any major Chinese or European city, the electrified line would already exist and be on the way to being obsolete by now. If it needed to be built, it would be done in a year or less. My guess is that I won’t live to see this line electrified (I’m 75). It’s all so sad for this once great city. It’s political correctness and over-regulation gone mad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Weston Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Why was electrification not included into the time frame for completing by 2014 or 2015? The UP Express Electrification EA is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for review in April 2014. Once the EA is approved, further funding will need to be identified to move to the next steps, which would be conducting the final, detailed engineering, procurement of electric trains, constructing the fixed infrastructure like substations and catenary, and commissioning/testing the new system.</td>
<td>Firstly, the requirement for Metrolinx to carrying out an Environmental Assessment to electrify an existing rail corridor is prescribed in Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings(<a href="http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws_regs_080231_e.htm">http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws_regs_080231_e.htm</a>) under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. Schedule 1, Subsection 2 (1) 7 of O. Reg. 231/08 is the regulation that requires the completion of an Environmental Assessment for electrification: Electrification of rail equipment propulsion on existing commuter rail corridor and associated power distribution system. In addition, O. Reg. 231/08 requires Metrolinx to consult with interested persons (including public, property owners, Review Agencies, other stakeholders) on the proposed project, including aboriginal communities. Specifically, Consultation Section 8 within O. Reg. 231/08 includes the requirement to consult with Aboriginal communities as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Does the government intend to electrify by 2017 as “promised” by Minister Murray? When will the EA be finished? - What then? The UP Express Electrification Environmental Assessment is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment in April 2014. Then the project will require EA approval and funding. Depending on the EA decision and funding, the estimated construction phase would be approximately three years. The EA document (Environmental Project Report) is to be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment on April 1, 2014. Then there is a 30 day review period for public and review agency comment. Following this, as part of the Transit Project Assessment Process, there is a 35-day Minister review period. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification. Yes, Metrolinx is purchasing DMUs for the UP Express service that will start in 2015. Part of</td>
<td>Can the Diesel Multiple Unit trains on order really be converted to electric as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shown in previous Metrolinx presentations?</td>
<td>That procurement process was that DMUs could be converted to EMU. The vehicles are designed and constructed to be convertible from diesel to electric propulsion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No, are electric trains quieter than diesel trains like other rail services claim?</td>
<td>Yes. The noise is distinctly different, and marginally quieter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Metrolinx considering the lighter European trains that CalTrain is using which are even more quieter than North American electric trains?</td>
<td>No. We are required to be FRA (Federal Railroad Administration) compliant and therefore this is not an option for Metrolinx.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would there be a need for sound walls if we had electric trains?</td>
<td>Yes. This line will see an increase of train traffic due to the introduction of both UP Express and increase to future GO Train service. The noise walls are meant to benefit local communities based on the increase in train traffic. For further information please see: <a href="http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/201303-">http://www.gotransit.com/gts/en/docs/201303-</a> GTS_Noise_Impacts_with_Electrification_UP_GO.pdf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is $400M still the estimate for the upfront costs of electrification?</td>
<td>As part of the Electrification Study, the cost estimate to electrify UP Express was $440 million. We will be refining these cost estimates throughout the preliminary design process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you talking to the TTC about possible use of line as western leg of relief line?</td>
<td>No, not as part of this EA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How close can new stations be built along the line with electric locomotion? What locations are being considered?</td>
<td>The UP Express will be a dedicated Union-Pearson link intended specifically for airport-oriented traffic. The introduction of electric locomotion does not have an impact on how close the stations can be built to each other. Currently there are four stops/stations associated with the UP Express service: UP Express Union, UP Express Bloor, UP Express Weston, and UP Express Pearson. No additional locations are being considered at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Metrolinx be applying the federal Building Canada Fund for funding to electrify?</td>
<td>The process for applying to the Fund is coordinated through the Government of Ontario.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open House #3 Weston

| Project Timeline and Implementation | Not that tunnels and trenches still open will you at least “rough in” the infrastructure for electrification rather than go through this much more complicated, expensive, and lengthy process of retrofitting electrification? | Where possible, electrification infrastructure has been incorporated into the construction As an example both Bloor and Weston Stations have included the Grounding & Bonding necessary for electrification. |

Open House #2 Liberty Village

<p>| Project Timeline and Implementation | Current speculation by the Ontario government suggests electrification to be under construction by 2017. There should be more clarification as to what timeline would be feasible. | The UP Express Electrification EA is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for review in April 2014. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Project Timeline and Implementation</th>
<th>Metrolinx Investment Strategy...tell me all about this please. It sounds like the money isn't in place yet for electrification project.</th>
<th>Once the EA is approved, further funding will need to be identified to move to the next steps, which would be conducting the final, detailed engineering, procurement of electric trains, constructing the fixed infrastructure like substations and catenary, and commissioning/testing the new system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Metrolinx Investment Strategy...tell me all about this please. It sounds like the money isn't in place yet for electrification project.</td>
<td>Electrification of the Lakeshore Corridor, and the electrification of the UP Express, had been identified as priority projects in the Next Wave of The Big Move projects. Funding and timing of this project will become part of the Investment Strategy discussion regarding Next Wave projects. For additional information on the Investment Strategy and Next Wave Projects, please visit our website: <a href="http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/funding/investment_strategy.aspx">http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/funding/investment_strategy.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>I'm enclosing my suggestions for expediting the electrification eastward to the Main/Danforth TTC/GO interchanger. This mobility hub together with the one at Dundas West hub will complete the trajectory of the TTC's proposed DRL at much less cost and in an earlier timeframe -- I hope? Comments noted.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>I am writing with respect to the ad regarding “Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment” which recently appeared in the Etobicoke Guardian. This is an issue that has concerned me for a number of years since we learned of the connection between Union Station and Pearson. My Ward (1) runs along rite west side of the I-lumber River and will be impacted by the originally proposed diesel trains running to Pearson. The concern has been the frequency of the trains and the amount of diesel fumes that will be emitted. I am in full support of the electrification of this line and in the past have expressed this support to other parties involved in this process. In the past I chaired the restoration of Union Station and in doing so I had the opportunity to visit the Grand Central Station in New York. I was impressed with the fact that as New York does not allow diesel trains to come within the city boundaries, goods must be transferred to electric trains. This makes good sense to me in dense urbanized areas. I respectfully request that you convey my support for electrification to those involved in this project. Thank you for your support for the UP Express Electrification project. Your comments have been conveyed to the project team.</td>
<td>Thank you for your support for the UP Express Electrification project. Your comments have been conveyed to the project team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>I would recommend electrification versus diesel trains for interurban transportation, such as the ones in existence in Europe and the United States. I don't understand all the studying going on without action. The biggest factor we may have is climate. Canadian must become more embracing of new technology whether its transport or other things. Unfortunately we seem to have quite a strong resistance to change overall. Your comment regarding your support for electrified trains is noted. With respect to your second comment, in terms of the study process, Metrolinx is required to carry out the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) in accordance with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act prior to implementing/constructing the UP Express Electrification project.</td>
<td>Your comment regarding your support for electrified trains is noted. With respect to your second comment, in terms of the study process, Metrolinx is required to carry out the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) in accordance with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act prior to implementing/constructing the UP Express Electrification project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #2</td>
<td>The future will require independent electric suppliers along all railway lines. Thank you for the comment. Metrolinx has decided that a reliable supply of power tapped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liberty Village Implementation

The power lines will be required to be replaced. I believe that windmills along the lines should be installed today for the future. We have the technology. Directly from the high-voltage grid (which incorporates power from many renewable sources) is necessary for its trains.

### Via email

**Project Timeline and Implementation**

I was so pleased to get an email from Metrolinx (Georgetown South Project) and read in my local York Guardian - Dec. 5/2013 issue that FINALLY maybe some progressive ideas are truly being considered for the Union-Pearson Express line due to open in time for the Pan American Games in 2015.

Toronto should be a forward looking city, not one that lives in the past. When a brand new train line, especially one that visitors are quite likely to use, is put into service in the 21st century, one would expect the environment would be front & centre when building it and operating it. Having diesel trains, even the most modern, going every 15 minutes in each direction throughout the day (and night), contributing pollution (and noise) to the neighbourhoods it runs through, is NOT the way public transit should be.

The notice did not mention if the goal is to have the electrification in place for 'day one' of public operations. I truly hope it is. It seems to me that there's been so much 'stone walling' against electrification that one might think it's 'political' especially given all the messes one sees at all levels of governments these days. Whatever, I don't really care as long as we indeed see positive results in favour of electrification and the prompt implementation of such a program beginning with the Union-Pearson Express and eventually having the entire GO system running on cleaner electric power.

I find it rather ironic that I keep hearing we are having to pay other jurisdictions to get rid of our extra power and yet have been also hearing, up until this announcement, that diesel is the only way to go for the near future. Having travelled much throughout the world and especially to continental Europe, I know that 'cleaner running' trains are not in the future, they are here and now, and many indeed are made by the Canadian manufacturer Bombardier. So let's 'get with the green script' and 'all aboard' for a environmentally forward looking system of mass transit in the GTA!!

Comments noted.

### Via email

**Project Timeline and Implementation**

Just wondering if you have a standard introductory set of information on this, what are next steps/what is status of UPEX EA, and can you please add me to mailing list of future notices/correspondence?

We have added you to our mailing list so that you will receive future project updates. Regarding your inquiries, please see the electrification webpage as the starting point for the introductory background information, it can be found here:


### Open House #3 Weston

**Project Timeline and Implementation**

Incorporate portal/cantilever structures, and any additional hardware structures; Need to electrify in the Weston corridor before UP is running in 2015. Access to the empty rail corridor would accommodate work without interfering with the trains which have been purchased for UP Express can be converted to electric, and where possible, infrastructure improvements currently underway on the Georgetown South Corridor are being built to allow for electrification.

The trains which have been purchased for UP Express can be converted to electric, and where possible, infrastructure improvements currently underway on the Georgetown South Corridor are being built to allow for electrification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #3 Weston</th>
<th>Project Timeline and Implementation</th>
<th>The project timeline of summer 2015 is realistic and feasible for the initial diesel service. The next step depends on financing from the governments and the timeline is 2016? 2017?</th>
<th>The UP Express Electrification EA is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for review on April 1, 2014. Once the EA is approved, further funding will need to be identified to move to the next steps, which would be conducting the final, detailed engineering, procurement of electric trains, constructing the fixed infrastructure like substations and catenary, and commissioning/testing the new system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Weston</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Hopefully, the existing UP Project will provide fully for eventual conversion to electrification of UP Express</td>
<td>The trains which have been purchased for UP Express can be converted to electric, and infrastructure improvements currently underway on the Georgetown South Corridor are, where possible, being built to allow for electrification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #3 Weston</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Why are we not electrifying now?</td>
<td>Why are we not electrifying now? The UP Express Electrification EA is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for review on April 1, 2014. Once the EA is approved, further funding will need to be identified to move to the next steps, which would be conducting the final, detailed engineering, procurement of electric trains, constructing the fixed infrastructure like substations and catenary, and commissioning/testing the new system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Junction</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Don't set up or orchestrate false deadlines like your “arms-length” relationship with the Ontario government with the Pan AM excuse, Where’s the financial stewardship.</td>
<td>The UP Express Electrification EA is targeted for submission to the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) for review on April 1, 2014. Once the EA is approved, further funding will need to be identified to move to the next steps, which would be conducting the final, detailed engineering, procurement of electric trains, constructing the fixed infrastructure like substations and catenary, and commissioning/testing the new system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Junction</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>Why are we even having this conversation when we know modern countries run electric and we “cost” the healthcare system with the lethal and deadly consequences of a known and WHO carcinogen diesel?</td>
<td>Why are we even having this conversation when we know modern countries run electric and we “cost” the healthcare system with the lethal and deadly consequences of a known and WHO carcinogen diesel? The UP Express service will launch with state-of-the-art Tier 4 diesel multiple units. Tier 4 diesel is the strictest non-road engine emissions standard set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and reduces airborne particulate emissions by 90 per cent and nitrogen oxides (NOx) by 80 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #4 Junction</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>It is not now funded. When will it be funded? Electrification now and make it a commuter train for the people of Toronto.</td>
<td>Electrification of the UP Express is included in the “Next Wave” of Metrolinx priorities and funding is subject to the Investment Strategy. It is not unusual that Environmental Assessments are completed and approved before funding is committed to their implementation. Upon confirmation of funding, the project can proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Project Timeline and Implementation</td>
<td>It strikes me that physical provisions for platforms at a future Eglinton West GO Transit/UPE station, as well as for the requisite vertical links between the two stations will certainly require pre-planning, and I can only hope that adequate space for these components has been identified for protection. Attempting to add such facilities after operations begin would be prohibitively costly and disruptive.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Mount Dennis/Eglinton station will be included in the Eglinton Crosstown project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>I recommend you also look at battery powered EMU hybrid units. They offer recharging while on the grid and about 30+ miles of battery power. They could work well with your system and offer the ability to gain the benefit of electric power.</td>
<td>The GO Electrification study included a review of alternative technologies and based on the requirements for the GO Transit Network, it was determined that the 2x25k Overhead Contact system was the best fix. For more information please see EStudy link</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GO Electrification study included a review of alternative technologies and based on the requirements for the GO Transit Network, it was determined that the 2x25k Overhead Contact system was the best fix. For more information please see EStudy link.
technology while you build out the infrastructure.

Here are a few links to the technology now being tested in the UK and Japan.

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDQFjAB&url=http://www.networkrail.co.uk/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=30064788652&ei=xm3oUqrUIMutsQSJq4HwBQ&usg=AFQjCNHkr0dnDKLB6Ja00GTLFqUx7EO1TQ&sig2=NNmg7EXB2Qr--_BxD4g6gNQ&bvm=bv.60157871,d.cWc


Open House #3 Weston Technology I would like to see us work like German, be ingenious like the Japanese with levitation technology instead of the old "steam motion" technology and eliminate hydro right now.

The GO Electrification study included a review of alternative technologies and based on the requirements for the GO Transit Network, if was determined that the 2x25k Overhead Contact system was the best fix. For more information please see EStudy link


Via email Power supply for rolling stock Use hydrogen fuels with condenser units to improve the gas mileage. Change to electric powered vehicles and monorail trains.

Comment noted.

Open House #3 Weston Cost It was very interesting and this was my first meeting. No details on costs of infrastructure or rolling stock and projects of date of completion.

The GO Transit Electrification Study (E-Study) estimated $440 million for the electrification of the UP Express. As we complete the preliminary design for the UP Express, this cost estimate will be updated. For further information see E-Study


Open House #3 Weston Cost I feel that this 25-kilometer project, which I gather, may cost $1.5 billion. They should not electrify but stick with the cleaner diesel engines, which I gather are less polluting and less noisy since the quality of diesel is now matching the emission standards. It would be good to move forward fast using existing engines and cars and study the ridership.

Metrolinx is committed to the electrification of GO Transit and UP Express services. These corridors were selected following Metrolinx’s comprehensive Electrification Study completed in 2010 that recommended proceeding with electrification contingent on funding availability.

Open House #3 Weston Cost Why is there no projected cost analysis done on this project and why has the feds, provincial, and municipal governments not jointly funded this project. I will like to see an elevated track horizontally across the city with few stops parallel.

The E-Study cost estimate is $440 million. For further information please refer to the E-Study:


Open House #3 Weston Cost Is there any reason not to go ahead with electrification now even as the train running on diesel? Have you compared your costs with those in other parts of Work is already underway, and we’re on track to have UP Express up and running in 2015. Construction work on the corridor is protecting for future electrification where possible.
Weston

| the world where electrification has recently been done? Do you have a travelling research team that studies rapid transit around the world? It would be smart money well spent. | Metrolinx hired consultants who have implemented electrified railways around the world. The cost estimates are based on their experience. Thank you for your support. |

Via email

| I know you are going to electrify a GO train line but I was wondering if you are going to use electric locomotives or electric multiple unit cars, what company they are going to be built by and what they are going to be called. I know that some people criticize you for using diesel trains because diesel train pollute the air but people are forgetting that they should be grateful for the efforts you are making to improve transit in the GTA such as: the GO trains and buses which are good for commuting people to other towns and cities, the upcoming UP express which will get people to the Pearson airport in just 25 minutes, the upcoming LRT lines which will provided rapid transit to areas that don’t already have rapid transit and the Viva BRT which will prevent Viva buses from getting stuck in traffic so Viva customers will get to their destination on time. I really appreciate these efforts you are making to make commuting in the GTA easier, faster and more convenient and everybody else should also be grateful. I believe that public transit is one of the most important parts of a city. And just so you know, if you need me to come to a meeting to talk about my advertising ideas just give me a date, time and place and I will be there. I have thought of a whole bunch of ads and commercials and have written them down. | For the UP Express trains, we have identified that the UP Express will be EMUs. (the proposed Maintenance Facility at Resources Rd. will be an Electric Multiple Unit Maintenance Facility). As for GO Trains, the scope of the current UP Express Electrification EA does not include electrification of GO trains. In addition, a decision has not yet been made whether the new trains will be EMUs or an electric locomotive. Regarding advertising ideas - As a government agency, Metrolinx has to go through a mandated procurement process. Please watch the Metrolinx website for advertising tenders that may be issued in the future. |

Open House #1

| Hydro infrastructure must be designed such that it is similar enough to other systems in use around the world for ease of procuring rolling stock and locomotives. This will allow for Metrolinx the best price after further electrification for the GO service. | Comment noted. |

Via email

| Is the system for electrification of the UP Express line the same intended for the GO trains? Additionally, can it be compatible with the standard-gauge built LRT trains as will be used on the Eglinton, Sheppard and Finch lines? | The vehicles being purchased for the UP Express are compatible with the existing rail infrastructure used by GO. The LRT system uses a different gauge track and therefore requires different vehicles. |

Open House #1

| Don’t forget to have lots of parking at the stations. | Comment noted. |

Open House #1

| Stop treating Weston as the only top priority – add Etobicoke as a stop or add a stop at Kipling. | Comment noted. The consideration of additional stops along the route is not part of the UP Express Electrification EA. |

Open House #2

| After electrification has been completed, are there plans to add more stations in between? Currently three are only two stations planned (Bloor and Weston), but electrification would allow for quicker acceleration and stations being brought closer together. There are two stations which should be added. One at Mt. Dennis to connect with the Crosstown and the other at Liberty Village. | Comment noted. The consideration of additional stops along the route is not part of the UP Express Electrification EA. |

Via email

| Please note that further to your public open houses, we have some serious concerns with respect to the propose TPS Site at 175 City View Drive, Toronto. | Letter response was sent as follows: Thank you for your comments on the Union Pearson Express Electrification Traction Power Facility Sites. |
We and our employees are very concerned with the environmental impact as we are the adjoining property at the proposed TPS site. In addition we are not and were never interested in being property owners next to such a development, and the negative and adverse impact that will undoubtedly arise both on a health and economic basis. Please provide me with the individuals that I should be dealing with in respect to these issues. I would like to be directly contacted with any and all ongoing developments with this project so that I may have representation present.

| Open House #4 Junction | Air Quality | I am a local property owner and active voter. The WHO has declared diesel a carcinogen, regardless of “clean diesel” purchases. Electrify now, you are directly impacting our health and property values. Electrify now, stop polluting the environment and our air now! | The UP Express service will launch with state-of-the-art Tier 4 diesel multiple units. Tier 4 diesel is the strictest non-road engine emissions standard set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and reduces airborne particulate emissions by 90 per cent and nitrogen oxides (NOx) by 80 per cent. The UP Express service will not result in a significant contribution to air emissions from the rail corridor. |
| Open House #4 Junction | Air Quality | The climate temperature is rising therefore what we need like a hole in the head is more carbon emissions. Electrifying the UP Express is a good idea, more rail lines should be electrified such as GO Trains and the Ottawa O-Train. | Comment noted. |
| Via email | Air Quality | I am very excited to hear about the Pearson line and am very curious to know about getting the Lakeshore line West electrified. Further I would like to know how much greenhouse gas and other pollutants would not be put into our Neighborhoods. Please know you have my full support for electrification of our rail system. | Apologies on behalf of the project team for the delay in getting a response back to you. Further to my email, please see responses from the team to your questions below: Electrification of the Lakeshore West (LSW) line is dependent on funding which was proposed as part of the Investment Strategy. Timing for the electrification of LSW is dependent on a number of factors including the review of the Investment Strategy and funding. More detailed information about the Investment Strategy can be found at [http://www.bigmove.ca/report](http://www.bigmove.ca/report). Metrolinx is committed to reducing our carbon footprint and minimizing the impact on the environment by removing vehicles from the highways and roads and by using the most efficient locomotive technology available. It is noted that potential effects on air emissions related to the electrification of the LSW line would need to be determined as part of a separate Environmental Assessment study. Regarding your second question, it is estimated that replacing UP Express diesel multiple |
units (DMUs) with electric multiple units (EMUs) amounts to less than a 0.02% reduction in regional GHG emissions.

A preliminary Acoustic Assessment has been completed for the substation. This report will be made available in the appendix of the Draft Environmental Study Report (Hydro One, 2014). Once the design of the substation has been finalized, additional assessments will be completed in order to ensure that the station will meet MOE standards. These standards and associated guidelines have been heavily reviewed by the MOE and any concerns pertaining to them should be addressed to the MOE.

There are no noise emissions associated with operation of the gantries.

With regard to construction, it is anticipated that OCS structures will be constructed within the railway right-of-way and therefore will have negligible traffic effects. Temporary traffic detours may be required in relation to construction of the facilities; however, they are anticipated to be of short duration (approximately 6-9 months). There may also be minor disruptions on some bridges in order to install the bridge barrier protection; however, they are anticipated to be of short duration.

Metrolinx is doing its part to support walking and cycling in the City of Toronto by helping to extend the West Toronto Railpath. Metrolinx continues to balance its mandate to expand public transit with the City's desire to extend the West Toronto Railpath. Metrolinx is supportive of walking/cycling and other active transportation initiatives across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

Timeline: The earliest that construction can begin on the Phase 2 expansion is in late 2014 into 2015 when the GTS Project construction is completed. The City's EA timeline and Metrolinx's electrification EA timeline fit well with this construction timeline. In other words, we will know exactly where the catenary poles will be in time for the City to adapt their design to account for any catenary poles that will need to be located on the property outlined for the Railpath. The City's team is aware of this issue and they are including it in their EA investigation.

Yes, the panels will be posted tomorrow on the project webpage in advance of Monday's meeting. http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx

As for the format, this will be an open house. Project team members will be available to explain the technical information and will be available for one-on-one Q&A.

Comment noted

The format for the meeting was an open house and participation opportunities were provided which included project staff on site to answer questions and discuss details of the project directly with participants. In addition, comment sheets were provided to all participants.
Open House #4 Junction Consultation Process Attend this event, yes, but there was no opportunity to actually participate. Pretty visuals but conflicting information from the “Ask Me” people.

Open House #3 WestonConsultation Process More pictures with the OCS portals modeled in would be great.

Open House #3 Weston Environmental effects and mitigation Concerns were addressed about numerous environmental concerns and how the community look will be taken into consideration.

Open House #4 Junction Environmental effects and mitigation Most details are TBD or dependent on further study/mitigations. My concerns are what will happen if too proximate to parks and rec, too proximate to residences, EMFs are higher than anticipated, runoff drainage shifts, train discharge and pollution to parks and residential as well as will EMIs and EMFs affect WiFi reception?

The public open house display panels provided summaries of the potential environmental effects and mitigation (including land use, natural environmental, EMI and EMFs) based on the technical studies carried out as part of the EA process.

With regard to the locations of the traction power facilities, alternative sites were considered and assessed as part of the EA process and presented at the June 2013 Public Open Houses for feedback. Following this, the preferred sites were established based on application of the following list of criteria:

- **Natural Features** - consideration of sensitive natural features in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Land Use/Social Features** - consideration of existing/planned land use in the vicinity of the facility location/consideration of social features (i.e., schools, daycares, etc.) in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Cultural Features** - consideration of sensitive cultural/archaeological features in the vicinity of the facility location.
- **Technical** - consideration of Property Availability, Development Cost, Site Accessibility

Furthermore, during the construction phase, an Environmental Inspector will be responsible for ensuring that environmental mitigation measures are implemented and functioning as predicted, to ensure environment effects are mitigated/minimized to the extent possible.

With respect to train discharge and pollution, it is noted that the purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express trains from diesel to electric power, thereby removing diesel emissions that are associated with the UP Express Diesel Multiple Unit trains.

Based on the EMI and EMF assessments carried out as part of the EA, WiFi reception is not expected to be affected by EMF emitted by UP Express Electrification equipment. UP
Express electrification equipment will be designed, constructed and integrated to be in compliance with the relevant industry standards (e.g., European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization, Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, Canadian Standards Association, etc.) to ensure that the emissions are kept within the permissible limits. As a result, compatibility with WiFi equipment will be achieved and no adverse effects to the WiFi equipment and services are anticipated.

Furthermore, Metrolinx will undertake additional studies and analyses during the detailed design phase based on the electric train specifications to ensure that no adverse EMI/EMF effects will result from the project. This will include: design verification studies, factory testing and field testing, as part of the testing and commissioning phase prior to commencing the electrified UP Express service.

Open House #3 Weston
Environmental Approvals
Would like information as to what the Environmental Compliance Approval at the EMU Facility is required for?
An Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for Air and Noise for the EMU Maintenance Facility will need to be obtained from the Ministry of Environment (MOE) in accordance with Part II.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA), prior to its implementation. It is also noted there is potential for MOE to require an Acoustic Audit as a condition of the ECA which would require that a monitoring study be completed by an independent third party during construction and operation of the facility in order to demonstrate that the facility complies with the MOE sound level limits outlined in the ECA.

Open House #3 Weston
Design
Why is the Weston tunnel being designed for 3 tracks rather than 4?
The OCS design for Weston Tunnel has been made to be easily expandable for the future track electrification once the track alignment becomes known. The only additional work that needs to be done is to apply the same OCS design utilizing the same type of tunnel arm assemblies. The alignment needs to be confirmed prior to the final design at which time it is not complicated to add the tunnel arm attachment.

Open House #4 Junction
Design
How protected would the lines be in the case of inclement weather e.g. ice storm of 2013?
The UP Express OCS preliminary design meets the AREMA standards, which requires the OCS structures (portals, gantries, poles etc. catenary system) to be designed for the extreme weather conditions (-40°C, wind speed at 35m/s and ice accumulation of 12.5 mm). In addition, during detail design, further review of industry proven solutions to prevent ice accumulation on the wires will be carried out. These solutions may include heating systems for the OCS contact and messenger wires that prevent ice accumulation on the exposed and elevated sections of track.

Open House #4 Junction
Energy
What other means will be used to be less dependent on the grid but still keeping it electrified?
Other than the power grid, during normal operation, there would be no alternative energy sources required to propel the UP Express electric trains. The UP Express traction power system has been designed and implemented to deliver and exceed the required reliability requirements. Therefore, implementing alternative energy sources and hybrid technologies will not be required.

Open House #4 Junction
Other
When people think of the future they think of smartphones and computers but they should be thinking of public transit and the economy because a fancy smartphone can’t get you to work and home.
Comment noted.

Via email
Other
We welcome the long awaited start of the electrification process of GO rail and take the opportunity of the Environmental Assessment hearings to voice our support for an extension of this project eastward at least to the Danforth GO if not to Kennedy station in Scarborough. These extensions would enable GO rail to function as relief lines to the overcrowded subways, given convenient
Comments noted.
'mobility hubs' at the transfer stations, and more frequent trains. Both can be provided at a fraction of the cost of a new Downtown Relief [subway] Line advocated by the TTC and can be implemented in a much shorter timeframe. This 'low-hanging fruit' of GO/TTC integration is detailed in the December 13th Neptis Foundation report in chapter 5, and in chapter 3 regarding electrification and the use of Electric Multiple-Unit (EMU) rolling stock. http://www.neptis.org/sites/default/files/metrolinx_review_2013/review_of metrolinxs_big_move_neptis_foundation_schabas.pdf

As advocates for GTA public transit integration and as elected officials we urge you to initiate this pro-active extension.

PS: For an electrification EUREKA moment going back to 1897 click on the following link: http://home.cc.umanitoba.ca/~wyatt/alltime/pics/toronto-MRloco1897RHill-DonEvans.jpg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House #1 Highway 27 Area</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Metrolinx doesn't think outside the box – elevate the rail and for future track build up not out.</th>
<th>Comment noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 Highway 27 Area</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Most people don’t need heavy rail, it’s more for the City. Suspend the rail, use a roller coaster style similar to propulsion. It’s perfect for use in the City. One benefit of this approach is that you wouldn’t need to implement heavy commuter infrastructure like you normally would. Also consider building a ride like at Canada’s Wonderland and let gravity do the work for you.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 Highway 27 Area</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Whenever possible, this TPAP/EA should include provisions for expanding electrification to adjacent lines (i.e. can we include additional areas/components in the EA to fast-track future electrification?)</td>
<td>Electrification is a critically important issue and is a multi-billion dollar decision. Metrolinx has selected the electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore East and West rail corridors, along with UP Express, to be part of its proposed “next wave” of The Big Move projects. Metrolinx provided funding recommendations to the government on May 27, 2013 for these and other next wave projects that will help determine potential implementation timelines. The design for electrification of UP Express has been undertaken to accommodate GO Trains. This design work can be applied to other corridors to be electrified in the future. This work will assist with the pre-planning for the future EA’s which will be required for the electrification. In the meantime, the preliminary design and EA is underway for the first phase of a potential electrification program, UP Express. Completing the preliminary design and obtaining the necessary environmental approvals are important steps that cannot be rushed or skipped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House #1 Highway 27 Area</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Why doesn’t the TTC run (bus route 58 A or B) on Sunday? This is not helpful for airport employees.</td>
<td>This comment is outside the scope of the UP Express Electrification EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>GO Transit Pricing</td>
<td>Keep services free of charge at GO Transit that keeps services free of charge by using revenues from gambling, advertising, retail and restaurant services. If you must charge, have simple prices like $10 for a ride not $8.95 plus taxes. Use TTX cash registers only.</td>
<td>Comment noted. We appreciate that pricing of the planned new UP Express service is of interest. We are currently conducting detailed market research to ensure that the UP Express service is relevant and reflective of the needs of the market. The outcome of this research will guide key elements, including the customer service strategy and business plan, and will influence possible pricing models. These details will be announced closer to the inaugural launch date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Get free hydro power for all of your buildings.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Always buy buildings over leasing them.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via email</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Always use steel frame construction for GO Transit buildings.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for listening.

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project timeline and the project milestones?
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?  
   It was very interesting this was my first meeting. No details on costs of infrastructure or rolling stock & project completion date.

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?  
   I feel that the 25km project which together may cost 1.5 billion dollars to cost & analyses done on this project should be electrified but start with ad how has the Goede's Provincial & the cleaner diesel engine, which together Municipal & GO & Jointly funded this I feel less pollution & less noisy since the project quality diesel is now matching the European Standards. Would be good to move forward fast using existing engines etc & Study of the whole shop.

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?  
   I would like to see more hi-tech be gain in the Japanese with less technology head & how the ‘80s & ‘90s & ‘20s change at the Hydro project.

Additional comments. (additional space on reverse)  
   Why is there no project?  
   I will like to see a dedicated track that runs across horizontally across the City with feeder stop...
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

No

2. Would you like information as to what environmental effects and mitigation are involved?

No

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?

No

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)
Thank you for participating in the process, we appreciate your feedback.

Please forward all feedback by February 17th, 2014.

Thank you.

Please leave your completed feedback form at

THE REGISTRATION TABLE ON THE WAY OUT.

How does the Open House work?

Next steps/immediate
Environmental impacts and mitigation:
The preliminary design components:
and to seek feedback on:
The purpose of the Open House:

Two rounds of public consultation:
The Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Kipling GO Rail Corridor underwriting involves electrification of approximately 22 km of track along Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express Service from EA for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express Service from the Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed electrification of the Union Pearson Express Service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport underwriting involves the environmental assessment. The purpose of this study, which examines electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx believes the electrification assessment.

WELCOME

An agency of the Government of Ontario

Welcome
There should be more characterization to what timeline would be feasible.

There should be more characterization as to when the project would be under construction by the government.

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental offsets and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?
Thank you for participating in the process. We appreciate your feedback.

Feedback as we move forward with the UP Express Electrification Project.

Regulation Tables: The Metrolinx team will be reviewing all of the questions on the inside of this booklet and share your responses at the next meeting on the UP Express Electrification Project.

How does the Open House Work?

1) Next Steps/Measurements
2) Environmental Effects and Mitigation:
3) The Preliminary Design Components:

Purpose of the Open House:

To update the public on the status of the Environmental Assessment:

Purpose of the Open House:

Two rounds of public consultation.

Public consultation is a key part of the EIA process. This is the second of the two rounds of consultation.

The Union Station GO rail corridor and the Kitchener GO rail corridor:

Understanding the intersection of Electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Pearson Express (UPE) GO rail line is to extend GO services from Union Station to York region.

The ETIPs are presented and the Environmental Assessment:

Findings of this study: Metrolinx identified the Environmental Assessment:

Public consultation is to discuss project components. Based on the results of the Environmental Assessment:

Additional Comments:
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the environmental effects and mitigation?

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)
1. Have you any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental issues and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project timeline and the project timeline?

4. How can you build a model for the project team regarding next steps?

5. What is the model for the project team regarding final steps?

6. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding final steps?
Below the standards, do you have feedback regarding the project team?

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the HP Express Edification and the project timeline?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the environmental aspects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the additional comments (additional space on reverse)?

- Additional comments: (additional space on reverse)
Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification Project and the project timeline?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?

---
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project timeline and project milestones?
Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

1. Will cancel at any

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the U/I Express Electrification project?

Form
The feedback form contains handwritten responses. The text is partially legible and includes questions about project activities, environmental effects, and comments. The form seems to be filled out by someone providing feedback on a specific project or initiative, possibly related to environmental or sustainability aspects.
Home

You can't get you to work and
because there's a lack of
Public transport and the economy
but they should be thinking of
environmental objectives and mitigation.

The climate temperature

Additional comments (additional space on reverse)

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the transition?

9. Takes over why until
Up EX need as very
I think that the
FEEDBACK FORM

1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electrification project?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding next steps and the project timeline?

Additional comments. (additional space on reverse)

1. What other means will be used to be less dependent on the grid but still keeping it electrified [or possibly hybrid]?

2. How protected would the lines be in case of inclement weather e.g. ice storm 2013?
1. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the preliminary design components of the UP Express Electroletion system?

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project timeline?

3. Additional comments (additional space on reverse)
Thank you for participating in the process. We appreciate your feedback.

Feedback as we move forward with the UP Express Electrification Project.
Registration table: The MetroLink team will be reviewing all the
questions on the inside of this brochure and base your responses at the
answers you may have. Please answer these.

How does the Open House work?

Next steps:

Environmental effects and mitigation:

The Preliminary Design Components:

and to seek feedback:

To update on the public on the status of the environmental assessment:

Purpose of the Open House:

Two rounds of public consultation:

Public consultation is a key part of the EA process. This is the second of
the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Mississauga GO Rail Corridor.

The Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Mississauga GO Rail Corridor
includes rail electrification and approximately 5.2 km of track along
Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The purpose
of the Union Station to Toronto Pearson (UP) Express Corridor Study was
for electrification of the Union Station GO Rail Corridor Study in December 2010.

Background:

Welcome

Metrolinx

An agency of the Government of Ontario

Electrication@metrolinx.com

Www.metrolinx.com
1. Do you have any feedback for the team regarding the preliminary design of the system? 

2. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the environmental effects and mitigation?

3. Do you have any feedback for the project team regarding the project timeline?
COMMENT FORM
Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
Hydro One Traction Power Substation (TPS)

February 10, 2014

Thank you for attending Hydro One and Metrolinx Union Pearson Express Electrification open house. Please note any comments or questions about Hydro One’s Traction Power Substation below:

At the yes but there was no opportunity  

to actually participate.

Pretty visuals but conflicting information  

from the Ask Me People

(Additional space on reverse)

Please provide your contact information so that we may follow-up with you on your comments or questions, and add you to our project contact list for future communications.

Name: ____________________________________________

Mailing Address & Postal Code: ____________________________________________

Tel: ___________________________ Email: ________________________________________

Please leave your comment form with a representative at this meeting or send it to:

Marylena Stea, Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street, 7th Floor, South Tower, Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel. 1-877-345-6799; Fax: 416-345-6984; Email: Community Relations@HydroOne.com

Please be advised that any of your personal information contained on this comment form will become part of the public record files for this project, and may be released, if requested, to any person, unless you state on this form that you do not consent to your personal information becoming part of the public record files and disclosed to any person upon request.
COMMENT FORM
Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
Hydro One Traction Power Substation (TPS)

February 10, 2014

Thank you for attending Hydro One and Metrolinx Union Pearson Express Electrification open house. Please note any comments or questions about Hydro One’s Traction Power Substation below:

Most details are TBD or depend on further study/mitigations ...
My concerns are: what will happen if too proximate to power lines:
- too proximate to residences
- EMFs are higher than anticipated
- runoff drainage shifts
- train discharge/pollution to nearby residence
- will EMFs & EMFs affect WiFi reception?

[Additional space on reverse]

Please provide your contact information so that we may follow-up with you on your comments or questions, and add you to our project contact list for future communications.

Name: 

Mailing Address & Postal Code: 21955 Common View Terr, Markham

Tel: Email:

Please leave your comment form with a representative at this meeting or send it to:
Marylena Stea, Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street, 7th Floor, South Tower, Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel. 1-877-345-6799; Fax: 416-345-6984; Email: Community.Relations@HydroOne.com

Please be advised that any of your personal information contained on this comment form will become part of the public record file for this project, and may be released, if requested, to any person, unless you state on this form that you do not consent to your personal information becoming part of the public record file and disclosed to any person upon request.
Welcome

An agency of the Government of Ontario

Metrolinx

February 2014

Please forward all feedback by February 17th, 2014.

Thank you.

The Registration Table on the Way Out.

Please leave your completed feedback form at

Next steps/Alternatives
•

Environmental effects and mitigation:
•
The Preliminary design components:
•

and to seek feedback on:

To update the public on the status of the environmental assessment:

Purpose of the Open House:

Two rounds of public consultation.

Public consultation is a key part of the EA process. This is the second of
the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and the Kitchener GO Rail Corridor
undertaking updated EIS/EA for two corridors, approximately 25 km each along
Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed
Union Pearson (UP) Express Corridor Study in December 2010.

Metrolinx conducted the GO EIS/EA study between January and

Additional comments?
Appendix J6
Public Correspondence
Dear Team:

I took the opportunity yesterday to explore the GO website, with a particular focus on the electrification of the Lakeshore line. In addition to being an occasional GO user, I have a general interest in railways, and I am hoping we will soon start to catch up to other countries in our rail infrastructure. In 1962, 25kV wires went up on the Crewe to Liverpool line in the UK and now almost all main lines are electrified. The Glasgow suburban network has been electrified for well over 40 years now. The Dutch NS network is all electric (with the exception of some diesel freight locomotives originally built in London, ON). As you are well aware, Ontario has a long way to go.

We can probably agree that GO Transit and its customers would like to see the electrification completed without delay. Comments in favour of the Air Rail Link to be built electrified from scratch were heard loudly and often, although it would be difficult to do so over just some of the tracks on the Georgetown lines and especially in the throat West of Union station. However, studies and EA's are pushing the Lakeshore Line project out into the future. I read with some dismay that the schedule for Lakeshore electrification stretches well into 2014 before anything tangible will be seen, following extensive EA's and studies.

Cost estimates and pre-engineering studies I can understand. However, please help me understand the need for full EA's for an alternate form of energy input to be installed on an existing corridor. No one would expect that conversion of traffic on the QEW from gasoline fuel input to diesel or electric vehicles would require such an EA for the existing highway. Your comments, of course, are welcome.

Can you also share with me an overall schedule for the engineering, installation and commissioning of the overhead system, assuming approvals and funding are obtained?

Regards
Re: Why the Full EA?

Sent: April 30, 2012 2:15 PM
To: Blanca Wyle

Yes, please add my name.

I'd be interested in knowing whether Mr. McCuaig or other executives thought of asking for a waiver or partial waiver of the EA requirement. And whether the West Coast Main Line and East Coast Main Line electrification in the UK required a full EA. The UK is even more bound up by such legal obstacles than Ontario.

Thanks for following through with your response.

--- Original Message ---

Sent: Monday, April 30, 2012 1:22 PM
Subject: RE: Why the Full EA?

Hi Archie,

Thanks very much for your email and your interest in the project. We’ve shared your email with the Metrolinx team and have a few thoughts in response that we hope are helpful:

- Regarding the need for an Environmental Assessment (EA), the Ontario government requires Metrolinx to conduct an EA for this project. Through the EA, Metrolinx is responsible for assessing the potential impacts of implementing electrification and proposing measures to mitigate those impacts (more specifically, the environmental effects of the new infrastructure, systems and equipment, as well as the electrical infrastructure needed to supply the power). As part of the electrification project Metrolinx will also be thinking about how best to phase implementation across the GO System.

- Regarding the overall schedule, Metrolinx plans to complete the EA for the ARL by 2014. We are happy to share the results of our work with you as it unfolds, and if you're interested, we'd like to add you to our contact list. We have a group of stakeholders (as well as the public) that we keep updated during the project, and including you on that list will help us make sure you get project updates, information about meetings, etc.

Please let me know if you are comfortable with me adding your name to our contact list, and we'll add it right away. In the meantime I've attached the summary report from our first Stakeholder Workshop from March to provide you with some additional background (in case you haven't come across it already as you've browsed the Metrolinx website).

Kind regards,
Dear Sir/Madam,

I live a few hundred metres from the Dundas West Go station where the Air Rail Link will one day run.

I am worried about pollution. I'm worried for my children and their friends. I'm worried about elderly neighbours. I'm worried about the look of an ugly concrete wall Metrolinx plans to build to reduce noise and particulate matter. I'm worried as a taxpayer about proceeding with a diesel system when studies show an electric system would be better.

The decision to proceed with diesel seems inconsistent with the provincial Policy Statement pursuant to the Planning Act - particularly those provisions dealing with human health and air quality. The move is also inconsistent with Ontario's commitment to reducing greenhouse gases as per the Western Climate Initiative. As a lawyer, I'm considering how I might be an advocate for the cause. It seems everyone agrees electric is better but we're proceeding with diesel because of failings of our political system.

I suggest your consultation process was deficient. Too many people in my community were not made aware of the plans and are only now coming to appreciate the impact of a truncated consultation process.

Please contact me to discuss how we might change course.

Yours truly,
Contract Awards

From: mor-booket@ alice@ alice@mor-booket.acsstrategy.com
Sent: May 16, 2012 4:50 PM
To: electrification@metrolinx.com

Is there any information about who has been awarded the contract to execute this piece of electrification work, and if not will there be an RFP?

Many Thanks

This message is intended for the above named only and may be privileged or confidential. If this message has come to you in error, you may not copy, distribute or take action based on it; please notify us immediately by replying to the sender. Any views expressed in this email are those of the original sender, except where the sender is clearly identified as a guest. No warranty is given with respect to the accuracy of the information contained in this email.
Hi

I was just wondering the status of the electrification process regarding the lakeshore east and west lines.

Thank you
I live in Guelph — will the electrified GO line be stopping at Guelph? IF the EA supports electrification — when will the Kitchener line be electrified?

Thanks
Greetings Metrolinx:

The attached story from the Toronto Star indicates that Diesel exhaust fumes are now directly linked to cancer (World Health Organization). I trust, that in light of this, you will accelerate the electrification of the Lakeshore railway line through Mississauga.

Regards,
Diesel exhaust can cause cancer, WHO group finds

Unanimous report puts fumes on same level as asbestos or mustard gas

REUTERS

LONDON—Diesel engine exhaust fumes can cause cancer in humans and belong in the same potentially deadly category as asbestos, arsenic and mustard gas, World Health Organization experts said on Tuesday.

In an announcement that caused consternation among car and truck makers, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, a France-based part of the WHO, reclassified diesel exhausts from its group 2A of probable carcinogens to its group 1 of substances that have definite links to cancer.

The IARC experts, who said their decision was unanimous and based on “compelling” scientific evidence, urged people across the world to reduce exposure to diesel fumes as much as possible.

“The (expert) working group found that diesel exhaust is a cause of lung cancer and also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer,” it said in a statement.

The decision is a result of a week-long meeting of independent experts who assessed the latest scientific evidence on the cancer-causing potential of diesel and gasoline exhausts.

IARC said gasoline exhaust fumes should be classified as “probably carcinogenic to humans,” a finding that was unchanged from its previous assessment in 1989.

It puts diesel fumes in the same risk category as noxious substances such as asbestos, arsenic, mustard gas, alcohol and tobacco.

Diesel cars are popular in western Europe, where tax advantages have encouraged technological advances and a boom in demand.

Outside of Europe and India, diesel engines are mostly confined to commercial vehicles.

About 5.5 per cent of new autos, including light-duty pickup trucks, sold in the United States run on diesel and that figure is expected to rise to 8 or 9 per cent by 2015.

For about 20 years, diesel engine exhaust was defined by IARC as probably carcinogenic to humans — group 2A — but an IARC advisory group has repeatedly recommended diesel engine exhaust as a high priority for re-evaluation.

The global auto industry had argued diesel fumes should be given a less high-risk rating to reflect tighter emissions standards.

General Motors Co. said in a statement: “We will continue with our plans to introduce new fuel saving technologies and engines that run on alternate fuels, including diesel.”

GM said diesel engines being made today have lower sulphur content and emit much less particulate matter than engines from a few years ago.
I completely agree with this project, it's the way to go!!
To: electrification@metrolinx.com
Subject: Revised body of letter svp

To Metrolinx,

My (herewith elaborated) question to Metrolinx at the June 27 Air-Rail Link meeting was:

How, if the Ontario government has a Climate Action Plan goal to reduce emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050 (1), does using public funds to build an air-rail link, diesel or electric, help Ontarians fit that mitigation curve (2)? The average Ontario per capita emissions rate in 2010 was 13 tonnes/annum (3); with non-ICI domestic-only emissions at 5.3 tonnes per person (4). We need to get that down to the maximum allocation of 2 tonnes per capita per annum. Flying is clearly one of the fastest ways to over-shoot any chance of climate mitigation, and should no longer be seen as a public good, natural right or hospitable act facilitating an innocent sporting event. Air transport is projected to grow up to fourfold by 2050 (5).

Further, as Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation are bound to act within these legal (6) and biophysical laws, has anyone at either Provincial government or Metrolinx, done a well-to-wheels carbon budget on the transit system, including air travel, using our stated provincial emission reduction targets? International air travel is not counted in national carbon inventories, however Nature sees emissions, not countries.

The reason I say this is because without more attention to de-incentivize emission growth, it appears to me that Metrolinx’s air-rail link plan is helping sell Ontarians tickets to a climate with far greater odds of crashing than a plane anyone would ever consider flying. (7) At what odds of crashing would you still buy a ticket for air travel? Is Metrolinx acting as a sane, moral public corporation that knows or care what those odds are, for either the current or next generations? Even reducing by 80% will only give us a 50% chance of staying below 2 C.

If 9.5% of a typical barrel of oil goes into making jet fuel (8), doesn’t the Provincial government have a responsibility to reduce this use?

Does Metrolinx read the law under which it operates? While the environmental clauses in these two founding acts are weak and few, it would be wise for Metrolinx to accord them the full weight of what they carry. A growing economy will never execute a successful takeover and subordination of the environment. The economy is a subsidiary of the environment.

Please send me a systemic analysis using explicit carbon budget allocations for Metrolinx’s current plan, and how it fits with the government’s emissions reduction plan.

Yours sincerely,
Bianca,

Here are three documents, two from rail authorities and one produced by the Professional Engineers of Ontario (which is very good). They are among the many documents and EA's and other research that leaves little doubt about why electric is a better transit solution. The amount of research is so overwhelming as to be almost comical. Government findings and even private run rail networks all sound like they are Clean Train Coalition. Serious.

Cheers, Scott

1. Network Rail operates transportation infrastructure in the UK


The full report report:
http://www.networkrailmediacentre.co.uk/imagelibrary/downloadMedia.ashx?MediaDetailsID=2802

2. Auckland Rail in New Zealand

The main page on electrification

The FAQ from the electrification of a rail line in Auckland, not the quote "A safety awareness programme will be launched prior to the introduction of electrified services to educate the community on the dangers of electrification, quieter trains and general rail safety."

http://www.kiwrail.co.nz/auckland-s-electrification---frequently-asked-questions#electricdiesel

3. Report from the Professional Engineers of Ontario

Note that this study says that:

A) page 19: "Future U.S. Tier 4 emission standards and other recent advances in diesel engine technology will make diesel fuel almost “clean” by removing soot and converting tailpipe emissions into harmless gases. However, diesel emission is, in fact, dirty when compared to the “life-cycle emission” of electric trains, a significant policy gap that leads to misinterpretation of air pollution standards."

B) page 20 "Electric trains have another health benefit: they are quieter. A GO Transit study found the noise from electric locomotives to be five to 10 decibels lower than from diesel (cpcs, 1992)."
Thanks for the information. If the EA is also looking at the electrification of the Lakeshore and Kitchener lines in addition to the ARL could you let me know the time lines for public comment?

Thanks

Please find below a response from the Metrolinx electrification project team:

Thank you for your email and interest in the Electrification Project.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) currently underway is being done to specifically examine the electrification of the Air Rail Link. It will also look at the phasing for the electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors. Metrolinx anticipates this work will be completed by 2014.

In December 2010, Metrolinx concluded its Electrification Study, a one-year study on the feasibility of electrification of the entire GO rail system. After a careful review of the findings, the staff recommended to the Metrolinx Board of Directors to proceed with the electrification of the GO Georgetown and Lakeshore corridors in phases, beginning with the Air Rail Link on the Kitchener (formerly Georgetown) corridor. At its Board meeting on January 26, 2011, the Metrolinx Board of Directors approved the staff recommendation, subject to provincial funding.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) is a required first step in the process. Metrolinx expects the EA for the electrification of the ARL service to be completed and submitted to the Minister of the Environment for review in 2014. The phasing plan for the electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors will have to be reviewed and approved by the Metrolinx Board of Directors prior to any decision.

Additional EAs will be required to examine possible impacts (both negative and positive) associated with converting GO operations from diesel to electric operation along the entire Kitchener and Lakeshore corridors.
I would be very interested if any of you have an answer to my questions below.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

To: electrification@metrolinx.com

Subject: Metrolinx - Question re GHG emission reduction

To Metrolinx,

My (below elided) question to Metrolinx at the June 27 All-Rail Link meeting was:

How, if the Ontario government has a Climate Action Plan goal to reduce emissions by 80% from 1990 levels by 2050 (1), does using public funds to build an air-rail link, diesel or electric, help Ontarians fit that mitigation curve (2)? The average Ontario per capita emissions rate in 2019 was 13 tonnes/annum (3); with non-ICI domestic-only emissions at 5.3 tonnes per person (4). We need to get that down to the maximum allocation of 2 tonnes per capita per annum. Flying is clearly one of the fastest ways to over-shoot any chance of climate mitigation, and should no longer be seen as a public good, natural right, or hospitable act facilitating an innocent sporting event. Air transport is projected to grow up to fourfold by 2050 (6).

Further, as Metrolinx and the Ministry of Transportation are bound to act within these legal (5) and biophysical laws, has anyone at either Provincial government or Metrolinx, done a well-to-wheels carbon budget on the transit system, including air travel, using our stated provincial emission reduction targets? international air travel is not counted in national carbon inventories, however, Nature sees emissions, not countries.

The reason I say this is because without more attention to de-incentivize emission growth, it appears to me that Metrolinx’s air-rail link plan is helping sell Ontarians tickets to a climate with far greater odds of crashing than a plane anyone would ever consider flying (7). At what odds of crashing would you still buy a ticket for air travel? Is Metrolinx acting as a sane, moral public corporation that knows or cares what those odds are, for either the current or next generations? Even reducing by 80% will only give us a 50% chance of staying below 2°C.

If 9.5% of a typical barrel of oil goes into making jet fuel (8), doesn’t the Provincial government have a responsibility to reduce this use?

Does Metrolinx read the law under which it operates? While the environmental clauses in these two founding acts are weak and few, it would be wise for Metrolinx to accord them the full weight of what they carry. A growing economy will never execute a successful takeover and subordination of the environment. The economy is a subservient of the environment.

Please send me a systematic analysis using explicit carbon budget allocations for Metrolinx’s current plan, and how it fits with the government’s emissions reduction plan.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]


Goals

As part of its 2007 Climate Change Action Plan, the Ontario government established three targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The government’s targets are:

- 6 per cent below 1990 GHG emission levels by 2014;
- 15 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020; and
- 80 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050.

https://connect.emailsrv.com/owa/?ae=item&d=IjM.Note&d=RgAAAAAJLe4FSiS7RkY+yBbCOXbuvAweTkJtZ1sQfudiaWm07AAAAYlrsAAAAWmAeTkJtZ1sQ... 4/13
Progress
In previous reports, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario (ECO) has expressed concern about the government's ability to meet these GHG emission reduction targets. While tangible progress has been made in the electricity sector with the phase-out of coal-powered generating plants, there is a lack of correspondingly ambitious policy tools in other large emitting sectors, such as transportation and industry.

While GHG emissions measured in tons of carbon dioxide (t CO₂) have decreased over the past two decades, economic growth over the period has overwhelmed these improvements. Future projected growth will make the targets even more difficult to reach.

- According to the latest figures, Ontario's GHG emissions were 165.7 million tonnes (Mt) in 2010. That's about 6.5% below 1990 emissions and if it could be sustained would meet the 2014 target.
- However, emissions are expected to increase by an additional 23 Mt, because of renewed economic growth.
- After building gas peaking capacity the net remaining reductions from the coal plant closures only account for about 10 Mt, leaving a gap of 13 Mt of further reductions to be found.

For more, see page 5 of Greenhouse Gas Progress Report.

Tyranny of the Near Term
While the government has established reduction targets for 2020 and 2050 as well, there are good reasons to act quickly. The severity of future climate changes will ultimately be determined by actions taken over the next ten to twenty years.

For one thing, reductions made now will mean less drastic emission cuts in the future. But there is also a risk of reaching a "tipping point" in atmospheric GHG concentrations. Once these concentration levels are exceeded, certain chemical processes can be triggered resulting in feedback cycles that drive the planet to a severely altered climate state that is beyond human control.

For more, see pages 9 and 43 of Greenhouse Gas Progress Report......

2) Emission curves

http://www.eco.ontario.ca/4degrees/epi/1-1scheilhuber.pdf

http://climateactionnetwork.ca/archive/issues/climate-justice/ox-canada-etc-share-es.pdf

Canada Fair Share of Emissions Reductions required to have even a > 50% chance of keeping warming below 2°C.
Figure 1: Canada's mitigation obligation, as calculated by the Greenhouse Development Rights framework, is a manner that is consistent with an overall 2°C emergency stabilization pathway. This mitigation obligation is shown, for illustrative purposes, as divided into a domestic (solid amber) mitigation obligation and an international (striped amber) mitigation obligation.


Figure ES1: Modeling Reason, Empathy, and Fair Play in CRED
Including assumptions of reason, empathy, and fair play in the CRED model transforms a Weak Conventional emissions reduction policy with a less than 1-in-1,000 chance of keeping temperature increases below 2°C into the CRED Optimal scenario with a better than 4-out-of-5 chance.

8,000 Gt CO₂ since 2000

http://www.pembina.org/blog950
3) Ontario total emissions from national emissions table and Ontario population from national population table to give per capita emissions.

http://www.ec.gc.ca/indicatorms-indicateurs/default.asp?lang=En&n=DFE66D29-1&n=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2010 Greenhouse gas emissions (equivalent of carbon dioxide equivalent)</th>
<th>Percent of total emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioenergy, Non-Renewable</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and Others</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "Other" sector includes emissions from light manufacturing, construction, forest industries, trade and total production.

Ontario CO2e 2010 Total: 171.3 MT from above table.


171.3 x 10^6 / 13.23 x 10^6 Population = 12.96 or ~ 13 tonnes Ontario per capita 2010, including ICI sector.

4) Average Ontario Personal emissions: 5.3 Tonnes (excluding ICI sector)

My own non work-related emissions for 2007-2008 from our "Carbon Pation Action Group" baseline, which doesn't judge carbon emitted driving to work, group comparison at http://www.carbonactionca.org/ontario-west-canada/creating-members-emissions-baseline, my 6.2 tonne carbon footprint that year is an example how easily flying can be a large fraction of carbon footprint. Excluded from this account is the 1.1 tonnes from my work-related driving and food-related emissions. With work-driving included, my emissions were 7.3, well above the 5.3 Provincial average for personal emissions that year.

Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Airplane</th>
<th>Bus/Train</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2007 the average Ontarian emitted 5.3 tonnes of CO2, excluding the per capita share of ICI emissions.

5) Projected growth in air travel emissions

http://www.ply sorrow.com/blogn-europe-airtrain-biofuel-reach-the-runway:

In an industry where, according to the IEA, CO2 emissions are estimated to increase 3.1% per year over the next 40 years, resulting in a 300% increase in emissions by 2050, this would be no small feat.

Projected Aviation Fuel Demand, World Markets: 2011-2021

Transport, Energy and CO2: Moving Toward Sustainability

Transport accounts for nearly one-quarter of global energy-related CO2 emissions. To achieve the necessary deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, transport must play a significant role.

Transport accounts for nearly one-quarter of global energy-related CO2 emissions. To achieve the necessary deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, transport must play a significant role. However, without stronger global action, car ownership worldwide is set to triple to over two billion by 2050. Trucking activity will double and air travel could increase four-fold. These trends will lead to a doubling of transport energy use, with an even higher growth rate in CO2 emissions as the planet shifts toward high-CO2 synthetic fuels. How can we enable mobility without accelerating climate change?

6) The two Statutory Acts Metrolinx is bound to act under, and the Ministry of Transport's expressed Sustainability Strategy.


Metrolinx Act, 2006
S.O. 2006, CHAPTER 16
Consolidation Period: From June 30, 2011 to the e-Laws currency date.
Last amendment 2011, c. 9, Sch. 27, s. 31.

Objects
5. (1) The objects of the Corporation are,
(a) to provide leadership in the co-ordination, planning, financing, development and implementation of an integrated, multi-modal transportation network that,
(i) conforms with transportation policies of growth plans prepared and approved under the Places to Grow Act, 2005 applicable in the regional transportation area,
(ii) complies with other provincial transportation policies and plans applicable in the regional transportation area, and
(iii) supports a high quality of life, a sustainable environment and a strong, prosperous and competitive economy;
(b) to act as the central procurement agency for the procurement of local transit system vehicles, equipment, technologies and facilities and related supplies and services on behalf of Ontario municipalities; and
(c) to be responsible for the operation of the regional transit system and the provision of other transit services. 2006, c. 16, s. 5 (1); 2009, c. 14, s. 5.

Places to Grow Act, 2005
S.O. 2005, CHAPTER 13

Preamble
The Government of Ontario recognizes that in order to accommodate future population growth, support economic prosperity and achieve a high quality of life for all Ontarians, planning must occur in a rational and strategic way.
The Government of Ontario recognizes that building complete and strong communities, making efficient use of existing infrastructure and preserving natural and agricultural resources will contribute to maximizing the benefits, and minimizing the costs, of growth.
The Government of Ontario recognizes that identifying where and how growth should occur will support improved global competitiveness, sustain the natural environment and provide clarity for the purpose of determining priority of infrastructure investments.
The Government of Ontario recognizes that an integrated and co-ordinated approach to making decisions about growth across all levels of government will contribute to maximizing the value of public investments.

Therefore, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

Purposes
1. The purposes of the Act are,
(a) to enable decisions about growth to be made in ways that sustain a robust economy, build strong communities and promote a healthy environment and a culture of conservation;
(b) to provide 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;
(d) to ensure that a long-term vision and long-term goals guide decision-making about growth and provide for the co-ordination of growth policies among all levels of government. 2005, c. 13, s. 1.

Ministry of Transportation

Demonstrate good stewardship

The breadth and scope of MTO's mandate offers many opportunities to practise good stewardship of Ontario's resources - human, financial and natural. Every time we make a decision, we need to consider how it will affect the surrounding ecosystem and communities. MTO's transportation activities must include protecting and conserving the province’s resources and dealing with any potentially negative effects of our activities or operations. Areas of focus include:

- recognizing that many natural resources are finite and shared, and making every effort to conserve, reuse and recycle them as much as possible
- minimizing disruptions to the natural environment or to historic or cultural features
- responding to climate change by reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector and preparing for the potential impacts of climate change
- investigating methodologies to improve our ability to incorporate sustainability in our Environmental Assessment process
- supporting the Ontario Public Service-wide Green Transformation, an initiative that will reduce the environmental footprint of the provincial government and foster a green organizational culture

---

7) Percent chances of staying below a 2°C global temperature rise, seen as the limit for dangerous anthropogenic climate change:


Canada's Fair Share of Emissions Reductions required to have a >50% chance of keeping warming below 2°C

![Graph showing GHG emissions reduction](image_url)

**Figure 1:** Canada's mitigation obligation, as calculated by the Greenhouse Development Rights framework, in a manner that is consistent with an overall 2°C emergency stabilization pathway. This mitigation obligation is shown, for illustrative purposes, as divided into a domestic (solid amber) mitigation obligation and an international (striped amber) mitigation obligation.

Do we want to gamble by following the status quo (which isn't even a gambling risk at this point, it's a certainty): [http://test-globalchange.mit.edu/resources/gamble/no-policy.html](http://test-globalchange.mit.edu/resources/gamble/no-policy.html)

Or do we want a sustainable future? [http://test-globalchange.mit.edu/resources/gamble/policy.html](http://test-globalchange.mit.edu/resources/gamble/policy.html)
The door to 2°C is closing, but will we be "locked-in"?

Figure 6.12: World energy-related CO2 emissions from locked-in infrastructure in 2010 and room for manoeuvre to achieve the 450 Scenario

Without further action, by 2017 all CO2 emissions permitted in the 450 Scenario will be "locked-in" by existing power plants, factories, buildings, etc

The above from the IEA is for a 450 ppm target, which is still 100 ppm above what's considered "safe" by most
How much tar sands oil is it reasonable to burn to provide air travel to this generation?

See the following Northern Gateway Panel submission by


Net Imports as a Percentage of Consumption, 1989-2010

![Net Imports as a Percentage of Consumption, 1989-2010](chart.png)

**Figure 6** - Level of dependency of eastern Canada on imported oil, 1989-2010 (crude oil and equivalents). Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces were almost totally dependent on imports in 2010 whereas Ontario dependence was about 13%.


**Figure 7** illustrates the countries of origin of Canada's imported oil. OPEC countries accounted for 50% of imports in 2010. Norway and the United Kingdom, non-OPEC countries that provided a significant proportion of Canadian imports in the late 1990s, have encountered peak oil.

The Northern Gateway Pipeline: An Affront to the Public Interest and Long Term Energy Security of Canadians Page 7 of 30

Where does the carbon go, and does the atmosphere have room to take more?

For excellent visual representations of this, see

[http://www.paxifreedom.org/eco/show/25b0e/Tar_sands_vs_entire_nations](http://www.paxifreedom.org/eco/show/25b0e/Tar_sands_vs_entire_nations)
Kinetics of Blunt Trauma (3 of 3)

- Force
  - Emphasizes the importance of rate at which an object changes speed (acceleration or deceleration)

\[ \text{Force} = \text{Mass} \times \text{Acceleration} \]
Correction to formula in my letter below, \( F = M V^2 \) conflates two different formulas, and should have read: \( F = ma \); and then listed Kinetic energy as \( K = \frac{1}{2} m v^2 \).

Force is a vector quantity while kinetic energy is a scalar quantity. In making an analogy between the momentum of our now non-existent force to kinetic energy of vehicle & occupant crashes, I should keep clear the distinction between the thermal & mechanical calculations involved.

To calculate the kinetic energy of an infant held in a parent's arms, it's more than just the square of the velocity or speed times mass:

\[ \text{KE} = \frac{1}{2} m v^2 \]


![Kinetics of Blunt Trauma](https://connect.emulab.cn/home?ze-item&li-IPM.Note&i-RgAAAAAJ-JeFGi67R4yRTYeEBCOX/bwAWzTlWtsCeQwqiqWmpo?AAAAV1oxAAAfVUz1eQ..."

### Kinetic Energy
- Energy in motion

\[ KE = \text{mass (weight)} \times \text{velocity (speed)}^2 \]

- Double weight = double energy
- Double speed = quadruple energy

**Speed is the greatest determinant.**
Who pays for the "externalities" of climate change from that carbon?

www.parks.pembina.org/reports/on-policies-ranking-2011.pdf

The NDP climate goals given during 2011 election:
* Commit to strengthening Ontario’s 2020 emissions target to 20 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020 (promising deeper emissions reductions than the current goal of 15 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020) and to developing a plan within the first year of government to meet the 2020 target.
* Would work with other jurisdictions on a coordinated climate change strategy, continuing to push the federal government to move forward with a national plan.

Explanation for rating: A more stringent target is encouraging, but the NDP platform lacks detail on how the party’s policies would meet this target and whether those measures would be adequate.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

13-Pageant Ave
Toronto, Ontario
M9H 3W7

“Climate change puts us all in the same boat. One hole will sink us all!” - Kofi Annan
C) page 18 "In addition, Metrolinx launched another study (May 2009) on the possible electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system, which is expected to be finished by the end of 2010. Despite these initiatives, there appears to be no fundamental policy shift among decision-makers to realize rail electrification's potential. As Les Benjamin (1981) indicates, the barriers to electrification in Canada appear to be psychological rather than technical or financial."

The full report:

http://members.peo.on.ca/index.cfm/document/1/cl_id/42969/la_id/1
It is for this reason I gave you a pie chart showing my own emissions, and sectoral emissions. Unless you can provide evidence to say that the climate problem has gone away, then how did the air travel factor disappear from Ontario's collective GHG profile in your Net Force calculation? Regardless of which level of government is responsible for flight emissions, if the Provincial government proposes a plane green solution to facilitate and validate increased air travel, then you are making it harder for the Federal government (run by extremely slow learners in environmental science) to comply with the emissions reductions we need. The entire notion of an air rail link is like a compromise from the 1960's, not something suitable to today's climate or state of environmental knowledge.

It is always good politics to provide jobs, and even better to provide green jobs locally. The best politics is to provide green jobs locally that it global demands for a balanced carbon cycle. This cycle is already perturbed in a large manner. You can plot the benefit to disbenefit ratio of our present energy consumption on a quadratic curve, and is 1 to 100,000 fold. According to Ken Caldeira, http://www.sce.edu.uk/~kcal/Climate%20change/Climate%20change%20review/Winning-Burning.pdf, the direct energetic benefit of our present consumption (calories for calorie) is 1/100,000 as big as the net radiative forcing (in effect waste heat produced), by today's release of carbon, spread across thousands of years.

As climate scientists make the parallel between air flight safety (1) and what we are doing to the climate as a mechanical system with irreversible results, Metrolinx and this provincial government owe citizens far more than you're going in planning to build an air rail link to increase or perpetuate existing air travel patterns that future generations can ill afford. No parent nowadays would think that they could snatch a child held in their lap if they crashed at high speed (Force = Mass X Velocity^2, please note the exponent, that's where the quadratic above comes into the picture, it's the same functional curve). And this is exactly what we're doing to the climate system for all future generations, not just those riding on the planet right now.

Whenever setting energy policy, remember your Net Force calculation method, and where to draw the system boundaries. If we leave large things out, or draw boundaries too narrow, it is our own kids and all future ones who will pay for our oversight.

With this in mind, I respectfully ask again: Please send me a systemic analysis using explicit carbon budget allocations for Metrolinx's current plan, and how it fits with the government's emissions reduction plan.

---

1) Climate scientist Kirsten Zeick is one of the first to explain the climate analogy to safety enthusiasts, making this air flight risk analogy towards the end of this 33 minute talk, at: http://www.sce.edu.uk/~kcal/Climate%20change/Climate%20change%20review/Winning-Burning.pdf

---

Re: Bruce McCuaig (mailto:Bruce.McCuaiag@metrolinx.com)

Sent: Friday, August 17, 2012 6:06 AM

Subjects: Re: Metrolinx - Question re GHG emission reduction

Dear Mr. Shepherd,

Thank you for writing to us with your concerns. I understand that you have also attended the Electrification Public Meeting in June and are in contact with our Electrification team.

One of the key initiatives in the Great Move, the regional transportation plan for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area, is to provide transit linkages to Pearson International Airport. Pearson Airport represents one of the largest passenger and employment centres in the region, as well as providing a major entrance to the region for business and tourist travelers. There is a need to provide alternative modes of travel to and from the airport to reduce our reliance on personal automobile trips, taxis and limousines. By building the Air Rail Link, we forecast that the project will reduce 1.2 million car trips from our roads in the first year of operation alone.

We welcome your continued participation in our work on the potential electrification of the Air Rail Link and other elements of the transit system.

Thank you again for sharing your comments and concerns with Metrolinx.

Bruce McCuaig

Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2012 1:20 AM

Subject: Re: Metrolinx - Question re GHG emission reduction

Dear Robert Pichard, Chair

Bruce McCuaig, President & CEO
Rahul Bharvaj, Board Member

https://connect.emailsrv.com/owa?se...
Hi Danielle,

As per our earlier phone conversation, my name is Alexandra Goldstein and I work with the Region of Peel. We are currently putting together a council report outlining the status of Metrolinx’s key projects and there are a few questions I need further information on.

1- What is the status of the Mobility Hubs studies? Are there any new studies coming out? Any new workshops? How is Metrolinx moving forward?
2- What is the status of the EA for the GO Electrification. Are there any documents about the
3- Does the Region of Peel have a representative sitting on the Urban Freight Forum?
4- Can you please send me some background information on the GO Rail Parking Strategy? I received the Station Profiles on Friday but was hoping for an outline of the study.

Alexandra Goldstein, M.P.
Transportation Planning
Transportation Division | Public Works

T: 905-791-7800 x7874
alexandra.goldstein@peelregion.ca
EA of Diesel takes 6 months. EA of electric will take over 3 years.

**Date:** Tuesday, May 28, 2013 10:10 AM

**Cc:** "karen.pitre@metrolinx.com" <karen.pitre@metrolinx.com>

**Subject:** Union Pearson Express Electrification EA – Public Open Houses June 4, 10, 11 & 12

As part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall Room 314 55 John St. Toronto, ON</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church 119 Mimico Ave. Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion 1050 Weston Rd. Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station 6100 Viscount Rd. Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the EA for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power...
Hi there,

Can you confirm there are some upcoming public meetings to update the progress of the electrification EA? I recall seeing a notice for a series of June meetings on the back of yesterday’s Metro newspaper, but can find no announcements online.

Please advise. Thanks,
Hey Karen,

how about having a meeting location at Lithuanian Hall near a lot of people effected by this?

And can we have more notice on these meetings in the future?

---

From: "Wylie, Bianca" <bwylie@swerhun.com>
Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 10:10 PM
To: "Wylie, Bianca" <bwylie@swerhun.com>
Cc: "karen.pitre@metrolinx.com" <karen.pitre@metrolinx.com>
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification EA – Public Open Houses June 4, 10, 11 & 12

As part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd.</td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire...
Thank you for the information.
I am in full support of the electrification of the rail system in the GTA. I welcome further developments in this direction, as burning diesel fuels for transportation in a populated urban setting, is just plain wrong.

Regards,

[redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

https://connect.amslnr.com/owa?ae=Item&b=FPM.Note&id=RqAAAAAJe4F5i67R4vRTYeEBCOXDwAWsTkJfz1eQquaAAkxmpo7AAAAAXQ8AAAAWsTkJfz1eQ...
Hi there,

I'm just wondering why there is not going to be an EA Open House meeting in the Junction. Many of the residents who live there have expressed their concern around electrification with regards to the UP Express. From what I understand, the UP Express does not go through Mimico nor Metro Hall, so I don't understand why these two locations would have been chosen as priority locations for an Open House for the UP EA when there are other locations closer to the affected residents that would seem much more suitable.

Thank-you,
Hi Project Team,

I have just received your notice of proposals for the facilities that you intend to build.

The map variance in shading makes this difficult to read.

I am unable to locate your proposed EMU Maintenance Facility?

I am requesting the address or an updated clearer key map so I can review this before the meeting.

Awaiting your reply,

Sincerely,
I wish to state my support for the electrification of Go Transit and the Union Pearson Express. In my opinion it will not only be environmentally acceptable, it is much better than diesel power.
Union Pacific Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment Project.

To whom it may concern.

For your information regarding the need for electric trains, over cheaper, more extremely dangerous 'diesel option's which assure cancers and various harms to the communities.

Diesel Exhaust Chemicals:

- There is a need to use environmental science to understand human biology and human diseases.

- Fetal origins of diseases need scientific clarification and much more discussion.

- The science is not 100%, but it is suggested that Diesel Exhaust (DE) may play a causal role in asthma, autism, Huntingtons Disease, Parkinsons Disease, various cancers, ischemic disorders, myocardial infarctions, arterial vasidilation, and fetuses aborting before coming to term.
- When a person is subject to (DE), arterial vasoconstriction occurs that is -- the arteries constrict in response, shying away from the exposure.

- This causes less blood flow to the fetus in the case of a pregnant woman, and decreases lung size and function, possibly leading to asthma and other possible respiratory ailments such as autism, Huntington's disease, or Parkinson's disease.

- There is a basic biological need to determine public health by using interdisciplinary research, that is -- Health officials at all levels of government along with all agencies should unite. In working together, this research and the articles are submitted and peer-reviewed by scientists. Pending approval, submissions would then be published. The information would then be more available for dissemination to the public.

- There needs to be a focused understanding of the chemicals and biologics in the environment, and how this affects humans.

- There is a need to develop local issues regarding microbial environmental disruption on human growth cells.

- There needs to be very clear and concise research before developing any new transportation systems, which accurately reflect all of the potential harm that is imposed on the communities.

- Ischemic diseases, - blood spurts (uneven blood flow) in arteries and veins.

- Myocardial infarction, - irregular and uneven heartbeats.

New areas of research will include:

- Environmental Epigenetics: Environmental Stress-Gene Expression and Human Fetal Development, including DNA Methylation, Genomic Imprinting, Histone Modification.

- Cumulative effects of environmental and all other exposures (home, diet, lifestyle, exercise).

- Endocrine disruptors that negatively impact gene growth.

All of these areas will contribute to developing diseases in populations, especially regional populations.

Specific to Cancer:
Agencies such as the World Health Organization's – International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the United States National Toxicology Program follow a scientific process and consider the weight of scientific evidence to determine whether a substance or chemical causes cancer.

Class 1: exposure causes cancer in humans.

Class 2A: exposure probably causes cancer in humans.

Class 2B: exposure possibly causes cancer in humans.

Class 3: scientists are unable to determine or classify whether exposure does or does not cause cancer in humans.

Class 4: exposure probably does not cause cancer in humans.

Please let me know if I can help in any discussions.
It makes me happy to see that metrolinx is looking at electrifying the tracks. Diesel is such a old and dirty way of fuelling. Now if only you would consider joining the express with the eglinton LRT and Bloor subway line! To me it doesn’t make sense to not join the lines now. It is inevitable that it will be done. It would be far more cost efficient to do it now rather than 5-10 years from now.
I read the Notice of Commencement in the paper today. It explains why we are decades behind most other countries in infrastructure projects (I've just come back from Hong Kong and weep at our inability to get things done). Why on earth is an environmental assessment necessary to erect electricity wires over an existing railway track? And what on earth does it have to do with First Nations people? Electrical rail traction is known throughout the world to be vastly superior to diesel in terms of environmental impact. All those living close to the track will benefit from reduced noise. Travellers will benefit from faster times (better acceleration) and the air will benefit from less diesel fumes.

SO JUST DO IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

The only political issue is, and should be, cost. The only reason it was built as a diesel line in the first place was cost, and the fact that finally (several decades late) politicians realized that we needed to do it fast to avoid being the laughing stock of the world (or at least the Americas) by having no rail link to the airport in time for the Pan Am Games.

If this were Beijing, or Hong Kong, or Singapore, or any major Chinese or European city, the electrified line would already exist and be on the way to being obsolete by now. If it needed to be built, it would be done in a year or less. My guess is that I won't live to see this line electrified (I'm 75).

It's all so sad for this once great city. It's political correctness and over-regulation gone mad.
I am very excited to hear about the Pearson line and am very curious to know about getting the Lakeshore line West electrified. Further I would like to know how much green house gas and other pollutants would not be put into our Neighborhoods.

Please know you have my full support for electrification of our rail system.

Regards,
Bill Lediard

Sent from my iPhone
Metrolinx Investment Strategy...tell me all about this please.

It sounds like the money isn't in place yet for electrification project.
Attn: Karen Pitre; Exec. Dir. - Electrification at Metrolinx-GO Transit and Patricia Stake; Environmental Planner at Hydro One Networks Inc.

I was so pleased to get an email from Metrolink (Georgetown South Project) and read in my local York Guardian - Dec. 5/2013 issue that FINALLY maybe some progressive ideas are truly being considered for the Union-Pearson Express line due to open in time for the Pan American Games in 2015.

Toronto should be a forward looking city, not one that lives in the past. When a brand new train line, especially one that visitors are quite likely to use, is put into service in the 21st century, one would expect the environment would be front & centre when building it and operating it. Having diesel trains, even the most modern, going every 15 minutes in each direction throughout the day (and night), contributing pollution (and noise) to the neighbourhoods it runs through, is NOT the way public transit should be.

The notice did not mention if the goal is to have the electrification in place for 'day one' of public operations. I truly hope it is. It seems to me that there's been so much 'stone walling' against electrification that one might think it's 'political' especially given all the messes one sees at all levels of governments these days. Whatever, I don't really care as long as we indeed see positive results in favour of electrification and the prompt implementation of such a program beginning with the Union-Pearson Express and eventually having the entire GO system running on cleaner electric power.

I find it rather ironic that I keep hearing we are having to pay other jurisdictions to get rid of our extra power and yet have been also hearing, up until this announcement, that diesel is the only way to go for the near future. Having travelled much throughout the world and especially to continental Europe, I know that 'cleaner running' trains are not in the future, they are here and now, and many indeed are made by the Canadian manufacturer Bombardier. So let's 'get with the green script' and 'all aboard' for a environmentally forward looking system of mass transit in the GTA!!

Thank You
To whom it may concern,

Is the system for electrification of the UP Express line the same intended for the GO trains? Additionally, can it be compatible with the standard-gauge built LRT trains as will be used on the Eglinton, Sheppard and Finch lines?

Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions,
Hi,

Just wondering if you have a standard introductory set of information on this, what are next steps/what is status of UFEX EA, and can you please add me to mailing list of future notices/correspondence?

Please do send correspondence via email and NOT in the post, if that's possible.

Thanks and regards,
Attention Karen Pitre, Executive Director, Electrification.

METROLINX ELECTRIFICATION PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS

VERSION 4 - November 2012

EPS 22000 - SAFETY AND SECURITY

THREAT VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT (TVA)

Documented threat and vulnerability reviews will be conducted on any deviations from the project design utilized in the project preliminary design.

Other threats and vulnerabilities identified during the course of the work shall also be assessed and accordance with a threat and vulnerability identification and resolution process outlined in the System for METROLINX ELECTRIFICATION PROJECT. The Threat and vulnerability identification and ocess has three main steps:

1. Threat and vulnerability identification
2. Threat and vulnerability categorization and assessment; and
3. Threat and vulnerability resolution and closure.

APPENDIX A : STANDARDS

The following documents shall be used as guidance or reference for the safety and security requirements for the design of Metrolinx Electrification facilities, systems and equipment:

RAILWAY SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, TRANSPORT CANADA.

RAILWAY SAFETY ACT, TRANSPORT CANADA.


https://connect.emaisrv.com/owa/?blog=Item&Id=rgAAAAJedFS67R4yRTYeEBCOXbhAW+jfTc0eQquqipqjTempo7AAAAARdFAAAWeTkJfz1e...
Hazard Analysis Guidelines for Transit Project, DOT-FTA-7A-26-3005-00-01, U.S. Department of Transportation;


Manual for the Development of Rail Transit System Safety Program Plans, American Public Transit Association (APTA);

The design shall be in accordance with the latest edition of the following standards:

NFPA 130, Standards For Fixed Guideway Transit and Passengers Rail Systems;

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Applicable Standards;

Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act (OSHA) and Regulations Requirements;

Ontario Building Code (OBC) as applicable, supplemented by local municipal code amendments.

[[ It should be noted that when regarding SAFETY AND SECURITY, the Metrolinx dialogue deals with ‘System Safety’, and not PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH ]].

CURIOUSLY MISSING IN THEIR LEGISLATION MANDATES, ARE;

Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999. C.33

[ Assented to September 14\textsuperscript{th}, 1999.

An Act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development through pollution prevention.

DECLARATION

It is hereby declared that the protection of the environment is essential to the well-being of Canadians and that the primary purpose of this Act is to contribute to sustainable development through pollution prevention.

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Government of Canada is committed to implementing pollution prevention as a
national goal and as the priority approach to environmental protection,

Whereas the Government of Canada acknowledges the need to virtually eliminate the most persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances and the need to control and manage pollutants and wastes if their release into the environment cannot be prevented,

Whereas the Government of Canada is committed to implementing the precautionary principle that, where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.

ACCORDING TO (www.linguee.com) website;

[[ for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental damage, translates in the French language - pour remettre a plus tard l’adoption de measures effectives visant a prevenir la degradation de l’environnement ]]

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes that all Governments in Canada have authority that enables them to protect the environment and recognizes that all governments face environmental problems that can benefit from cooperative resolution;

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes the importance of endeavouring, in cooperation with the provinces, territories, and aboriginal peoples, to achieve the highest level of environmental quality for all Canadians and ultimately contribute to sustainable development;

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes that the risk of toxic substances in the environment is a matter of national concern and that toxic substances, once introduced in the environment, cannot always be contained within geographic boundaries;

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes the integral role of science, as well as the roll of traditional aboriginal knowledge, in the process of making decisions relating to the protection of the environment and human health and that environmental or health risks and social, economic and technical matters are to be considered in that process;

Whereas the Government of Canada recognizes the responsibility of users and producers in relation to toxic substances and pollutants and wastes, and has adopted the polluter pays principle; [[ by choosing diesel powered trains, cancers and ailments most definitely shall result, and the fault will lie with the Metrolinx decision making participants ]] - including all local, provincial, federal governments, as well as all corporate officials collectively.

Whereas the Government of Canada is committed to ensuring that its operations and activities on federal and aboriginal lands are carried out in a manner that is consistent with the principles of pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health.

[[ ARE ANY OF THE LANDS BEING USED IN THE METROLINX PROCESS ]]

https://connect.emailsrv.com/wa/?aID=IPM.Note&ID=RgAAAAAJe4F5I67RyRTYeEBCOXBwAWsTkIjz1eQquqj5mpo7AAAAAXrdFAAAAsTkIjz1e... 3/11
FEDERAL ABORIGINAL ?? |]

Whereas the Government of Canada will endeavour to remove threats to biological diversity through pollution prevention, the control and management of the risk of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, pollutants and wastes, and the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances.

DUTIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Section 2. (1) In the administration of this Act, the Government of Canada shall having regard to the Constitution and laws of Canada and subject to subsection (1.1)

1.(a) exercise its powers in a manner that protects the environment and human health, applies the precautionary principle that, where there are serious threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation, and promotes and reinforces enforceable pollution approaches;

(a.1) take preventative and remedial measures to protect, enhance and restore the environment;

(f) facilitate the protection of the environment by the people of Canada;

(j) protect the environment, including its biological diversity, and human health from the risk of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, pollutants, and wastes;

(k) endeavour to act expeditiously and diligently to assess whether existing substances or those new to Canada are toxic or capable of becoming toxic and assess the risk that such substances pose to the environment and human life and health;

CONSIDERATIONS

The Government of Canada shall consider the following before taking any measure under paragraph (1) (1.1):

[[ take preventative and remedial measures to protect, enhance, and restore the environment ]]

1.(a) the short-and long-term human and ecological benefits arising from the environmental protection measure;

(b) the positive economic impacts arising from the environmental protection measure, including those cost savings arising from health, environmental and technological advances and innovation, among others; and

© any other benefits accruing from the measure.

Next Act discussed will be the PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA ACT.

S.C 2006, c.5
Assented to 2006-December-12.

An Act respecting the establishment of the Public Health Agency of Canada and amending certain Acts.

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Government of Canada wishes to take public health measures, including measures relating to health protection and promotion, population health assessment, health surveillance, disease and injury prevention, and public health emergency preparedness and response;

And Whereas the Government of Canada considers that the creation of a public health agency for Canada and the appointment of a Chief Public Health Officer will contribute to the federal efforts to identify and reduce public health harms.

Next Act discussed will be the CANADA HEALTH ACT


An Act relating to cash contributions by Canada and relating to criteria and conditions in respect of insured health services and extended health services.

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Parliament of Canada recognizes:

- That it is not the intention of the Government of Canada that any of the powers, rights, privileges or authorities vested in Canada or the provinces under the provisions of the Constitution Act,1867, or any amendments thereto, or otherwise, by reason of this Act abrogated or derogated from or in any way impaired

- That Canadians can achieve further improvements in their well-being through combining individual lifestyles that emphasize fitness, prevention of disease and health promotion with collective action against the social, environmental and occupational causes of disease, and that they desire a system of health services that will promote physical and mental health protection against disease

That future improvements in health will require the cooperative partnership of governments, health professionals, voluntary organizations and individual Canadians;

- That continued access to quality health care without financial or other barriers will be critical to maintaining and improving the health and well-being of Canadians.

- That continued access to quality health care without financial or other barriers will be critical to maintaining and improving the health and well-being of Canadians.
NOW, THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows;

Short Title

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the Canada Health Act.

1984,c.6,s.1

DEFINITIONS

Section 2. In this act

"hospital services", "hospital services" means any of the following services provided to in-patients or out-patients at a hospital, if the services are medically necessary for the purpose of maintaining health, preventing disease, diagnosing or treating an injury, illness or disability, namely;

(a) Accommodation and meals at the standard or public ward level and preferred accommodation if medically required.

(b) Nursing service

(c) Use of operating room, case room and anesthetic facilities, including necessary equipment and supplies

(d) Drugs, biological and related preparations when administered in the hospital

(e) Use of operating room, case room and anaesthetic facilities, including necessary equipment and supplies

(f) Medical and surgical equipment and supplies

(g) Use of radiotherapy facilities

(h) Use of physiotherapy facilities and,

(i) Services provided by persons who receive remuneration therefore from the hospital

"resident" "resident" means, in relation to a province, a person lawfully entitled to be in or remain in Canada who makes his house and ordinary present in the province, but does not include a tourist, a transient or a visitor to the province;

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF CANADIAN HEALTH CARE POLICY

3. It is hereby declared that the primary objective in Canadian Health Care Policy, is to protect, promote and restore the physical and mental well-being of residents of Canada and to facilitate reasonable access to health services without financial or other barriers.

1984,c.6, s.3
PURPOSE OF THIS ACT

4. The purpose of this Act, is to establish criteria and conditions in respect of insured health services and extended health care services provided under provincial law must be met before a full contribution may be made.

CASH CONTRIBUTION

5. Subject to this Act, as part of the Canada Health Transfer, a full cash contribution is payable by Canada to each each province of each fiscal year.

R.S., 1985, c. C-6, s.4; 1995, c.17, s.35.

CONDITIONS FOR CASH CONTRIBUTION

13. In order that a province may qualify for a full cash contribution referred to in section 5, the government of the province

(b) shall give recognition to the Canada Health Transfer in any public documents, or in any advertising or promotional material, relating to insured health services and extended health care services in the province.

R.S., 1985, c. C-6, s.13; 1995,c.17, s.37;2012,c.19,s.409 (E).

CONSULTATION PROCESS

14(2). Before referring a matter to the Governor in Council under subsection (1) in respect of a province, the Minister shall;

(a) Send by registered mail to the Minister responsible for health care in a province a notice of concern with respect to any unforeseen problem

(b) Seek any additional information available from the province with respect to the problem through bilateral discussions, and make a report to the province within ninety days after sending the notice of concern; and

(c) If requested by the province, meet within a reasonable time to discuss the report.

(3) The Minister may act without consultation if the Minister is of the opinion that a sufficient time has expired after reasonable efforts to achieve consultation and that consultation will not be achieved.

ACCORDING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE CANADA WEBSITE:

Canada Health Transfer received funding of 26 (twenty-six) Billion dollars.

ABOUT HEALTH CANADA.

HEALTH PORTFOLIO

The Minister of Health is responsible for maintaining and improving the health of Canadians. This is supported by the Health Portfolio which comprises Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Hazardous Materials Information Review
Commission, the Patented Medicine Review Board and assisted Human Reproduction Canada. The Health Portfolio consists of approximately 12,000 full-time equivalent employees and an annual budget of - 3.8 Billion dollars.

MANDATE OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA.

- Promote health;
- Prevent and control chronic diseases and injuries;
- Prepare for and respond to public health emergencies;
- Serve as a central point for sharing Canada’s expertise with the rest of the world;
- Apply international research and development to Canada’s public health programs
- Strengthen intergovernmental collaboration on public health and facilitate national approaches to public health policy and planning.

Municipal governments also play a role in public health, they have primary responsibility for responding to public health emergencies in their jurisdictions. If a public health emergency grows beyond a municipality’s boundaries or its ability to deal with the emergency, then the provincial or territorial governments may be asked to step in and provide assistance. If a public health emergency grows beyond one province and/or territory – again, either its boundary or capacity, the Public Health Agency of Canada usually gets involved – often playing a coordinating role. This can also include lending its lab capacity, contributing emergency medical and equipment stockpiles and response teams, and connecting with the World Health Organization and other countries.

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION DEFINITION OF HEALTH:

‘HEALTH’ IS A STATE OF COMPLETE PHYSICAL, MENTAL AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING AND NOT MERELY THE ABSENCE OF DISEASE OR INFINITY.

FURTHER, THE CORRECT BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION FOR THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION’S DEFINITION OF HEALTH IS:

https://connect.emaillerv.com/owa/?ae=Item&k=PM.Note&id=RgAAAAAJe4F5i87R4yRTYeBhOCXSwAWeTkJfz1eQpyqjklkmpo7AAAAARdFAAAWeTkJfz1e...
PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
AS ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH CONFERENCE, NEW YORK,
19-22 JUNE, 1946; signed on 22 July, 1946; by the representatives of 61 states (Official
Records of the World Health Organization, no. 2, p.100) and entered into force on 7 April,
1948.

The definition has not been amended since 1948.

www.thefreedictionary.com/wrongdoing

Legal.

Wrongdoing (noun) (LAW) the act or instance of doing something immoral or illegal.

Dictionary Definition.

1. Wrong, evil, or blame worthy behavior.

2. A misdeed, sin.

PUBLIC SERVANTS DISCLOSURE PROTECTION ACT

S.C. 2005, c.46.

Assented to 2005 November 25.

NOTE BENE:

IN NO WAY AM I INFERRING OR ACCUSING ANY PERSON OR PERSON’S
OF ANY CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES, BUT RATHER THERE MIGHT BE ISSUES
THAT NEED TO BE REGARDED AND SCRUTINIZED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY AND BETTER SERVE
CANADIAN PUBLIC HEALTH NEEDS.
VERY SPECIFIC TO THE POPULATION OF THE TORONTO METROPOLITAN AREA.

PREAMBLE

Recognizing that the federal public administration is an important national institution and is part of the essential framework of Canadian parliamentary democracy;

It is in the public interest to maintain and enhance public confidence in the integrity of public servants;

Confidence in public institutions can be enhanced by establishing effective procedures for the disclosure of wrongdoings and by establishing a code of conduct for the public sector;

Public servants owe a duty of loyalty to their employer and enjoy the right to freedom of expression as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and that this Act strives to achieve an important balance between those two important principles;

WRONGDOINGS

SECTION 8.

This Act in respect of the following - WRONGDOINGS IN OR RELATING TO THE PUBLIC SECTOR -;

(a) A contravention of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, or any regulations made under any such Act;

(b) A misuse of public funds or a public asset

(c) A gross mismanagement in the public sector;

(d) An act or omission that creates a substantial and specific danger to the life, health, or safety of persons, or to the environment, other than a danger that is inherent in the performance of the duties of a public servant.

If it is indeed decided by the powers that be in the case of the Metrolinx rail system to be used in Toronto chose to utilize diesel commuter trains, as opposed to the safer, healthier electric technology which already has been
selected- this would indeed be a 'wrongdoing' regarding public health, safety and security.

- RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.

[Contact Information]

https://connect.emailisnr.com/owa/?ae=Item&d=IPM.Note&id=Fr4AAAAAJe4F5I67R6RyRTYeEBCO2wAIWsTkJfz1e9uo9qjQkmpo7AAAAXRdFAAA/WeTiUjz1...
Project updates

Sent: April 3, 2012 7:58 AM
To: electrification@metrolinx.com

I would like to receive project updates as they are published.

Back in 1983 (30 years ago), as part of my MBA at UofT, I produced a paper (assignment) on the Electrification of the GO Transit system. A set of linear equations calculated the operating cost break-even points between the cost of oil/diesel fuel and electricity. It assumed that the capital costs would be covered by the government. I don't think I kept the report but it would be interesting to look at its findings now.

Thank you,
Dear Karen Pitre,

I recommend you also look at battery powered EMU hybrid units. They offer recharging while on the grid and about 30+ miles of battery power. They could work well with your system and offer the ability to gain the benefit of electric technology while you build out the infrastructure.

Here are a few links to the technology now being tested in the UK and Japan.

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDEQFjAB&url=http://www.networkrail.co.uk/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=30064788652&ei=xm3oUqrUIMtUq4HwBOA&usg=AFQjCNHkr0dnDKLB6a00GTLFkQx7E01TQ&sig2=NNmg7EXB2Ore_BxD4g66gNQ&bvm=bv.60157871.d.cWc


Best,
Dear Karen,

On February 10 I would like your presentation to answer these questions that have been collected from people in our community.

- Does the government intend to electrify by 2017 as “promised” by Minister Murray?
  - When will the EA be finished? - What then?
  - Can the Diesel Multiple Unit trains on order really be converted to electric as shown in previous Metrolinx presentations?
  - Yes or No, are electric trains quieter than diesel trains like other rail services claim?
  - Is Metrolinx considering the lighter European trains that CalTrain is using which are even more quieter than North American electric trains?
  - Would there be a need for sound walls if we had electric trains?
  - Is $400M still the estimate for the upfront costs of electrification?
  - Are you talking to the TTC about possible use of line as western leg of relief line?
  - How close can new stations be built along the line with electric locomotion? What locations are being considered?
  - Will Metrolinx be applying the federal Building Canada Fund for funding to electrify?
Hi Daniel,

It was nice to meet you the other night. As a follow-up to your questions, I have attached the drawings for the portal structures that would span 4 tracks.

With respect to your question about the Weston Tunnel, I followed up on the attachments for the 3 (v4) tracks. This may be too much technical information but this will help explain why the current design is for the 3 tracks that will be built first. The Weston Tunnel itself is approximately 2136m in length. As the minimum vertical clearance within the tunnel is 7.4m, it has been determined that the OCS equipment will be suspended from the tunnel soffit on tracks W2, W3 and W4, utilizing tunnel arm attachments with spans between each registration of approximately 30m.

The OCS design for Weston Tunnel has been made to be easily expandable for the future W1 track electrification once the track alignment becomes known. The only additional work that needs to be done is to apply the same OCS design utilizing the same type of tunnel arm assemblies. The alignment needs to be confirmed prior to the final design at which time it is not complicated to add the tunnel arm attachment.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
I would recommend electrification versus diesel trains for interurban transportation, such as the ones in existence in Europe and the United States.

I don't understand all the studying going on without action. The biggest factor we may have is climate. Canadian must become more embracing of new technology whether its transport or other things. Unfortunately we seem to have quite a strong resistance to change overall.
Open Letter

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx GO Transit
20 Bay St, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W5

Cc: The Hon. Glen Murray, Minister of Transport, Ontario.

SUBJECT: Extend Airport Rail Corridor Electrification Project Eastward

Dear Ms. Pitre,

We welcome the long awaited start of the electrification process of GO rail and take the opportunity of the Environmental Assessment hearings to voice our support for an extension of this project eastward at least to the Danforth GO if not to Kennedy station in Scarborough.

These extensions would enable GO rail to function as relief lines to the overcrowded subways, given convenient ‘mobility hubs’ at the transfer stations, and more frequent trains.

Both can be provided at a fraction of the cost of a new Downtown Relief [subway] Line advocated by the TTC and can be implemented in a much shorter timeframe.

This ‘low-hanging fruit’ of GO/TTC integration is detailed in the December 13th Neptis Foundation report in chapter 6, and in chapter 3 regarding electrification and the use of Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) rolling stock.


As advocates for GTA public transit integration and as elected officials we urge you to initiate this pro-active extension.

Signed:

PS: For an electrification EUREKA moment, going back to 1897 click on the following link:

http://home.cc.umanitoba.ca/~watt/alltime/pics/toronto ~MRI1oco1897RHIll -DonPEvans.jpg
Dear Metrolinx,

I know you are going to electrify a GO train line but I was wondering if you are going to use electric locomotives or electric multiple unit cars, what company they are going to be built by and what they are going to be called. I know that some people criticise you for using diesel trains because diesel train pollute the air but people are forgetting that they should be grateful for the efforts you are making to improve transit in the GTA such as: the GO trains and buses which are good for commuting people to other towns and cities, the upcoming UP express which will get people to the Pearson airport in just 25 minutes, the upcoming LRT lines which will provided rapid transit to areas that don't already have rapid transit and the Viva BRT which will prevent Viva buses from getting stuck in traffic so Viva customers will get to their destination on time. I really appreciate these efforts you are making to make commuting in the GTA easier, faster and more convenient and everybody else should also be grateful. I believe that public transit is one of the most important parts of a city. And just so you know, if you need me to come to a meeting to talk about my advertising ideas just give me a date, time and place and I will be there. I have thought of a whole bunch of ads and commercials and have written them down.
TPS Site - Union Pearson Express Electrification

Sent: March 12, 2014 1:27 PM
To: electrification@metrolinx.com; community.relations@hydroone.com
Cc: avescio@toronto.ca; councillor_dford@toronto.ca
Attachments: POH_Ad_Final_Jan2014EN.pdf (292 KB); UPExpress_Jan 2014POH2_Dis~1.pdf (7 MB); Traction Power Supply Syst~1.pdf (336 KB)

Dear Karen and Patricia,

Please note that further to your public open houses, we have some serious concerns with respect to the propose TPS Site at 175 City View Drive, Toronto.

We and our employees are very concerned with the environmental impact as we are the adjoining property at the proposed TPS site.

In addition we are not and were never interested in being property owners next to such a development, and the negative and adverse impact that will undoubtedly arise both on a health and economic basis.

Please provide me with the individuals that I should be dealing with in respect to these issues. I would like to be directly contacted with any and all ongoing developments with this project so that I may have representation present.

Regards.
To:
   Karen Pitre – Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
   Patricia Staite – Community.Relations@HydroOne.com

Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification – Environmental Assessment
February 3, 2014

Thanks for sending me a copy of the announcement of the commencement of this study. I became all excited when I first saw the map (copy attached) which accompanied the announcement. Upon first glance, this appeared to show a “station” on the GO/UPE alignment at Eglinton Avenue West where GO/UPE will cross the Eglinton LRT at the latter’s Mount Dennis (Weston Road) first phase terminal station. I then read the text and looked more carefully at the map and at its legend, and discovered that the symbol shown at Eglinton is meant to designate a “Proposed Paralleling Station (Metrolinx –Power Distribution)” facility, rather than a passenger station!

I realize that Metrolinx’s Regional Transportation Plan (The Big Move) of 2008 is not cast in stone by any means, but I trust that one of its key objectives; i.e. to provide a viable intermodal network; will be retained. Certainly, regional travel using a variety of modes can only occur if well designed, strategically located interchanges allow such a network to exist!

Billions of dollars are being spent on Phase I of the Eglinton-Crosstown LRT, and over a billion is being spent to widen, grade-separate and generally enhance operation on the Georgetown South rail corridor within the City of Toronto, including the new link with Pearson International Airport’s passenger terminal area. Moreover, GO Transit service on the corridor – particularly that section of the line within the Greater Toronto Area – is an early candidate for initiation of two-way, all-day operation in recognition of that section’s strategic role in the regional network. Surely, then, the fact that these two significant and long overdue projects might not be provided with a key interchange station is astonishing and disappointing, to say the least, and frankly suggests that the oft-stated objective of creating new opportunities for TTC/GO Transit service integration is not really serious.

In hoping that my misgivings in this regard are misplaced, it strikes me that physical provisions for platforms at a future Eglinton West GO Transit/UPE station, as well as for the requisite vertical links between the two stations will certainly require preplanning, and I can only hope that adequate space for these components has been identified for protection. Attempting to add such facilities after operations begin would be prohibitively costly and disruptive.

As you know, many (including the writer) continue to express concern that the Union Pearson Express operation in the form currently under development would be far more valuable in the form of a bona fide higher capacity, electrified, limited-stop component of the regional public transit network to better serve its historic, fairly densely developed west Toronto corridor. This could take the form of a medium-capacity operation at five- to ten-minute headways on standard
gauge railway tracks not unlike the “Stadtbahn” (“City Railway”) services that are common in European urban areas such as Berlin, Hamburg and Vienna. The number of tracks to be available (ultimately up to four) could accommodate such a service, while also allowing for less frequent “airport express” service, as needed, at premium fares.

In order to provide a viable rail transit service, at least two additional stations would be needed within the City of Toronto; e.g. Parkdale/Liberty Village southeast of the Queen West/Dufferin intersection, and St. Clair West, in addition (needless to say) to a greatly improved interchange with the Bloor-Danforth subway at Bloor West/Dundas West. However, in due course an interchange at Eglinton West would clearly become as important as the Bloor West/Dundas West interchange, in view of the importance of the Eglinton-Crosstown LRT as the first wholly new major east-west rail transit facility to be added to the network since the Bloor/Danforth subway’s initial phase began operating nearly a half-century ago!

The lengthy, costly Eglinton-Crosstown line will serve as the north-central east-west transit “spine” of the City of Toronto, and besides leading to land use intensification and urban regeneration over time, will carry increasingly heavy passenger volumes in large part because of the line’s many opportunities for interchange with numerous surface bus routes, up to four GO Transit rail lines, and the three subway lines at the Eglinton West, Yonge and Kennedy interchanges. In light of this, the apparent lack of urgency in providing for an interchange with GO Transit at Mount Dennis is particularly troubling.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

I am trying to retain some degree of optimism in crafting the foregoing misgivings and propositions, but this is becoming increasingly difficult after so many years of published visions and subsequent disappointments relating to possibilities for TTC/GO Transit integration. I earnestly hope that my concerns are unfounded, and would eagerly welcome any relevant comment or clarification, for which I tender appreciation in advance.

Respectfully submitted,
Edward J. Levy, P.Eng. – Transportation Consultant
March 21, 2014

CanMar Contracting Limited
169 City View Drive, 2nd Floor
Etobicoke, ON  M9W 5B1

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Traction Power Substation

Dear

Thank you for your comments on the Union Pearson Express Electrification Traction Power Substation (TPS) project. We understand that you spoke with members of our team at the public open house in late January. We would be pleased to meet with you.

As you are aware, Hydro One is conducting a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act for the proposed Union Pearson Express Electrification TPS project, and Metrolinx is conducting a parallel process to obtain environmental approvals for its proposed electrification. Public consultation is an important part of the Class EA process.

Hydro One’s Class EA process is an effective way to ensure minor transmission projects that have a predictable range of effects are planned and carried out in a manner that is environmentally acceptable. Hydro One is experienced in predicting and mitigating environmental effects of transmission projects. The predicted environmental effects for this project and our proposed mitigation measures will be fully documented in the draft Environmental Study Report (ESR) that Hydro One will make available for a 30-day public review and comment period starting April 1.

Karen and I would be pleased to discuss concerns that you may have about the project. If you have specific issues you would like to discuss and could let me know ahead of time, it would be helpful. Please contact me at 416-345-6686 to set up a meeting.

Thank you again for bringing your concerns to my attention and I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Cc: Karen Pitre
We need people on our website who want to sue Go Transit. Kindly charge your way of business.

Dear Karen Pidre,

Kindly keep services free of charge at Go Transit by getting gambling, advertising, retailing and restaurant services to absorb all the costs.

Get free hydro power for all your blods, always buy clean lease. Use steel frame construction.

Use hydrogen fuels with condenser units to improve the gas mileage.
Go to electric powered vehicles, monorail trains.

Simple pricing $10 all taxes included, not $8.95 + taxes.

Visit our website and steel great idea, send everyone from Go Transit to our website
Appendix J7

Aboriginal Correspondence and Contact List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>First Nation</th>
<th>Main Address 1</th>
<th>Main Address 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Main E-mail</th>
<th>Main Phone 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Brian LaForme</td>
<td>Mississaugas of the New Credit</td>
<td>2789 Mississauga Rd.</td>
<td>R.R. #6</td>
<td>Hagersville, ON</td>
<td>NOA 1H0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brianlaforne@newcreditfirstnation.com">brianlaforne@newcreditfirstnation.com</a></td>
<td>905-768-1133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Donna Big Canoe</td>
<td>Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation</td>
<td>R.R. #2</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13</td>
<td>Sutton West, ON</td>
<td>L0E 1R0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbigcanoe@georginaisland.com">dbigcanoe@georginaisland.com</a></td>
<td>705-473-1337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Thomas Bressette</td>
<td>Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation</td>
<td>6247 Indian Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lambton Shores, ON</td>
<td>N0N 1J1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Thomas.bressette@kettlepoint.org">Thomas.bressette@kettlepoint.org</a></td>
<td>519-766-2125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine George</td>
<td>Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lorraine.george@kettlepoint.org">lorraine.george@kettlepoint.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Scott Lee</td>
<td>Chippewas of Nawash First Nation</td>
<td>R.R. #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wiarton, ON</td>
<td>N0H 2T0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Reception.admin@nawash.ca">Reception.admin@nawash.ca</a></td>
<td>519-534-1684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kerry Sandy-Mackenzie</td>
<td>Barristers &amp; Solicitors, Coordinating</td>
<td>Chippewas of Rama First Nation</td>
<td>8 Creswick Court</td>
<td>Barrie, ON</td>
<td>L4M 2J7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.s.sandy-mckenzie@rogers.com">k.s.sandy-mckenzie@rogers.com</a></td>
<td>705-792-5087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Sharon Stinson Henry</td>
<td>Chippewas of Rama First Nation</td>
<td>5884 Rama Road Suite 200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rama, ON</td>
<td>L3V 6H6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chief@ramafirstnation.ca">chief@ramafirstnation.ca</a></td>
<td>705-325-3611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Joe Miskokomon</td>
<td>Chippewas of the Thames First Nation</td>
<td>320 Chippewas Road</td>
<td>R.R. #1</td>
<td>Muncey, ON</td>
<td>N0L 1Y0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:miskokomon@cottfn.com">miskokomon@cottfn.com</a></td>
<td>519-289-5555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Kelly LaRocca</td>
<td>Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation</td>
<td>22521 Island Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Perry, ON</td>
<td>L9L 1B6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ckarloca@scugogislandnation.com">ckarloca@scugogislandnation.com</a></td>
<td>905-365-3337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Randall Kahgee</td>
<td>Saugeen First Nation</td>
<td>6453 Highway 21</td>
<td>R.R. #1</td>
<td>Southampton, ON</td>
<td>N0H 2L0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkahgee@saugeenfirstnation.ca">kkahgee@saugeenfirstnation.ca</a></td>
<td>519-797-2781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief William Kenneth Montour</td>
<td>Six Nations of the Grand River</td>
<td>1695 Chiefswood Road</td>
<td>P.O. Box 5000</td>
<td>Ohsweken, ON</td>
<td>N0A 1M0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wkmontour@sixnations.ca">wkmontour@sixnations.ca</a></td>
<td>519-445-2201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Robert Bird</td>
<td>Toronto and York Region Metis Council</td>
<td>22 Pheasant Valley Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thornhill, ON</td>
<td>L3T 2H1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodbird_consulting@gmail.com">rodbird_consulting@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>905-731-5610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 8, 2012

Agatha Garcia-Wright  
Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Ave. W.  
Floor 12A  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
e-mail: agatha.garcia-wright@ontario.ca

Dear Ms. Garcia-Wright:

Re: Initiation of the Metrolinx Airport Rail Link Electrification Project and request for list of bodies that may assist in identifying Aboriginal Communities

Metrolinx is currently in the pre-planning phase of the Airport Rail Link (ARL) Electrification Project. Based on the findings of the GO Electrification Study completed in December 2010, Metrolinx has initiated the electrification design and environmental assessment (EA) for Phase 1: the Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The preliminary project study area includes the ARL corridor as well as potential locations for electrification infrastructure (see key map below).
The ARL Electrification project includes design and engineering of the power supply and distribution for the ARL corridor, as well as development of performance standards for electrification. In addition, as part of electrifying the ARL corridor, there are a number of related infrastructure requirements such as Traction Power Substation(s), Switching Station(s), and Paralleling Station(s). The project also includes assessment of Maintenance Facility options.

As part of carrying out pre-planning activities, Metrolinx is working closely with Hydro One to identify potential locations for the required electrification infrastructure and to coordinate EA process requirements as they relate to the electricity supply portion of the project (Ontario Regulation 116/01). It is expected that Metrolinx will follow Ontario Regulation 231/08 (Transit Projects Regulation) for the ARL Electrification project.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal peoples is a key component of the ARL Electrification project. In accordance with subsection 7(4) of O. Reg. 231/08, Metrolinx is requesting the list of bodies that may assist us in identifying and contacting Aboriginal communities that may be interested in this project. Metrolinx will contact those bodies you identify and ask that these bodies identify specific Aboriginal communities that should be consulted.

Currently, we anticipate holding our first Public Open House (POH) as early as June 2012 to introduce the project and obtain initial feedback. As previously discussed with Jeff Dea, Metrolinx and Hydro One would like to meet with MOE EAAB staff at your earliest convenience to discuss the ARL Electrification project in advance of holding the first POH. With that in mind, we would like to schedule a meeting for late May, if possible.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification

cc:
J. Dea – Special Project Officer, MOE EAAB
M. Harrison, Supervisor – Project Coordination, MOE EAAB
R. Fisher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
J. Salter, Account Executive Ontario Hydro
B. McCormick, Manager Environmental Services, Ontario Hydro
FYI

From: Desautels, Solange (ENE)  [mailto:Solange.Desautels@ontario.ca]
Sent: June 14, 2012 11:04 AM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: Ryan, Jason (ENE); Karlos, George (ENE); Lashbrook, Ross (ENE); Garcia-Wright, Agatha (ENE)
Subject: GO Metrolinx Airport Rail Link Electrification Study Request for Aboriginal Contact Information

Re: List of Agencies to assist in identifying interested Aboriginal Communities & Notice of Commencement

Thank you for your May 8, 2012 letter regarding the Metrolinx’s Airport Rail Link Electrification Project. In your letter you request that the ministry provide you with a list of agencies that can assist you in identifying interested Aboriginal communities.

Aboriginal communities must be contacted prior to issuing a Notice of Commencement for the project. In response to your request, the ministry recommends that you contact the following organizations and resources to assist you in identifying interested Aboriginal communities for this project.


The ministry is pleased that you intend to follow the accelerated transit project assessment process as per Ontario Regulation 231/08 for your projects. Please provide us with advance notice prior to publishing your Notice of Commencement of the transit assessment process. Also can you please provide us with the web site address for this project when it is available.

Once your project timing is known; a Project Officer will be assigned to your project who will be responsible for coordinating the one window ministry review of your project. Should you have any further questions related to Ontario Regulation 231/08 and its requirements, please contact, the undersigned.
Yours Truly

Solange Desautels

Solange Desautels, Special Project Officer
Project Coordination Unit
Environmental Assessment Services Section
Environmental Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment
2 St. Clair Ave W
Toronto ON M4V 1L5
Ph: (416) 314-8360
Fax: (416) 314-8452
March 27, 2013

Mr. David Pickles  
Consultation Unit  
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs  
9th Floor-160 Bloor Street East  
Toronto ON M7A 2E6  
Phone: 416-326-4757  
Fax: 416-325-1066  
E-mail: david.pickles@ontario.ca

Re: Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Mr. Pickles:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25kms of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor from just west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The EA study area also includes potential locations for proposed traction power facilities as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed (see key map below).

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate new electrical connection facilities, which will be provided by Hydro One, including design of two new traction power substations and transmission line network connection(s). These particular project components are subject to Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One will carry out a Joint EA process in order to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as well as Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

In accordance with TPAP requirements, Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we are requesting assistance from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs to identify potentially
interested Aboriginal communities for this project. Please note that Hydro One has also contacted the Ministry of Energy in accordance with their Class EA process to request direction with respect to the Crown’s duty to consult.

For additional information on this project, please visit the project website: www.gotransit.com/electrification.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification project and we will continue to keep you informed as the EA progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Gibson, Ministry of Energy
General Contact, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
G. McNeil, GO Transit
M. Maracle, Hydro One
P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
May 14, 2013

Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU)
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
E-mail: CAU-UCA@aandc.gc.ca

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The EA study area also includes potential locations for proposed traction power facilities as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed (see key map below).

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations and transmission line network connection(s). These particular project components are subject to Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are proposing an Integrated EA process in order to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as well as Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

In accordance with TPAP requirements, Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we subsequently requested assistance from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) via our letter dated March 27, 2013 as part of identifying potentially interested Aboriginal communities for the project. Please note that Hydro One has also contacted the Ontario Ministry of Energy in accordance with their Class EA process to request direction with respect to the Crown’s duty to consult.
Based on e-mail correspondence received from the AANDC Ontario Region Environment Unit on May 7, 2013 (as attached), we would like to request any additional information from AANDC’s Consultation and Accommodation Unit regarding claims, litigation, treaties and Métis and Non-Status Indians interests, that may be relevant to the UP Express Electrification EA project, including:

- The location of Aboriginal communities, reserves or their traditional territory, as claimed; and/or
- The asserted or established rights that pertain to those communities or to a given geographic location.

For additional information on this project, please visit the project website: www.gotransit.com/electrification.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification project and we will continue to keep you informed as the EA progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
M. Chen, AANDC (Ontario Region Environmental Unit)
W. Cornet, Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs
A. Gibson, Ministry of Energy
M. Maracle, Hydro One
P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield

Attach.
Hello,

Thank you for your letter. The AANDC Ontario Region Environment Unit generally does not comment on Municipal projects.

For information with respect to claims, litigation, treaties and Métis and Non-Status Indians interests, you may contact our Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU), located at AANDC Headquarters. The CAU can provide information on:

1. The location of Aboriginal communities, reserves or their traditional territory, as claimed; and/or
2. The asserted or established rights that pertain to those communities or to a given geographic location.

For these inquiries you may contact them directly at CAU-UCA@aadnc.gc.ca.

Please continue to send future notifications to this email in regards to projects in Ontario.

Mei Ling

Mei Ling Chen
Environmental Assessment Coordination
T: 416-954-3224
F: 416-954-4328

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Avenue East
Toronto, Ontario M4T 1M2
April 19, 2013

Karen Pitre
Metrolinx
20 Bay St, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario
M5J 2W3

Re: Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Karen Pitre:

Thank you for informing the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) of your project. Please note that MAA treats all letters, emails, general notices, etc. about a project as a request for information about which Aboriginal communities may have rights or interests in the project area.

For future Environmental Assessment (EA) inquiry correspondence to MAA, please take note of the following:
1. please send all future EA correspondence to the following email address: MAA.EA.Review@ontario.ca; or
2. if you prefer to send a hard copy rather than email, please address your correspondence as follows:
   Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, Consultation Unit
   160 Bloor Street East, 4th floor
   Toronto, Ontario, Canada
   M7A 2E6.

As a member of the government review team, the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) identifies First Nation and Métis communities who may have the following interests in the area of your project:
   • reserves;
   • land claims or claims in litigation against Ontario;
   • existing or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights, such as harvesting rights; or
   • an interest in the area of the project.
MAA is not the approval or regulatory authority for your project, and receives very limited information about projects in the early stages of their development. In circumstances where a Crown-approved project may negatively impact a claimed Aboriginal or treaty right, the Crown may have a duty to consult the Aboriginal community advancing the claim. The Crown often delegates procedural aspects of its duty to consult to proponents. Please note that the information in this letter should not be relied on as advice about whether the Crown owes a duty to consult in respect of your project, or what consultation may be appropriate. Should you have any questions about your consultation obligations, please contact the appropriate ministry.

You should be aware that many First Nations and/or Métis communities either have or assert rights to hunt and fish in their traditional territories. For First Nations, these territories typically include lands and waters outside of their reserves.

In some instances, project work may impact Aboriginal archaeological resources. If any Aboriginal archaeological resources could be impacted by your project, you should contact your regulating or approving Ministry to inquire about whether any additional Aboriginal communities should be contacted. Aboriginal communities with an interest in archaeological resources may include communities who are not presently located in the vicinity of the proposed project.

With respect to your project, and based on the brief materials you have provided, we can advise that the project appears to be located in an area where First Nations may have existing or asserted rights or claims in Ontario’s land claims process or litigation, that could be impacted by your project. Contact information is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation</th>
<th>Chief Bryan LaForme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2789 Mississauga Rd., R.R. #6</td>
<td>(905) 768-1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGERSVILLE, Ontario</td>
<td>(Fax) 768-1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N0A 1H0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryanaforme@newcreditfirstnation.com">bryanaforme@newcreditfirstnation.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information upon which the above comments are based is subject to change. First Nation or Métis communities can make claims at any time, and other developments can occur that could result in additional communities being affected by or interested in your undertaking.

Through Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development (AANDC), the Government of Canada sometimes receives claims that Ontario does not receive, or with which Ontario does not become involved. AANDC’s Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU) established a “single window” to respond to requests for baseline information held by AANDC on established or potential Aboriginal Treaty and rights. To request information from the Ontario Subject Matter Expert send an email to: UCA-CAU@aadnc-aandc.gc.ca

Additional details about your project or changes to it that suggest impacts beyond what you have provided to date may necessitate further consideration of which Aboriginal communities may be affected by or interested in your undertaking. If you think that further consideration may be required, please bring your inquiry to whatever government body
oversees the regulatory process for your project. MAA does not wish to be kept informed of the progress of the project; please be sure to remove MAA from the mailing list.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Heather Levecque
Manager, Consultation Unit
Aboriginal Relations and Ministry Partnerships Division
June 6, 2013

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Karen Pitre@metrolinx.com

Dear Ms. Pitre,

Thank you for your e-mail of May 16, 2013 regarding your request for information held by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) on established or potential Aboriginal and treaty rights in the vicinity of the Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service project in Toronto, Ontario.

Consulting with Canadians on matters of interest or concern to them is an important part of good governance, sound policy development and decision-making. In addition to good governance objectives, there may be statutory or contractual reasons for consulting, as well as the common law duty to consult with First Nations, Métis and Inuit when conduct that might adversely impact rights Aboriginal or treaty rights (established or potential) is contemplated.

It is important to note that the information held by AANDC is provided as contextual information and may or may not pertain directly to Aboriginal or treaty rights. In most cases, the Aboriginal community remains best positioned to explain their traditional use of land, their practices or claims that may fall under section 35, including claims they may have put before the courts. AANDC has developed the Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Information System (ATRIS), which brings together information regarding Aboriginal groups such as their location, related treaty information, claims (specific, comprehensive and special) and litigation data.

The Consultation Information Service (CIS) response
The CIS has prepared the attached response which combines the resources of ATRIS and the support of sectors and regions within the AANDC. Using a 100 km radius surrounding the project location, information regarding potentially affected Aboriginal communities is presented in the attached report in the following sections for each community:

Important Contextual Information Related to Section 35 Rights includes information on historic and modern treaties.

Aboriginal Community Information includes key contact information and any other information such as Tribal Council affiliation.

Claims includes specific, comprehensive and special claims.

Self-Government Agreements and other negotiations may be part of comprehensive claims or stand-alone negotiations.

Legal Proceedings usually refers to litigation between the Aboriginal Group and the Crown, often pertaining to section 35 rights assertions or consultation matters.
Also included, where available, is a section entitled Other Considerations. This may include information on Métis rights or information on the assertions of other Aboriginal groups, consultation-related protocols or agreements and other relevant information.

Should you require further assistance regarding the information provided, or if you have any questions and/or comments about the enclosed response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Allison Berman
Regional Subject Expert for Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario
Consultation and Accommodation Unit
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
5H- 5th Floor, 10 Wellington
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H4
Tel: 819-934-1873

Disclaimer
This information is provided as a public service by the Government of Canada. All of the information is provided “as is” without warranty of any kind, whether express or implied, including, without limitation, implied warranties as to the accuracy or reliability of any of the information provided, its fitness for a particular purpose or use, or non-infringement, which implied warranties are hereby expressly disclaimed. References to any website are provided for information only shall not be taken as endorsement of any kind. The Government of Canada is not responsible for the content or reliability of any referenced website and does not endorse the content, products, services or views expressed within them.

Limitation of Liabilities
Under no circumstances will the Government of Canada be liable to any person or business entity for any reliance on the completeness or accuracy of this information or for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, consequential, or other damages based on any use of this information including, without limitation, any lost profits, business interruption, or loss of programs or information, even if the Government of Canada has been specifically advised of the possibility of such damages.
On the map below, a 50 km radius around the project is provided to reflect the proximity of other First Nation communities nearby. The red circle highlights the project area. First Nations indicated by blue circles are signatories to the Upper Canada Treaties or the Williams Treaties and may have interests in the area.

Darker red shapes on the map below indicate reserve lands surrounding the project site. For further information on localized hunting, fishing, trapping activities which may be occurring contact the Ministry of Natural Resources.
There are no reserve lands found within the 50 km buffer. Information for the following First Nations is provided in alphabetical order for the following highlighted communities near the project. If information on other highlighted First Nations who are more distant to the project is required, please contact the CIS.

Chippewas of Georgina Island
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
Chippewas of Nawash First Nation
Chippewas of Rama first Nation
Chippewas of the Thames First Nation
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation
Mississaugas of the Credit
Saugeen
Six Nations of the Grand River

Information on other Aboriginal groups and/or the Métis is provided in the section “Other Considerations”.

**Important Contextual Information Related to Section 35 Rights**

**Treaty Area**
In general, where historic treaties have been signed, the rights of signatory First Nation’s are defined by the terms of the Treaty. In many cases, however, there are divergent views between First Nations and the Crown as to what the treaty provisions imply or signify. For each First Nation below, the relevant treaty area is provided.

In areas where no historic treaty exists or where such treaties were limited in scope (i.e. where only certain rights were addressed by the treaty, such as the Peace and Friendship Treaties),
there may be comprehensive claims that are asserted or being negotiated. Comprehensive claim negotiations are the means by which modern treaties are achieved.

**Treaties of Southern Ontario- The Upper Canada Treaties**
There are several treaty making eras which impact the province of Ontario. These eras are known as the Upper Canada Land Surrenders from 1764 to 1862. These surrenders are seen as treaties which transfer all Aboriginal rights and title to the Crown in exchange for one-time payments or annuities. They tended to be made with individual First Nation groups for tracts of land.

1764-1782 – Early Land Surrenders
The Royal Proclamation of 1763 established the protection from encroachment of an Aboriginal territory outside of the colonial boundaries. Rules and protocols for the acquisition of Aboriginal lands by Crown officials were set out and became the basis for all future land treaties. In response to military and defensive needs around the Great Lakes, the Indian Department negotiated several land surrender treaties in the Niagara region.

1783-1815- Treaties for Settlement
As part of the plan to resettle some 30,000 United Empire Loyalists who refused to accept American rule, and fled to Montreal, the Indian Department undertook a series of land surrenders west of the Ottawa River with the Mississauga and the Chippewa of the southern Great Lakes. These tended to be uncomplicated arrangements whereby for a particular Aboriginal group was paid a specific sum paid in trade goods, to surrender a stated amount of land.

1815-1862- Treaties to Open the Interior
After the war of 1812, the colonial administration of Upper Canada focused on greater settlement of the colony. The Indian Department completed the last of the over 30 Upper Canada Land Surrenders around the Kawartha, Georgian Bay, and the Rideau and Ottawa Rivers. All of this land which today is known as Southern Ontario, was ceded to the Crown.
Southern Ontario Treaty Making after the Upper Canada Land Surrenders

While the protocols for surrenders established in 1763 by the Royal Proclamation, were largely followed by the Indian Department, complaints and petitions to the Crown were submitted by First Nation signatories regarding these surrenders as early as 1866. They claimed they had an unsurrendered interest in the so-called “northern hunting grounds”. In response, the province of Ontario and Canada enlisted a Commission in 1916 to investigate the veracity of these claims once and for all. If the claims were found to be valid, the Commission was to negotiate a treaty. The Commission’s investigation found a number of places where the certainty of the validity of the surrenders was questionable, and recommended that new treaties be made. They appointed A.S. Williams to negotiate with the Ojibway in 1923. The areas of uncertainty were brought into the boundaries of the Williams Treaties to achieve certainty.

Unlike the terms of the Robinson Treaties in Ontario (1850) and the more recent numbered treaties in the west, the Williams Treaties were cash for land deals. Aboriginal (Ojibway) signatories surrendered all of their rights and benefits to the Crown on lands in central Ontario and the northern shore of Lake Ontario. The Potawatomi and the Mississaugas of the New Credit were not involved in these negotiations.

Since the signing of these treaties, there have been questions as to whether the signatory First Nations had surrendered all of their rights to hunt and fish. In 1994, this debate was ended by the Supreme Court of Canada, when in R. v. Howard, the Court decided that the seven First Nations Georgina Island, Mnjikaning and Beausoleil, Curve Lake, Alderville, Scugog and Hiawatha by way of the Williams Treaties “basket clause”, had knowingly surrendered all of their hunting, fishing and trapping rights (whether they be Aboriginal rights or treaty rights) outside of their existing reserves.

Litigation to resolve the allegations that Canada negotiated the Williams Treaties in bad faith was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations. A trial in this matter is scheduled to resume on October 22, 2012.
The signatories of the Williams Treaties are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alderville First Nation</th>
<th>Curve Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beausoleil</td>
<td>Hiawatha First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewas of Georgina Island</td>
<td>Mississauga's of Scugog Island First Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewas of Rama First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE)**

This term is used to describe treaty rights to reserve lands in the Prairie Provinces, northern Ontario and northern British Columbia which flow from Treaties 1 to 11, negotiated and confirmed between various First Nations and the Crown in right of Canada. It is a “subset of specific claims.

Treaty Land Entitlement claims are intended to settle the land debt owed to those First Nations who did not receive all the land they were entitled to under historical treaties signed by the Crown and First Nations. Settlement agreements are negotiated among First Nations, the Government of Canada and provincial/territorial governments. According to the terms of the agreement, a specified amount of Crown lands is identified and/or a cash settlement is provided so that a First Nation may purchase federal, provincial/territorial, or private land to settle the land debt. Once selected or purchased, this land can be added to the First Nations’ reserve under the Additions to Reserve process.

All selections and acquisitions are proceeding through the TLE and Additions to Reserves processes and are at various stages ranging from initial acquisition/selection to the Federal Order that would set the lands apart as reserve. For more information on Treaty Land Entitlement, please consult the AANDC website. [www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/enr/lds/tle-eng.asp](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/enr/lds/tle-eng.asp)

**First Nation/Aboriginal Community Information**

The following information is organized by First Nation in alphabetical order.

**Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation**

Chief Donna Big Canoe *(tenure expires March, 2013)*

RR 2, PO Box 13

Sutton West, Ontario, L0E 1R0

Phone: (705) 437-1337  Fax: (705) 437-4597

[www.georginaisland.com](http://www.georginaisland.com)

**Treaty Area** - Williams Treaties of 1923

**Associate Organizations:**

Union of Ontario Indians

Ogemawahj Tribal Council

Chiefs of Ontario
Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties
Status: active litigation
Description: The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit and Moose Deer Point.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No.: T-195-92
Description: The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
Chief Thomas Bressette (tenure expires June 23, 2014)
6247 Indian Lane
Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, Ontario, N0N 1J1
Phone: (519) 786-2125    Fax: (519) 786-2108
www.kettlepoint.org/home.html

Treaty Area - Southern Ontario Treaties to open the Interior: 1815 to 1862

Associate Organizations:
Southern First Nations Secretariat (London District Chiefs Council)
Union of Ontario Indians
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
Name: Clench Defalcation
Status: active negotiations
Description: The Plaintiffs claim a misappropriation of sale proceeds.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Sarnia et al. v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Laurie Desautels, Polysar Hydrocarbons Limited
Status: active
Court File No.: 1796A/87
Description: In 1987, the Chippewas of Sarnia and Kettle Point (Chippewas) sued Ontario and Polysar for a declaration of Aboriginal rights recognized by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and
never ceded to the waterbeds of the St. Clair River and Lake Huron and damages for Polysar’s gas pipeline contained therein. The Plaintiffs allege that Ontario has breached its fiduciary duties and trust obligations to the band as a result of granting licenses to the various companies named as defendants. The plaintiffs seek damages and declaratory relief.

Name: Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point v. Attorney General of Canada et al.  
Status: active  
Court No: C22725  
Description: The Plaintiffs allege that the 1927 surrender and subsequent letters patent for a portion of the Kettle Point Reserve is invalid, and that the beach front was not surrendered.

Name: Rosalie Winnifred Manning et al v. HMTQ  
Status: active  
Court File No: T-3077-94  
Description: The plaintiffs, who claim to be members of the self-styled Stony Point First Nation, and the defendants, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point are recognized as one band by the department. The plaintiffs claim, among other things, that the Crown breached its fiduciary duty. They allege this occurred through the Crown’s failure to ensure the plaintiffs’ interests: with regards to the Stony Point Reserve; when represented in its negotiations with the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point Band; trespassing from 1942 to 1994; the environmental degradation of the land; and the plaintiffs loss of the use and enjoyment of the lands.

Name: Corporation of Township of Bosanquet v. Attorney General of Canada, Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point  
Status: active  
Court File No: 24085/96  
Description: The Town of Bosanquet has initiated a claim against Canada in which they are asking the court for a declaration that the beachfront at Camp Ipperwash is dedicated to public use and that any transfer of land to the First Nation would be restricted by the declaration. The land in question was originally surrendered by the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point in 1928 and subsequently sold to private individuals. In 1944, the land was transferred to the Department of National Defence and became part of Camp Ipperwash. In accordance with the 1981 Order in Council (PC 1981-499), Canada made the commitment to return Camp Ipperwash, including the portion obtained from private individuals in 1944, to the band when no longer needed for military purposes. Canada is negotiating the return of the land with the Kettle and Stony Point First Nation. In separate litigation involving Canada, the Town of Bosanquet and a number of private homeowners, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point are claiming a portion of the West Ipperwash Beach, which is adjacent to the Kettle Point Reserve.

Name: HMTQ v. David Cloud  
Status: active  
Court File No: to be determined  
Description: This case relates to a criminal proceeding in the Ontario Court Provincial Division. The Plaintiffs allege that they have a treaty right to hunt and that the Game and Fish Act of Ontario is of no force and effect with respect to them by virtue of section 52 of the Constitution Act and by reason of their Treaty rights within the meaning of section 35.

Name: Reta George, Maynard George, Roy George, Noreen Kewageshig, Janet Cloud, Lee George v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Department of National Defence,  
Status: active
Description: In 1942 approximately 2,111 acres of lands comprising the Stony Point Indian Reserve were expropriated by the Department of National Defence under the authority of the War Measures Act. Since the end of the war, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point have sought the return of this land to reserve status. In 1981, after extensive negotiations with the band council, the federal government entered into a settlement with the band and agreed to return the lands when no longer required for military purposes. In 1994, the government announced its intentions to return the lands to the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point. The plaintiffs claim to be members of the self-styled ‘Stoney Point First Nation’ which they claim is a separate First Nation from the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point and the rightful beneficiary of the Camp Ipperwash lands. The essence of their claim is that the ‘Stoney Point First Nation’ originally occupied the former Stony Point Reserve and therefore, the Crown should return the Camp to the members of the ‘Stoney Point First Nation’ rather than the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point. The Crown does not recognize the ‘Stoney Point First Nation as a separate Band.

Name: Chippewas of Kettle and Stoney Point First Nation v. HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: dormant
Court File No.: T-863-95
Description: In 1942, approximately 2,111 acres of lands comprising the Stony Point Indian Reserve were appropriated by the Department of National Defence under the authority of the War Measures Act. Since the end of the war the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point have sought the return of this land, now Camp Ipperwash, to reserve status.

Traditional Territory:
In March 2012 and March of 2013, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation reaffirmed their claim (see above Chippewas of Sarnia et al. v. HMTQ) to the lakebed surrounding their First Nation in letters to AANDC. They wish to be notified by government, proponents, groups or individuals who use, or who plan to use, the area they consider their traditional territory. This area is described as such:

“from the point of intersection of the surrendered lands with Lake Huron at its most northerly point, extending directly out onto Lake Huron to the International boundary, then running along the international boundary to the southerly limit of the herein described lands at the water’s edge of the St. Clair River, and the land underlying this portion of Lake Huron (lake bed)”

Additions to Reserve:
Since 2009, the Province has been engaged with the First Nation to transfer the Ipperwash Provincial Park lands as an addition to their reserve. These lands are being transferred through the federal Additions to Reserve process.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.
Chippewas of Nawash First Nation
Chief Scott Lee (tenure expires June, 2014)
RR5
Wiarton, Ontario, N0H 2T0
Phone: (519) 534-1689    Fax: (519) 534-2130
www.nawash.ca

Treaty area - Southern Ontario treaties to open the interior: 1815 -1862
The Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation occupy Neyaashiinigmiing Indian Reserve No. 27 on the eastern shore of the Saugeen Peninsula on Georgian Bay. This reserve is located within the boundaries of the Saugeen Peninsula Treaty No. 72 of 1854 of which the Saugeen Ojibway signed. The Chippewas of Nawash also fall under the governance of the Indian Act and receives funding from various federal departments for services. Thus, while the First Nation considers its territory unceded, the federal government does not admit that his term accurately characterizes the nature of those lands, and instead uses the term “title claim area”.

Associate Organizations:
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
No active claims to report.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, Saugeen First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-261134CM1
Description: The plaintiffs are claiming unextinguished Aboriginal title to the Saugeen Ojibway Nation Unceded Traditional Lands. These lands (and the land under water) include portions of Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, and the Bruce Peninsula, with the exception of lands on islands which are already subject to treaty, and any lands which are already owned by private parties in fee simple. The plaintiffs assert that Canada and Ontario have breached their fiduciary duties to protect the Aboriginal title to this land and have alienated portions of the land to third parties.

Name: The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation, Chippewas of Nawash First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Corporation of Township of Amabel, Corporation of Township of Albemarle, Corporation of Township of Eastnor
Status: active
Court File No.: 94-CQ-50872
Description: The Chippewas of Saugeen and the Chippewas of Nawash allege that the Crown breached its fiduciary duty because of the manner in which it concluded Treaty 72. The First Nations claim that they are legally entitled to be put in the position they would have been had the surrender never occurred.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation v. 
Status: active
Court File No.: PA-050251-1
Description: This matter involves an appeal of Order PO-2491, where the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC) directed that the Ministry of Natural Resources disclose a Fishing Agreement between the Province of Ontario, the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash v.
Status: settled through negotiations
Court File No.: not available
Description: This was a dispute over a native land claim within the city limits of Owen Sound, northwest of Toronto. A group of natives have occupied the properties of two homes which they claim are on native burial grounds. They argued that the burial ground had been set aside as a reserve in the Treaty No. 82 of 1857. The Chippewas of Nawash broke camp after a six-day occupation of the back yards of two home owners. The settlement involved the removal of the houses and the re-consecration of the burial site. Members of the First Nation are appealing to the public for the return of the artifacts taken from the burial ground. Their goal is to restore the site.

Fishing Rights:
Prior to the arrival of European settlers, the Saugeen Ojibway had occupied a vast area of what is now southwestern Ontario, and were involved in a very productive fishery trade. This was a community based, collective activity on either side of the Bruce Peninsula and other parts of the Lake Huron Eastern shore. Over the previous century, the Aboriginal right to fish commercially in the waters of the Bruce Peninsula were severely curtailed. This happened in spite of an 1847 Royal Declaration by Queen Victoria acknowledging the ownership of the Bruce Peninsula by the Saugeen Ojibway and their heirs, including the waters and fishing islands within a seven-mile limit of the shore all around the peninsula.

In the early 1990’s two members of the Saugeen Ojibway Nations Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon, were charged with fishing over their quota under the Fisheries Act. In June 1993, the court found that that the two Bands (Chippewa of Nawash and the Chippewa (Ojibway) of Saugeen have an Aboriginal and treaty right to fish for trade and commerce. It was further found that Ontario’s quota system had discriminated against the two Bands and violated their Constitutional rights.

Chippewas of Rama (Mnjikaning)
Chief Sharon Stinson Henry (tenure expires 2014)
5884 Rama Road, Suite 200
Rama, Ontario, L0K 1T0
Phone: (705) 325-3611 Fax: (705) 325-0879
www.mnjikaning.ca

Treaty Area - Williams Treaties of 1923

Associate Organizations:
Ogemawahj Tribal Council
Chiefs of Ontario
Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties  
Status: active litigation  
Description: The United Indian Council alleges that the Williams Treaty was invalid, and inadequate compensation has been received for land taken. There has also been a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississaugas of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit, and Moose Deer Point.

Legal Proceedings:  
Name: Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in Right of Canada  
Status: active  
Court File No.: T-195-92  
Description: The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.

Chippewas of the Thames First Nation  
Chief Joe Miskokomon (tenure expires June 27, 2013)  
320 Chippewas Road  
Muncey, Ontario, N0L 1Y0  
Phone: (519) 289-5555  
Fax: (519) 289-2230  
www.cottfn.ca/index.html

Treaty Area – Southern Ontario Treaties to open the Interior: 1815 to 1862

Associate Organizations:  
Southern First Nations Secretariat (London District Chiefs Council)  
Union of Ontario Indians  
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:  
Name: Big Bear Creek Reserve  
Status: active negotiations  
Description: It is alleged that the 5,120 acre Big Bear Cree Reserve was patented and sold by the Crown in the 1830s without a proper surrender by the First Nation. Furthermore, the compensation paid by the Crown for the loss of the reserve in 1849-50 was inadequate. The land in question was reserved for the First Nation under the Longwoods Treaties (1819-1822). A community vote on whether to accept Canada’s offer to settle is expected to take place over the fall of 2012. The government has offered to pay the costs of acquiring land in Southwestern Ontario of the size believed to be the equivalent of the lost reserve (21 sq. Km).

Name: Caradoc Reserve 1834 Surrender  
Status: under assessment  
Description: The First Nation alleges that Canada breached fiduciary duties and duty of honour and integrity in relation to the 1834 Surrender.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Ether Deleary, Virgil Wilson, Eldon French, George Henry, Mina Riley, Martha Albert, John Riley, Mark French, Merle Fisher, Chippewas of Thomas Band of Indians
Status: now pursued as a specific claim
Court File No.: T-541-83
Description: This action was instituted in February; 1983 but pursued as a specific claim. The plaintiffs; the Chippewas of the Thames allege that; as part of the surrender of their traditional lands in 1922; they were promised certain reserve lands. When the Caradoc reserve was set aside for this band; two parcels of land were not included which should have been; according to the band. The Town of Muncey is located on part of this disputed land. The plaintiffs ask for a declaration that these parcels are part of their reserve.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

Mississauga's of Scugog Island First Nation
Chief Tracy Gauthier (tenure expires June 27, 2013)
22521 Island Road
Port Perry, Ontario L9L 1B6
Phone (905) 985-3337 Fax (905) 985-8828
http://www.scugogfirstnation.com/

Treaty Area - Southern Ontario treaties to open the interior: 1815 to 1862

Associate Organizations:
Union of Ontario Indians
Ogemawahj Tribal Council
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties
Status: active litigation
Description: The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga's of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit, and Moose Deer Point.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No: T-195-92
Description: The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.
Name: Curve Lake First Nation et al, and Hiawatha First Nation et al, and Mississauga of Scugog Island First Nation v. HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: dormant
Court File No.: T-1358-99
Description: The Plaintiffs allege that the construction of Trent Severn Waterway resulted in the flooding of reserve lands held by the Crown for the use and benefit of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs further allege that the Crown breached a fiduciary duty to the Plaintiffs to hold the reserves for the use and benefit of the Plaintiffs. They maintain that the fiduciary duty was breached when the Crown failed to inform the Plaintiffs of the flooding, failed to consult with the Plaintiffs, and failed to compensate the Plaintiffs for their loss.

Land Management:
The Mississauga’s of Scugog Island First Nation is party to the First Nation Land Management Regime. This Agreement was signed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in 1996, and is an initiative allowing signatory First Nations the ability to take over management and control of their lands and resources outside of the Indian Act. For more information, visit: http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1327090675492/1327090738973

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

Mississaugas of the Credit
Chief Bryan Laforme (tenure expires December 15, 2013)
2789 Mississauga Road
RR 6
Hagersville, Ontario, N0A 1H0
Phone: (905) 768-1133    Fax: (905) 768-1225
www.newcreditfirstnation.com

Treaty Area – Southern Ontario treaties for Settlement: 1783 -1815

Associate Organizations:
Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties
Status: active litigation
Description: The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga’s of Scugog Island.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Mississaugas of the New Credit – Toronto Purchase v.
Status: inactive
Court File No.: not available
Description: This concerns an 1805 surrender of land presumably by the Mississaugas of the New Credit. Documentation concerns discussions for a letter accepting settlement of the issue.

Name: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, Maurice Bryan Laforme, Kerri Louise King, Attorney General of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-12-373
Description: In this matter, the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation seeks a declaration of fee simple interest to a parcel of land in Hagersville which lies adjacent to the Applicant’s Reserve. The Applicant also seeks a declaration that the reservation of mines and minerals as set out in the original Crown Patent issued February 18, 1884 is null and void. The Applicant asserts that this property was originally part of a larger tract of land to which the Applicant had aboriginal rights, and that this larger tract of land was sold by the Applicant to the Crown in the 18th century. The Applicant claims that in 1999, the Applicant entered into a Land Claim Settlement Agreement whereby Canada agreed that it would recommend an addition to the Applicant’s reserve. The Applicant claims that following their application to the Crown to have the property added to its reserve, the Crown had concerns which prevented the completion of the Addition to Reserve process. The Crown’s concerns were regarding the capacity of a First Nation to hold title to lands in fee simple, and also about a reservation clause found in the original Crown Patent whereby the rights to all mines and minerals were reserved to the Government of Ontario.

Saugeen
Chief Randall Kahgee
RR1
Southampton, Ontario, N0H 2L0
Phone: 1-519-797-2781 Fax: 1-519-797-2978
www.saugeenfirstnation.ca

Treaty area -Treaties to Open the Interior: 1815-1862

Associate Organizations:
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
No active claims to report.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation v. Corporation of Township of Amabel, Barbara Twining, Larry Twining, David Dobson, Alberta Lemon, HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-253768-CM3
Description: This case concerns a dispute over the ownership of Sauble Beach. The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation take the position that Saugeen Indian Reserve No. 29 has always extended up the coast of Lake Huron to the front of Lot 31. However, the people of Amabel Township have used the beach property in front of Lots 25-31, Concession D, as their own land.
Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, Saugeen First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-261134CM1
Description: The plaintiffs are claiming unextinguished Aboriginal title to the Saugeen Ojibway Nation Unceded Traditional Lands. These lands (and the land under water) include portions of Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, and the Bruce Peninsula, with the exception of lands on islands which are already subject to treaty, and any lands which are already owned by private parties in fee simple. The plaintiffs assert that Canada and Ontario have breached their fiduciary duties to protect the aboriginal title to this land and have alienated portions of the land to third parties.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation v. Ontario (Information and Privacy Commissioner)
Status: active
Court File No.: PA-050251-1
Description: This matter involves an appeal of Order PO-2491, where the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC) directed that the Ministry of Natural Resources disclose a Fishing Agreement between the Province of Ontario, the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation.

Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-253768-CM3
Description: This case concerns a dispute over the ownership of Sauble Beach. The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation claim that Saugeen Indian Reserve No. 29 has always extended up the coast of Lake Huron to the front of Lot 31. However, the people of Amabel Township have used the beach property in front of Lots 25-31, Concession D, as their own land and as a public beach for many years. Canada’s position, in its defence to Ontario’s cross-claim, is that Ontario alone is responsible: a) for any claim the private landowners might have should the court find that Sauble Beach is in fact reserve land, and b) for any liability for the pre-Confederation actions of the Crown in Right of the Province of Canada.

Name: Franklin Shawbedeese et al and all other members of the Saugeen Band of Indians, Chippewas of Saugeen v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Canada
Status: dormant
Court File No.: T-2189-91
Description: The plaintiffs state that upon the surrender in 1854 of most of the Bruce Peninsula, they were to receive interest distributions from investments on the proceeds from the sale of the lands. The plaintiffs claim that certain individuals have erected structures and trespassed on a piece of land for which they have not received accurate compensation.

Fishing Rights:
Prior to the arrival of European settlers, the Saugeen Ojibway had occupied a vast area of what is now southwestern Ontario, and were involved in a very productive fishery trade. This was a community based, collective activity on either side of the Bruce Peninsula and other parts of the Lake Huron Eastern shore. Over the previous century commercial fishing by Aboriginal groups in the waters of the Bruce Peninsula were severely curtailed. This happened in spite of an 1847 Royal Declaration by Queen Victoria which described the territory of the Saugeen Ojibway and
their heirs on the Bruce Peninsula. The description included the waters and fishing islands within a seven-mile limit of the shore all around the peninsula.

_H.M.Q. v. Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon (1993)_
Two members of the Saugeen Ojibway Nations Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon, were charged with fishing over their quota under the Fisheries Act. In June 1993, the Ontario Court of Justice found that that the two Bands (Chippewa of Nawash and the Chippewa (Ojibway) of Saugeen) have an Aboriginal and treaty right to fish for trade and commerce in the waters of Lake Huron which is protected under Section 35 of the Constitution Act. It was further found that Ontario’s quota system had discriminated against the two Bands and violated their Constitutional rights.

**Agreements and Negotiations:**
Substantive Commercial Fishing Agreement between the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and Saugeen First Nation and HMTQ in Right of Ontario as Represented by the Ministry of Natural Resources- updated March 2013

This agreement covers areas recognized by Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) as traditional waters: Waters surrounding the Bruce Peninsula from Point Clark in Lake Huron to the international border and around the Bruce Peninsula into Georgian Bay to Craigleith.

---

**Six Nations of the Grand River**
Chief William (Bill) Kenneth Montour *(tenure expires December 6, 2013)*
1695 Chiefwood Road
PO Box 5000
Ohsweken, Ontario, N0A 1M0
Phone: (519) 445-2201 Fax: (519) 445-4208
[www.sixnations.ca](http://www.sixnations.ca)

**Recognized Leadership and Consultation:**
The Federal Government recognizes the elected Chief and Council (who are elected under the Indian Act) as the official Canadian leadership of Six Nations. For consultation purposes, the Federal Government recommends that the elected Chief and Council of Six Nations be engaged.

**Associate Organizations:**
Chiefs of Ontario

**Land Grant:**
_Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 and Simcoe Patent of 1793_
The Six Nations were native to an area that lies within present-day New York State and were allied with the British Crown during the American War of Independence. As compensation for lands lost as a result of the war, the Six Nations and their descendants were granted lands six miles deep on each side of the Grand River, from its mouth to its source. The granted lands were within a portion of territory that the Mississauga surrendered to the Crown in the Between The Lakes Treaty of 1784/1792 (the 1784 agreement contained a boundary description that was geographically impossible and this error was addressed and corrected in 1792).
The Simcoe Patent of 1793 confirmed the lands granted to the Six Nations by the Haldimand Proclamation; however, it included only lands within the corrected 1792 surrender and thus did not extend to the source so the Grand River. It specifies that the Six Nations can surrender and dispose of their land only to the Crown. Any other leases, sales or grants to people other than Six Nations shall be unlawful and such intruders evicted. A link to a map and additional information can be found at: http://www.aboriginalaffairs.gov.on.ca/english/negotiate/sixnations/sixnations.asp

Specific Claims:
Between 1980 and 1995, Six Nations submitted 28 specific claims to Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada under its Specific Claims Policy. These claims focus on the government’s management of their lands and other assets from 1784 to the present. In March 1995, Six Nations filed a lawsuit against the Government of Canada and the Province of Ontario, which also related to how Six Nations’ lands and monies were managed by the Crown (refer to Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Court file no. 406/95 in the litigation section below for additional information). As there was significant overlap between the 28 specific claims and the claims put forward in the litigation, work on the specific claims was suspended.

Other Claims:
In 1994, Six Nations submitted a claim to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada regarding their “right to hunt and fish,” which was premised in part on the Nanfan Treaty of 1701. This Treaty (also known as the Treaty of Albany) was related to the protection of hunting and fishing rights in and around Lakes Erie, Huron and Ontario, as well as a portion of the United States. The Treaty was between representatives of the Five Nations (now the Six Nations) and John Nanfan, the acting colonial governor of New York. Six Nations were referred to the Province of Ontario for remedy, as the province has the primary responsibility for harvesting.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario - Superior Court of Justice
Status: active
Court File No.: 406/95
Description: The Plaintiffs claim an accounting of all Six Nations’ assets including money and real property held in trust by the Crown for the benefit of the Six Nations since 1784. The Plaintiff seeks a declaration by the Court that the Defendants are in breach of their fiduciary duties towards the Plaintiff, and are liable for replacing all assets or the value of all assets found to be missing, with compound interest. The allegation of repeated breaches of fiduciary duty is supported by examples of breaches, between 1784 and 1970, that can be separated into 14 discrete claims.

Name: Thahoketoteh of Kanekota v. HMTQ
Status: active
Court File No.: T-1396-12
Description: In this claim, the Plaintiff seeks, among other things, the removal of alleged non-native squatters from Lot 1 Concession 11, Clearview Township, Simcoe County. He alleges that the Crown has not respected the Royal Proclamation of 1784 and he also seeks compensation from other parties, such as the Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc. and Enbridge Gas, for their alleged illegal involvement in the area.
Name: Thahoketoteh of Kanekota v. HMTQ
Status: active (November 2012)
Court File No.: T-2007-12
Description: In this action, the Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant Canada has allowed federal and provincial law to apply to a tract of land described in the Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 in violation of an alleged British Order in Council dating from 1704, the Royal Proclamation of 1763, ss. 90, 91(24) and 109 of the Constitution Act, 1867 and an alleged Canadian Order in Council relating to disallowance, dating from 1875. The Plaintiff particularly alleges that Canada has violated its duty in allowing the Indian Act, the Supreme Court Act and the Ontario Public Lands Act to apply to the Haldimand Tract. The Plaintiff seeks as relief a declaration that Canada has the duty not to allow the application of federal or provincial law to the Haldimand Tract except by a treaty in compliance with the Royal Proclamation of 1763 with any dispute resolved by a Standing Royal Committee constituted under the alleged Order In Council of 1704. The Plaintiff seeks to have the declaration described above determined under Rule 220(1)(a) of the Federal Courts Rules, and in writing under Rule 369.

Name: Six Nations Elected Council on its own behalf and on behalf of the Six Nations of the Grand River v. The Corporation of the City of Brantford
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-08-361454
Description: The Plaintiffs seek various declarations pertaining to Ontario and/or the City of Brantford’s constitutional duty to consult with and accommodate the Six Nations of the Grand River before considering or undertaking any planning activities and disposition of lands which could potentially affect the interests of the Six Nations of the Grand River.

Name: Aaron Detlor; the Haudenosaunee Development Institute v. the Corporation of the City of Brantford – Superior Court of Justice
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-08-356782

Name: King Chief ah’she hodeeheehonto v. HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No.: 10-20244 JR
Description: This is a Notice of Constitutional Question which seems to involve an argument involving Six Nations that among other things relies on the Two Row Wampum Treaty and other Aboriginal and treaty rights, as protection from the jurisdictional obligation to follow Canada’s laws and other obligatory requirements.

Name: Regina v. Michael Clarence Monture
Status: active
Court File No.: not available
Description: The defendant is a member of the Mohawk Nation from the Six Nations of the Grand River, and is seeking relief under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. The defendant alleges that the sub-standard health facilities are infringing on and limiting his Aboriginal rights, as well as preventing him from delivering contemporary health care.

Out-of-Court settlement discussions:
Since 1999, the Government of Canada, the Province of Ontario and Six Nations have made several attempts to resolve the historical grievances raised in Six Nations’ 1995 lawsuit (refer to Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Court file no. 406/95 in the litigation section above for additional information) through out-of-court settlement negotiations. Information on these discussions, including the negotiation process that commenced after the occupation of the Douglas Creek Estates site in Caledonia, Ontario, can be found on the AANDC website at: http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100016334/1100100016335.

Unilateral Protocol:
The Six Nations of the Grand River published a unilateral consultation and accommodation policy in 2009. You may wish to review this protocol to better understand the First Nation’s perspective regarding consultation and accommodation. However, the federal government is not a party to this protocol and does not endorse the content. The link to the protocol is: http://www.sixnations.ca/admConsultationAccommodationPolicy.pdf

Other Considerations

Aboriginal Rights Assertions: the Métis
The inclusion of the Métis in s.35 represents Canada’s commitment to recognize and value their distinctive cultures, which can only survive if they are protected along with other Aboriginal communities. In 2003, the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed Métis rights under s.35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, in the Sault St. Marie area, in the Powley decision. For more information on the Powley decision visit the following link: www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014419

The Office of the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians (OFI) is aware that the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), its regional and community councils, have asserted a Métis right to harvest in a large section of the province.

The provincial government has accommodated Métis rights on a regional basis within Métis harvesting territories identified by the MNO. These accommodations are based on credible Métis rights assertions. An interim agreement (2004) between the MNO and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) recognizes the MNO’s Harvest Card system. This means that Harvester’s Certificate holders engage in traditional Métis harvest activities within identified Métis traditional territories across the province. For a map of Métis traditional harvesting territories visit the MNO website at: http://www.metisnation.org/harvesting/harvesting-map.aspx

The MNO maintains that Aboriginal ‘rights-holders’ are Métis communities which are collectively represented through the MNO and its community councils. In partnership with community councils, MNO has established a consultation process. The MNO has published regional consultation protocols on their website which offer pre-consultation stage instructions on engaging the Métis through their community councils (via the consultation committee made up of an MNO regional councilor, a community councilor representative and a Captain of the Hunt). Please note however, that this organization does not represent all Métis in Ontario.

Métis Nation of Ontario
Métis Consultation Unit is located within the MNO head office.
500 Old St. Patrick Street, Unit 3
Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 9G4
For an indication of the population in Ontario who self-identify as Métis, visit the Statistics Canada website. The Ontario map indicates populations as small as 250 up to over 2,000 within its borders.


Legal Proceedings concerning the Métis in Ontario

Name: HMTQ in Right of Canada v. Michel Blais
Status: active
Court File No.: 08-213
Description: The Applicant is charged with unlawfully harvesting forest resources in a Crown forest without a license contrary to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, 1994. The Applicant, a Métis, asserts that he is an Aboriginal person within the meaning of s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 and that the alleged harvesting occurred in lands set apart for the Batchewana Band pursuant to the Robinson Treaty of 1850. He claims that the Batchewana First Nation may permit Métis persons to exercise the same Aboriginal and treaty rights as its members pursuant to this treaty.

Name: HMTQ in Right of Canada, Laurie Desautels v. Henry Wetelainen Jr.
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-08-151
Description: The defendant, Henry Wetelainen Jr., intends to question the constitutional validity of sections 28, 31 and 40 of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (1994), S.O. 1994, c. 25 and Ontario Regulation 167/95, as amended, in relation to an act or omission of the government of Ontario. The defendant claims that he was exercising Aboriginal and treaty rights afforded by the Adhesion to Treaty 3, by harvesting wood within his traditional territory. He claims that he is a Métis/Non-Status Indian and that the imposition of payment for harvesting or use of the forest resource is an infringement and violates his constitutional rights.

Name: Ministry of Natural Resources v. Kenneth Sr. Paquette
Status: active
Court File No.: to be determined
Description: This Notice of Constitutional Question relates to a provincial prosecution involving a charge pertaining to hunting moose. The Defendant intends to assert his s. 35 right as a Métis person to hunt moose, and he also intends to seek a Charter remedy under s. 15 of the Charter.

Court Decisions concerning the Métis in Ontario

Three Métis defendants were charged with fishing violations and claimed that the decision of the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to prosecute them violated the terms of the Interim Agreement (2004) between the MNR and the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO). As the defendants
were indeed Harvester Card holders authorized to fish in the Mattawa/Nipissing territory, therefore, they were entitled to the exemption in the agreement.

The Court concluded that laying of charges against any valid Harvester Card holder who is harvesting in the territory designated on the card within 2 years of the 2004 agreement was a breach. The Interim Agreement itself was silent as to any geographic limitations. There was no mention of the Agreement only applying north and east of Sudbury. Further, the reliance on Harvester Cards, which explicitly contained the territorial designation of the cardholder, signified that the MNR accepted such designations for the purpose of the agreement. The Court was clear to note that this case did not make any ruling regarding the merits of any claim that the Mattawa/Nipissing area contains section 35 rights bearing Métis communities.

Harry Daniels (2013)
The Plaintiffs sought judicial declarations that: Métis and non-Status Indians are “Indians” under section 91(24); that the Crown owes a fiduciary duty to Métis and non-Status Indians as Aboriginal peoples; and, Métis and non-Status Indians have the right to be consulted and negotiated with in good faith by the government of Canada, on a collective basis through representatives of their choice. On January 8, 2013, the Federal Court ruled in favour of Harry Daniels et al and declared Métis and non-status Indians as “Indians” under section 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867. Canada appealed this decision on February 6, 2013.

First Nation Associate Organizations
First Nations may or may not delegate certain authority and/or powers to tribal councils to administer programs, funding and/or services on their behalf. The best source of information with respect to consultation is though individual First Nations themselves.

Specific claims
Specific claims refer to claims made by a First Nation against the federal government related to outstanding lawful obligations, such as the administration of land and other First Nation assets, and to the fulfillment of Indian treaties, although the treaties themselves are not open to renegotiation. This response provides summaries of active and relevant claims that are current to the date of the response. Claims that have been settled or closed may also be included to give a sense of the First Nation’s claims history with the Crown.

As the claims progress regularly, it is recommended that the status of each claim be reviewed through the Reporting Centre on Specific Claims. A listing of concluded claims is also available through the Reporting Centre at: 
http://pse5-esd5.ainc-inac.gc.ca/SCBRI_E/Main/ReportingCentre/External/externalreporting.aspx

Self Government Agreement Negotiations
Self-government agreements set out arrangements for Aboriginal groups to govern their internal affairs and assume greater responsibility and control over the decision making that affects their communities. Many comprehensive claims settlements also include various self-government arrangements. Self-government agreements address: the structure and accountability of Aboriginal governments, their law-making powers, financial arrangements and their responsibilities for providing programs and services to their members. Self-government enables Aboriginal governments to work in partnership with other governments and the private sector to promote economic development and improve social conditions.
Anishinabek Nation (Union of Ontario Indians) negotiations on Governance and Education

In 1995, the Anishinabek Nation’s Grand Council authorized its secretariat arm, the Union of Ontario Indians (UOI), to begin self-government negotiations with Canada. Negotiations towards agreements in the areas of education and governance began in 1998.

An agreement-in-principle (AIP) on education was signed in November 2002. In February 2007, the parties signed the AIP with respect to governance. Final agreement negotiations are proceeding in parallel, and together these agreements would mark important steps towards the Anishinabek Nation’s long-term objective of supporting participating First Nations to move out from under the Indian Act.

The governance agreement will provide the establishment of the Anishinabek Nation government and the recognition of participating First Nation lawmaking authority in four core governance areas: leadership selection, citizenship, culture and language, and management and operations of government.

The education AIP authorized the parties to negotiate a final agreement with respect to lawmaking authority for primary, elementary and secondary education for on-reserve members, and to administer AANDC’s post-secondary education assistance program. Negotiations towards a final agreement with respect to education are nearing conclusion. The Province of Ontario is not a party to these negotiations but is engaged in tripartite discussions on particular issues that would assist in the implementation of the final agreement.

To prepare for self-government in member communities, the Union of Ontario Indians has undertaken a range of activities including a Community Engagement Strategy, the development of an appeal and redress process, a constitutional development process and a number of capacity development activities.

Provincial guidelines

Under its responsibility to promote stronger Aboriginal relationships, the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs has produced Draft Guidelines on Consultation with Aboriginal Peoples Related to Aboriginal Rights and Treaty Rights. These guidelines are for use by ministries who seek input from key First Nations and Métis organizations, all Ontario First Nations and selected non-Aboriginal stakeholders. To review the guidelines, visit:
Good afternoon.

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).
As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd., Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on this project, please visit: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an e-mail the project team at: [electrification@metrolinx.com](mailto:electrification@metrolinx.com)
Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com
July 22, 2013

Chief Donna Big Canoe
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
R.R. #2
P.O. Box 13
Sutton West, ON
L0E 1R0

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Big Canoe:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process, including future Public Open Houses and opportunities to provide comments/feedback. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Thomas Bressette  
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation  
6247 Indian Lane  
Lambton Shores, ON  
N0N 1J1

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Bressette:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Scott Lee  
Chippewas of Nawash First Nation  
R.R. #5  
Wiarton, ON  
N0H 2T0

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Lee:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2W3
Phone:  (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Sharon Stinson Henry  
Chippewas of Rama First Nation  
5884 Rama Road  
Suite 200  
Rama, ON  
L3V 6H6

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Henry:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Joe Miskokomon
Chippewas of the Thames First Nation
320 Chippewas Road
R.R. #1
Muncey, ON
N0L 1Y0

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Miskokomon:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Kelly LaRocca  
Mississauga's of Scugog Island First Nation  
22521 Island Road  
Port Perry, ON  
L9L 1B6

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief LaRocca:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx  
20 Bay St., Suite 600  
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2W3  
Phone: (416) 874-5910  
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:  
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief Randall Kahgee  
Saugeen First Nation  
6493 Highway 21  
R.R. #1  
Southampton, ON  
N0H 2L0  

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Kahgee:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2W3
Phone:  (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 22, 2013

Chief William Kenneth Montour  
Six Nations of the Grand River  
1695 Chiefwood Road  
P.O. Box 5000  
Ohsweken, ON  
N0A 1M0  

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Chief Montour:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
July 30, 2013

President Robert Bird
Toronto & York Region Métis Council
22 Pheasant Valley Court
Thornhill, ON
L3T 2H1

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear President Bird:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate a new transformer station (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx held a series of Public Open Houses in June 2013 to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

We have enclosed a printed copy of the June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels for your information. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification.
Consultation with Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. We will continue to keep you informed throughout the EA process. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the project, please don’t hesitate to contact me via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
August 22, 2013

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3

Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Karen,

We are in receipt of correspondence of the aforementioned project.

In our screening of your correspondence we have identified no concerns with your project or the information that you have presented to us as this time.

We ask that if there are any changes to your project that are of a substantive nature that you keep us informed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Fallon Burch
Chippewa of the Thames
Consultation Coordinator
July 30, 2013

Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3

Attention: Karen Pitre, Executive Director Electrification

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Pitre:

As a member of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nation acknowledges receipt of your letter of July 22, 2013, which was received on July 23, 2013.

A copy of your letter has been forwarded to Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Please direct all future correspondence and inquiries, with a copy to Rama First Nation, to Ms. Sandy-McKenzie at 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2J7 or her email address at k.a.sandy-mckenzie@rogers.com. Her telephone number is (705) 792-5087.

We appreciate your taking the time to share this important information with us.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chief Sharon Stinson Henry

cc: Council, Rama First Nation
    Jeff Hewitt, General Counsel
    Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations
    Chief Roland Monague, Portfolio Chief for Williams Treaties First Nations
November 25, 2013

Chief Donna Big Canoe
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
R.R. #2, P.O. Box 13
Sutton West, Ontario
LOE 1R0

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Big Canoe:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3  
Tel: 416-874-5910  
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com  
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite  
Environmental Planner  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
483 Bay Street TCT6  
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5  
Tel: 416-345-6799  
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com  
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Thomas Bressette
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation
6247 Indian Lane
Lambton Shore, Ontario
N0N 1J1

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Bressette:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

Traction Power Supply System

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Brian LaForme
Mississaugas of the New Credit
2789 Mississauga Road, R.R. #6
Hagersville, Ontario
N0A 1H0

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief LaForme:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

Traction Power Supply System

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Scott Lee
Chippewas of Nawash First Nation
R.R. #5
Wiarton, Ontario
N0H 2T0

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Lee:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as
well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the *Transit Project Assessment Process*, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial *Environmental Assessment Act* approval in accordance with the *Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities*.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Sharon Stinson Henry
Chippewas of Rama First Nation
5884 Rama Road, Suite 200
Rama, Ontario
L3V 6H6

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Stinson Henry:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Randall Kahgee
Saugeen First Nation
6493 Highway 21, R.R. #1
Southampton, Ontario
N0H 2L0

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Kahgee:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the *Transit Project Assessment Process*, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial *Environmental Assessment Act* approval in accordance with the *Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities*.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3  
Tel: 416-874-5910  
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com  
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite  
Environmental Planner  
Hydro One Networks Inc.  
483 Bay Street TCT6  
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5  
Tel: 416-345-6799  
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com  
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief Kelly LaRocca
Mississauga’s of Scugog Island First Nation
22521 Island Road
Port Perry, Ontario
L9L 1B6

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief LaRocca:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

Traction Power Supply System

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
November 25, 2013

Chief William Kenneth Montour  
Six Nations of the Grand River  
1695 Chief'swood Road, P.O. Box 5000  
Ohsweken, Ontario  
N0A 1M0  

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Montour:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution...
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the *Transit Project Assessment Process*, in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial *Environmental Assessment Act* approval in accordance with the *Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities*.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Chief Miskokomon:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

**Traction Power Supply System**

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

**CONSULTATION**

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Project Location Map
November 25, 2013

Mr. Robert Bird
President
Toronto and York Region Métis Council
22 Pheasant Valley Court
Thornhill, Ontario  L3T 2H1

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment - Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

Dear Mr. Bird:

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 kilometres of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into the new Terminal 1 Station at Toronto Pearson International Airport (see attached map). The purpose of the project is to convert the UP Express route from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express is part of The Big Move, Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan which will dramatically improve how people move in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton areas. Funding for the electrification is dependent on the Metrolinx Investment Strategy.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) PROCESS

Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The parallel EA process involves both EAs being completed simultaneously and will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report that will be made available for public review and comment.

THE PROJECT

Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One).

Traction Power Distribution System

The proposed Traction Power Distribution System is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) comprised of a wiring system providing power to the trains. The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution
System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The environmental impact of the Traction Power Distribution System components and the electrified maintenance facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 – Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings.

Traction Power Supply System

Electrification of the UP Express requires a connection to Ontario’s electrical system. It is proposed that the power be supplied from the existing 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line that runs between Hydro One’s Claireville Transformer Station (located near Highway 407 and Highway 27 in the City of Vaughan) and Richview Transformer Station (located near Highway 401 and Highway 27 in the City of Toronto). Two new cables will deliver power to a new 230 kV Traction Power Substation (TPS). The TPS will convert the voltage from 230 kV to 25 kV so that it can be used to power the electric trains.

The Traction Power Supply System is subject to provincial Environmental Assessment Act approval in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities.

CONSULTATION

Consultation opportunities are planned as part of the EA process and will be advertised on the project websites (www.gotransit.com/electrification and www.HydroOne.com/projects), in local newspapers, and via direct mail/e-mail. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to provide interested parties the opportunity to learn more about the project and discuss any issues or concerns with the Project Team.

In the interim, we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of the nature of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss with you the areas of interest and/or concern regarding this project.

If you would like to set up a meeting or discuss this project further, please contact us:

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON MSJ 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
December 12, 2013

Re: Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment—Union Pearson Express Electrification Project

To whom it may Concern;

This letter is to thank you and to acknowledge the information sent. We wish to be kept informed regarding the project and would like to remain on the study contact list. If any other First Nation has any concerns we stand behind them fully.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sheri Taylor
Community Consultation Worker
Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation
sherri.taylor@georginaisland.com
Dear Ms. Pitre:

As a member of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama First Nation acknowledges receipt of your email of November 25, 2013 with regard to the above noted topic.

A copy of your email has been forwarded to Karry Sandy-McKenzie, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Please direct all future correspondence and inquiries, with a copy to Rama First Nation, to Ms. Sandy-McKenzie at 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2J7 or her email address at k.a.sandy-mckenzie@rogers.com. Her telephone number is (705) 792-5087.

We appreciate your taking the time to share this important information with us.

Sincerely,

Chief Sharon Stinson Henry

Nicole Gray
Executive Assistant to the Chief, Administration
Chippewas of Rama First Nation
(ph) 705-325-3611,1216
(cell) 705-325-0879
(fax) 705-325-0879
(url) www.ramafirstnation.ca

This email is intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. No waiver of privilege, confidence or otherwise is intended by virtue of communication via the internet. Any unauthorized or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, or are not named as a recipient, please immediately notify the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

By submitting your or another individual's personal information to Chippewas of Rama First Nation, its service providers and agents, you agree and confirm your authority from such other individual, to our collection, use and disclosure of such personal information in accordance with our privacy policy.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2013 4:11 PM
To: Chief Sharon Stinson Henry
Cc: Nicole Gray; Amber Saltarelli; 'patricia.staite@HydroOne.com'
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification Project: Notice of Commencement

Dear Chief Stinson Henry,
Please find attached the Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment for the Union Pearson Express Electrification Project.

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx's requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One's requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA).

Consultation with the First Nations and Métis communities is important to us and we welcome your comments and feedback on the project. We request that you please advise Metrolinx and/or Hydro One in writing of any interest you may have in the UP Express Electrification project. In addition, we would be pleased to arrange a meeting to gather your input/feedback and discuss this project with you.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Appendix J8

Elected Officials Correspondence and Contact List
## Elected Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bal Gosal</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Bramalea—Gore—Malton</td>
<td>8500 Torbram Road, Unit 44</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>L6T 5C6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bal.Gosal@parl.gc.ca">Bal.Gosal@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jagmeet Singh</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MPP, Bramalea—Gore—Malton</td>
<td>8177 Torbram Road</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>L6T 5C5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsingh-qp@ndp.on.ca">jsingh-qp@ndp.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kirsty Duncan</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Etobicoke North</td>
<td>815 Albion Road</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M9V 1A3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kirsty.duncan@parl.gc.ca">kirsty.duncan@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shafiq Quadri</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MPP, Etobicoke North</td>
<td>823 Albion Road</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M9V 1A3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sqadri.mpp@liberal.ola.org">sqadri.mpp@liberal.ola.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Sullivan</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, York South—Weston</td>
<td>36 South Station Street</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M9N 2B3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.Sullivan@parl.gc.ca">Mike.Sullivan@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura Albanese</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MPP, York South—Weston</td>
<td>99A Ingram Drive</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M6M 2L7</td>
<td>la <a href="mailto:Albanese.mpp@liberal.ola.org">Albanese.mpp@liberal.ola.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andrew Cash</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Davenport</td>
<td>1162 College Street</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M6H 1B6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Andrew.Cash@parl.gc.ca">Andrew.Cash@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jonah Schein</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MP, Davenport</td>
<td>1359 Davenport Road</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M8H 2H5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcschein-qp@ndp.on.ca">jcschein-qp@ndp.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Peggy Nash</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Parkdale—High Park</td>
<td>1596 Bloor St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M6P 1A7</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Peggy.Nash@parl.gc.ca">Peggy.Nash@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cheri DiNovo</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MPP, Parkdale—High Park</td>
<td>2849 Dundas Street West</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M6P 1Y6</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dinovoc-qp@ndp.on.ca">dinovoc-qp@ndp.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Olivia Chow</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Trinity—Spadina</td>
<td>144 Augusta Avenue</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5T 2L5</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olivia.chow@parl.gc.ca">olivia.chow@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rosario Marchese</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MP, Trinity—Spadina</td>
<td>808 Dundas Street West</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M6J 1V3</td>
<td>rmarchese-co-ndp.on.ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bernard Trottier</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>MP, Etobicoke—Lakeshore</td>
<td>700 Kipling Avenue</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M8Z 5G3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bernard.Trottier@parl.gc.ca">Bernard.Trottier@parl.gc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Douglas Holyday</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>MP, Etobicoke—Lakeshore</td>
<td>701 Evans Avenue</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M7A 1L2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.holyday@pc.ola.org">doug.holyday@pc.ola.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bonnie Crombie</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 5</td>
<td>Mississauga City Hall</td>
<td>300 City Centre Drive</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>L5B 3C1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnie.crombie@mississauga.ca">bonnie.crombie@mississauga.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Doug Ford</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 6</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td>councillor_d福特@toronto.ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Frances Nunziata</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 11</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_nunziata@toronto.ca">councillor_nunziata@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank Di Giorgio</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 12</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_digiorgio@toronto.ca">councillor_digiorgio@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gord Perks</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 14</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_perks@toronto.ca">councillor_perks@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Cesar Palacio</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 17</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_palacio@toronto.ca">councillor_palacio@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ana Bailo</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 18</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_bailo@toronto.ca">councillor_bailo@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Layton</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 19</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_layton@toronto.ca">councillor_layton@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Adam Vaughan</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 20</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_vaughan@toronto.ca">councillor_vaughan@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sarah Doucette</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 13</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_doucette@toronto.ca">councillor_doucette@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Milczyn</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 5</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_milczyn@toronto.ca">councillor_milczyn@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Grimes</td>
<td>Councillor, Ward 6</td>
<td>Toronto City Hall</td>
<td>100 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>M5H 2N2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:councillor_grimes@toronto.ca">councillor_grimes@toronto.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good morning.

We are writing to provide you with a brief update on the Union Pearson Express (UP Express) Electrification project as well as to inform you of the upcoming Public Open Houses (see below) being held as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. In addition to this email update, we would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project, if you wish.

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. This involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate new electrical connection facilities as part of the power supply component of the project, which will be provided by Hydro One. As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are proposing to carry out an integrated EA process to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
• Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Weston Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Road,</td>
<td>55 John Street</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification. Please contact me if you have questions or would like to schedule a briefing.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Jonah Schein
Member of Provincial Parliament
Davenport

Karen Pitre
Project Director, Electrification
GO Transit (a division of Metrolinx)
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3

July 2, 2013

Dear Ms. Pitre,

As you know, the electrification of the UP Express is an issue of utmost importance to members of our community. That’s why we were surprised to learn that none of your planned open houses about electrification were located in the west Toronto neighbourhoods of Davenport or Parkdale High-Park.

Over the last several years our community has been disappointed time and time again by the lack of meaningful consultation done by Metrolinx or the provincial government in the planning of the new Air Rail Link. Indeed we remain very concerned about the decision to run dirty diesel trains along the Georgetown corridor instead of clean, electric powered locomotives. Given the significant impact of these decisions on our community, we were dismayed to learn that Metrolinx had chosen not to hold any electrification meetings in Davenport or Parkdale High-Park where thousands of affected residents live along the rail corridor.

Therefore we request that Metrolinx host a meeting in the west Toronto riding of Davenport. We look forward to your response.

Regards,

Jonah Schein
Member of Provincial Parliament, Davenport
NDP Critic, Environment
NDP Critic, GTA Issues

Andrew Cash
Member of Parliament, Davenport
NDP Chair of the Toronto Caucus
NDP Deputy Heritage Critic
Hello Victoria,

Thank you for your letter regarding the recent Public Open Houses for the Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA). We recognize that there are many interested neighbourhoods along the Union Pearson Express route to the airport. As you know, in June, four open houses were held at various locations along the route that would be accessible to the community: at Toronto Pearson International Airport (June 4), Metro Hall (June 10), Mimico Presbyterian Church (June 11), and Mount Dennis Legion (June 12). These venues were selected in order to provide locations that were distributed along the 25 km length of the UP Express route from Union Station to Pearson Airport.

The open houses were advertised broadly including: Parkdale Liberty Villager, City Centre Mirror, Etobicoke Guardian, York Guardian, Mississauga News, Bloor West Villager, North York Mirror, Metro News Toronto, L’Express de Toronto, Toronto le Metropolitain (Brampton) so that neighbours were made aware of the multiple date and location options. In addition to newspaper ads, the open house notice was posted on our website, notification emails were sent to the project contact list including: elected officials, review agencies, stakeholders, and first nations, and letters were mailed directly to property owners along the corridor.

We have received several suggestions for areas in which to hold our next round of public open houses and will endeavour to accommodate these requests. Metrolinx is committed to keeping the public informed throughout the EA process. We appreciate your feedback and invite you to join us during our next round of consultation. Please also note that a copy of the June 2013 Public Open House display panels has been posted to our website: [http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/).

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Dear Ms. Pitre,

Please find attached a letter from MP Andrew Cash and MPP Jonah Schein regarding Metrolinx’s recent Electrification EA meetings. Please let me know if you have any difficulty with the attachment.

Regards,
Victoria

Victoria Marshall
Constituency Assistant
Office of Jonah Schein, MPP Davenport
416 535 3158
marshally@ndp.on.ca
jonahscheinmpp.ca
August 13, 2012

-- OPEN LETTER --

Ms. Laura Albanese
MPP, York South—Weston
99A Ingram Drive
Toronto ON M6M 2L7

Dear Ms. Albanese:

I read with great interest your recent letter to Bruce McCuaig, President of Metrolinx, on the issue of timelines for electrification of the Air-Rail Link. I want to thank you for copying me. Unfortunately, your letter itself answers many of the questions you pose.

Let me explain.

First, you state “...the electrification of the ARL...should be a priority for the Provincial government.” Then you ask of the Environmental Assessment, ‘...can it be expedited or accelerated?’ Then you ask of electrification “...what options is (sic) Metrolinx looking at to fund the project?” Finally, you suggest that the province begin a more official engagement with the federal government on cost sharing possibilities.

By now, you should know the answers to these questions.

First, electrification is currently not a priority for your provincial government. The only funding that has been set aside is for yet another study, this time an EA. To date, the province has not committed itself to electrification through the most obvious method — by budgeting for it.

Second, with great fanfare in 2007 – at about the same time you announced that the Air-Rail Link was dead! – the Premier announced that EAs for transit projects would be expedited and take no longer than six months. The more than $1-billion rail expansion to accommodate the ARL was rushed through this process with very little in the way of meaningful community input.
Given the province’s rules, there is no reason the EA for electrification needs to take three years. In fact, if it wanted to, the provincial government has the power to exempt electrification from an EA entirely.

Third, and now most telling, the conflict between a government that has decided to spend between $1.1-billion and $1.6-billion to put a diesel ARL in place, but now for the first time suggests that the agency it created, Metrolinx, should fund electrification itself, is a very clear indication of your government’s priorities or lack thereof.

Finally, the suggestion that there needs to be more official engagement with the federal government on cost sharing is quite interesting. The federal government is spending significant sums on this project as part of the Canada-Ontario-GO agreement signed in 2004. When the Federal Liberal government first planned the project, the cost was pegged at $300-million and the Transport Minister at the time, David Collenette, stated that not one nickel of taxpayer dollars would be used. Now that your provincial Liberal government has made the diesel link its number one transit priority, the cost has more than quadrupled.

This past Spring, you wrote to me to ask for federal funding for the project. As you know, I’m not a minister of the crown and have no authority to bind the federal government. I responded by asking if you wanted me to pass on the request to the minister, as an official request of the province, but to date you have not responded. As far as I am aware, there has never been an official request from your government to the federal government for help with the costs of electrification. In any case, in my conversations with previous federal transport ministers, I was told that there were no other federal funds available, that the province had made its priorities clear with the demand for federal help with the Spadina subway extension into a sparsely-populated area of Vaughan.

It is indeed the concept of priorities which is at the root of this matter. As residents well know, Metrolinx has mostly been ‘just following orders’ from the province to get the ARL up and running in time for the Pan Am Games. The notion that electrification would not be possible in time for the games was finally put to rest by Metrolinx’s own consultant at a public meeting last month which was attended by a member of your staff. At that meeting, the consultant admitted what many already knew, that we had enough time to electrify before the Pan Am Games.

Laura, this project has been bungled from the time your government took it on. First we were told it was not part of the Pan Am bid book, then it was. We were told electrification would take seven to nine years to complete, now we are told it is much less than that. The new ARL diesel vehicles are not compatible with the existing GO Transit station platform heights, so GO patrons must now walk an additional 300 metres down the platform to get a GO train. And there is no certainty that the vehicles will be convertible to electric without incurring significant expense. The bridges at the airport are too low for double-deck vehicles, should they be needed in the future. I could go on and on.

But you still have an opportunity to convince your leader, the Premier of Ontario, that the time to electrify the line is now. Your own motion which was debated and passed in the Legislature demanded that the ARL be operated from the beginning as electric. With time now running
short, the motion needs to be put into action. Our constituents here in York South—Weston—and all the other Torontonians who live, work and play along the rail corridor—deserve no less from you and your government.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Sullivan,
MP, York South—Weston

cc. Jonah Schein, MPP, Davenport
Cheri DiNovo, MPP, Parkdale—High Park
Rosario Marchese, MPP, Trinity-Spadina
Andrew Cash, MP, Davenport
Peggy Nash, MP, Parkdale—High Park
Olivia Chow, MP, Trinity—Spadina
Clean Train Coalition
Weston Community Coalition
November 19th, 2013

Dear Minister Murray,

I am writing to you as a follow-up to the recent Metrolinx presentation to the Standing Committee on Government Agencies. As you know from my previous correspondence to Metrolinx and my many discussions with you concerning the importance of electrification of the Union-Pearson Air Rail Link (UP Express), I am very concerned that we take every opportunity to electrify the rail line as soon as possible. According to Metrolinx, the earliest the UP Express line could be electrified is 2017. To meet this target date, at least two steps are needed. One is the completion of the Environmental Assessment, which at this point is scheduled to be complete by the end of 2014. The other is the commitment by governments, both federal and provincial, to announce the funding for construction.

You will also know a variety of factors have necessitated changes to the construction schedule to maintain the timeline. I recognize that in all major construction projects there is always the possibility of unforeseen construction challenges or extreme weather conditions that may cause slippage to time lines. However I cannot stress to you enough the importance of meeting the 2017 electrification timeline.

To ensure that we stay on track to meet the 2017 target for electrification, I would ask that you take the following undertakings:

1. Seek confirmation from Metrolinx that it is still their intention to complete the Environmental Assessment by the end of 2014.

2. To ensure that we move expeditiously between the EA process to the design and construction process, it will be important for the government and Metrolinx to signal funding, in 2014-15, for design and construction relating to electrification. Moreover, given that Metrolinx is currently developing funding tools and/revenue streams relating to future transit priorities, that Metrolinx ensures that such tools/or revenue streams include the generation of funds to support the completion of electrification in 2017.
In short, however the government and Metrolinx may choose to fund the completion of electrification for the UP Express, it is imperative that the funding be secured or dedicated to electrification so that we move from the EA process to the construction process as expeditiously as possible.

Kindest regards,

Laura Albanese, MPP
York South-Weston

Cc: Bruce McCuaig, President and Chief Executive Officer of Metrolinx
December 10th, 2013.

Ms. Karen Pitre,
Executive Director, Electrification,
Metrolinx-GO Transit,
20 Bay Street, Suite 600,
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3

Ms. Patricia Staite,
Environmental Planner,
Hydro One Networks Inc.,
483 Bay Street TCT6,
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5

Dear Ms. Pitre & Ms. Staite:

I am writing with respect to the ad regarding "Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment" which recently appeared in the Etobicoke Guardian. This is an issue that has concerned me for a number of years since we learned of the connection between Union Station and Pearson.

My Ward (4) runs along the west side of the Humber River and will be impacted by the originally proposed diesel trains running to Pearson. The concern has been the frequency of the trains and the amount of diesel fumes that will be emitted. I am in full support of the electrification of this line and in the past have expressed this support to other parties involved in this process.

In the past I chaired the restoration of Union Station and in doing so I had the opportunity to visit the Grand Central Station in New York. I was impressed with the fact that as New York does not allow diesel trains to come within the city boundaries, goods must be transferred to electric trains. This makes good sense to me in dense urbanized areas.

I respectfully request that you convey my support for electrification to those involved in this project.

Yours very truly,

Gloria Lindsay Luby,

GLL/pp

Copy: Councillor Frances Nunziata, Ward 11 – York South-Weston

"Working for You to Build a Better Toronto"
Good morning,

I am writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. As you may know, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system. Metrolinx and Hydro One have initiated a simultaneous EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as well as Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). This process will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report, produced by both Metrolinx and Hydro One, which will be made available for public review and comment.

Metrolinx and Hydro One will be providing notification of this EA process by placing an ad in local newspapers the first week of December 2013 and mailing a notice to adjacent property owners along the corridor. Attached is a copy of the notice for your information. We are also planning Public Open Houses towards the end of January/early February 2014 and will provide you with details after the dates and locations are established.

We look forward to working with you on this important project and would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project.

For additional information on this project, please visit: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification) or [www.HydroOne.com/projects](http://www.HydroOne.com/projects)

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre

Marylena Stea
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

Communications Officer
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT 7
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
Community.Relations@HydroOne.com
Good morning,

I am writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. As you may know, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO Rail Corridor and Kitchener GO Rail Corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur line (under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system. Metrolinx and Hydro One have initiated a simultaneous EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as well as Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). This process will result in the preparation of an Environmental Project/Study Report, produced by both Metrolinx and Hydro One, which will be made available for public review and comment.

Metrolinx and Hydro One will be providing notification of this EA process by placing an ad in local newspapers the first week of December 2013 and mailing a notice to adjacent property owners along the corridor. Attached is a copy of the notice for your information. We are also planning Public Open Houses towards the end of January/early February 2014 and will provide you with details after the dates and locations are established.

We look forward to working with you on this important project and would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project.

For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification or www.HydroOne.com/projects

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

Marylena Stea
Communications Officer
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT 7
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
Community.Relations@HydroOne.com
Good afternoon,

I am writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. As you may know, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system.

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx and Hydro One are holding joint Public Open Houses at the end of January/early February 2014 to provide a project update and receive feedback on the preliminary design components, environmental effects and mitigation and next steps/timelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islington Evangel Centre</td>
<td>Locus 144 Restaurant</td>
<td>York West Active Living</td>
<td>Lithuanian House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Queens Plate Drive</td>
<td>171 East Liberty St.,</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>1573 Bloor St. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke, ON M9W 6P1</td>
<td>Unit 144</td>
<td>1901 Weston Rd.</td>
<td>Toronto, ON M6P 1A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Toronto, ON M6K 3P6</td>
<td>Weston, ON M9N 3P5</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your information, attached is a copy of the Newspaper Ad which will appear in the following newspapers:

- City Centre Mirror – Thursday, January 23
- Etobicoke Guardian – Thursday, January 23
- L’Express de Toronto – Tuesday, January 21
- Metro News Toronto – Thursday, January 23
We look forward to working with you on this important project and would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification or www.HydroOne.com/projects

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Good afternoon,

I am writing to provide you with an update on Metrolinx’s Union Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. As you may know, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the UP Express service beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (at Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. In order to electrify the system, Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is proposing to build a new Traction Power Substation, that will connect to Ontario’s electricity system.

As part of the EA process, Metrolinx and Hydro One are holding joint Public Open Houses at the end of January/early February 2014 to provide a project update and receive feedback on the preliminary design components, environmental effects and mitigation and next steps/timelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islington Evangel Centre</td>
<td>Locus 144 Restaurant</td>
<td>York West Active Living Centre</td>
<td>Lithuanian House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Queens Plate Drive</td>
<td>171 East Liberty St.,</td>
<td>1901 Weston Rd.</td>
<td>1573 Bloor St. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke, ON M9W 6P1</td>
<td>Unit 144</td>
<td>Weston, ON M6K 3P6</td>
<td>Toronto, ON M6P 1A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your information, attached is a copy of the Newspaper Ad which will appear in the following newspapers:

- City Centre Mirror – Thursday, January 23
- Etobicoke Guardian – Thursday, January 23
- L’Express de Toronto – Tuesday, January 21
- Metro News Toronto – Thursday, January 23
- Mississauga News – Friday, January 24
- North York Mirror – Thursday, January 23
- Parkdale Liberty Villager – Thursday, January 23
- Toronto le Metropolitain (Brampton) – Wednesday, January 22
- York Guardian – Thursday, January 23
We look forward to working with you on this important project and would be happy to meet with you in person to further discuss the project. For additional information on this project, please visit: www.gotransit.com/electrification or www.HydroOne.com/projects

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Appendix J9

Review Agency Correspondence and Contact List
Metrolinx has initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25kms of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor from just west of the Union Station train shed to Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport.

As outlined in the attached letter and in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 (TPAP), Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we are requesting assistance from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs to identify potentially interested Aboriginal communities for this project. We have also sent an original copy of the letter to you in the mail.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
March 27, 2013

Environmental Unit
Environment and Natural Resources
Lands and Trusts Services
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
8th Floor-25 St. Clair Avenue East
Toronto ON M4T 1M2
E-mail: EACoordination_ON@inac-ainc.gc.ca

Re: Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25kms of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor from just west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The EA study area also includes potential locations for proposed traction power facilities as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed (see key map below).

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate new electrical connection facilities, which will be provided by Hydro One, including design of two new traction power substations and transmission line network connection(s). These particular project components are subject to Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One will carry out a Joint EA process in order to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as well as Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

In accordance with TPAP requirements, Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we are requesting assistance from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada to identify potentially interested Aboriginal communities for this project. Please note that Hydro One has
also contacted the Ontario Ministry of Energy in accordance with their Class EA process to request direction with respect to the Crown’s duty to consult.

For additional information on this project, please visit the project website: www.gotransit.com/electrification.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification project and we will continue to keep you informed as the EA progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Gibson, Ministry of Energy
W. Cornet, Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs
G. McNeil, GO Transit
M. Maracle, Hydro One
P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
May 14, 2013

Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU)
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
E-mail: CAU-UCA@aandc.gc.ca

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The EA study area also includes potential locations for proposed traction power facilities as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed (see key map below).

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations and transmission line network connection(s). These particular project components are subject to Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are proposing an Integrated EA process in order to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as well as Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

In accordance with TPAP requirements, Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we subsequently requested assistance from Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) via our letter dated March 27, 2013 as part of identifying potentially interested Aboriginal communities for the project. Please note that Hydro One has also contacted the Ontario Ministry of Energy in accordance with their Class EA process to request direction with respect to the Crown’s duty to consult.
Based on e-mail correspondence received from the AANDC Ontario Region Environment Unit on May 7, 2013 (as attached), we would like to request any additional information from AANDC’s Consultation and Accommodation Unit regarding claims, litigation, treaties and Métis and Non-Status Indians interests, that may be relevant to the UP Express Electrification EA project, including:

- The location of Aboriginal communities, reserves or their traditional territory, as claimed; and/or
- The asserted or established rights that pertain to those communities or to a given geographic location.

For additional information on this project, please visit the project website: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification project and we will continue to keep you informed as the EA progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
M. Chen, AANDC (Ontario Region Environmental Unit)
W. Cornet, Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs
A. Gibson, Ministry of Energy
M. Maracle, Hydro One
P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield

Attach.
Hello,

Thank you for your letter. The AANDC Ontario Region Environment Unit generally does not comment on Municipal projects.

For information with respect to claims, litigation, treaties and Métis and Non-Status Indians interests, you may contact our Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU), located at AANDC Headquarters. The CAU can provide information on:

1. The location of Aboriginal communities, reserves or their traditional territory, as claimed; and/or
2. The asserted or established rights that pertain to those communities or to a given geographic location.

For these inquiries you may contact them directly at CAU-UCA@aandc.gc.ca.

Please continue to send future notifications to this email in regards to projects in Ontario.

Mei Ling

Mei Ling Chen
Environmental Assessment Coordination
T: 416-954-3224
F: 416-954-4328

Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada - Ontario Region
25 St. Clair Avenue East
Toronto, Ontario M4T 1M2
June 6, 2013

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3  
Karen Pitre@metrolinx.com

Dear Ms. Pitre,

Thank you for your e-mail of May 16, 2013 regarding your request for information held by Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) on established or potential Aboriginal and treaty rights in the vicinity of the Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service project in Toronto, Ontario.

Consulting with Canadians on matters of interest or concern to them is an important part of good governance, sound policy development and decision-making. In addition to good governance objectives, there may be statutory or contractual reasons for consulting, as well as the common law duty to consult with First Nations, Métis and Inuit when conduct that might adversely impact rights Aboriginal or treaty rights (established or potential) is contemplated.

It is important to note that the information held by AANDC is provided as contextual information and may or may not pertain directly to Aboriginal or treaty rights. In most cases, the Aboriginal community remains best positioned to explain their traditional use of land, their practices or claims that may fall under section 35, including claims they may have put before the courts. AANDC has developed the Aboriginal and Treaty Rights Information System (ATRIS), which brings together information regarding Aboriginal groups such as their location, related treaty information, claims (specific, comprehensive and special) and litigation data.

The Consultation Information Service (CIS) response
The CIS has prepared the attached response which combines the resources of ATRIS and the support of sectors and regions within the AANDC. Using a 100 km radius surrounding the project location, information regarding potentially affected Aboriginal communities is presented in the attached report in the following sections for each community:

**Important Contextual Information Related to Section 35 Rights** includes information on historic and modern treaties.

**Aboriginal Community Information** includes key contact information and any other information such as Tribal Council affiliation.

**Claims** includes specific, comprehensive and special claims.

**Self-Government Agreements and other negotiations** may be part of comprehensive claims or stand-alone negotiations.

**Legal Proceedings** usually refers to litigation between the Aboriginal Group and the Crown, often pertaining to section 35 rights assertions or consultation matters.
Also included, where available, is a section entitled **Other Considerations.** This may include information on Métis rights or information on the assertions of other Aboriginal groups, consultation-related protocols or agreements and other relevant information.

Should you require further assistance regarding the information provided, or if you have any questions and/or comments about the enclosed response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Allison Berman  
Regional Subject Expert for Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario  
Consultation and Accommodation Unit  
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada  
5H- 5th Floor, 10 Wellington  
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H4  
Tel: 819-934-1873

**Disclaimer**  
This information is provided as a public service by the Government of Canada. All of the information is provided "as is" without warranty of any kind, whether express or implied, including, without limitation, implied warranties as to the accuracy or reliability of any of the information provided, its fitness for a particular purpose or use, or non-infringement, which implied warranties are hereby expressly disclaimed. References to any website are provided for information only shall not be taken as endorsement of any kind. The Government of Canada is not responsible for the content or reliability of any referenced website and does not endorse the content, products, services or views expressed within them.

**Limitation of Liabilities**  
Under no circumstances will the Government of Canada be liable to any person or business entity for any reliance on the completeness or accuracy of this information or for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, consequential, or other damages based on any use of this information including, without limitation, any lost profits, business interruption, or loss of programs or information, even if the Government of Canada has been specifically advised of the possibility of such damages.
On the map below, a 50 km radius around the project is provided to reflect the proximity of other First Nation communities nearby. The red circle highlights the project area. First Nations indicated by blue circles are signatories to the Upper Canada Treaties or the Williams Treaties and may have interests in the area.

Darker red shapes on the map below indicate reserve lands surrounding the project site. For further information on localized hunting, fishing, trapping activities which may be occurring contact the Ministry of Natural Resources.
There are no reserve lands found within the 50 km buffer. Information for the following First Nations is provided in alphabetical order for the following highlighted communities near the project. If information on other highlighted First Nations who are more distant to the project is required, please contact the CIS.

Chippewas of Georgina Island  
Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point  
Chippewas of Nawash First Nation  
Chippewas of Rama first Nation  
Chippewas of the Thames First Nation  
Mississauga’s of Scugog Island First Nation  
Mississaugas of the Credit  
Saugeen  
Six Nations of the Grand River  

Information on other Aboriginal groups and/or the Métis is provided in the section “Other Considerations”.

**Important Contextual Information Related to Section 35 Rights**

**Treaty Area**

In general, where historic treaties have been signed, the rights of signatory First Nation’s are defined by the terms of the Treaty. In many cases, however, there are divergent views between First Nations and the Crown as to what the treaty provisions imply or signify. For each First Nation below, the relevant treaty area is provided.

In areas where no historic treaty exists or where such treaties were limited in scope (i.e. where only certain rights were addressed by the treaty, such as the Peace and Friendship Treaties),
there may be comprehensive claims that are asserted or being negotiated. Comprehensive claim negotiations are the means by which modern treaties are achieved.

**Treaties of Southern Ontario - The Upper Canada Treaties**

There are several treaty making eras which impact the province of Ontario. These eras are known as the Upper Canada Land Surrenders from 1764 to 1862. These surrenders are seen as treaties which transfer all Aboriginal rights and title to the Crown in exchange for one-time payments or annuities. They tended to be made with individual First Nation groups for tracts of land.

**1764-1782 – Early Land Surrenders**

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 established the protection from encroachment of an Aboriginal territory outside of the colonial boundaries. Rules and protocols for the acquisition of Aboriginal lands by Crown officials were set out and became the basis for all future land treaties. In response to military and defensive needs around the Great Lakes, the Indian Department negotiated several land surrender treaties in the Niagara region.

**1783-1815- Treaties for Settlement**

As part of the plan to resettle some 30,000 United Empire Loyalists who refused to accept American rule, and fled to Montreal, the Indian Department undertook a series of land surrenders west of the Ottawa River with the Mississauga and the Chippewa of the southern Great Lakes. These tended to be uncomplicated arrangements whereby for a particular Aboriginal group was paid a specific sum paid in trade goods, to surrender a stated amount of land.

**1815-1862- Treaties to Open the Interior**

After the war of 1812, the colonial administration of Upper Canada focused on greater settlement of the colony. The Indian Department completed the last of the over 30 Upper Canada Land Surrenders around the Kawartha, Georgian Bay, and the Rideau and Ottawa Rivers. All of this land which today is known as Southern Ontario, was ceded to the Crown.
Southern Ontario Treaty Making after the Upper Canada Land Surrenders

While the protocols for surrenders established in 1763 by the Royal Proclamation, were largely followed by the Indian Department, complaints and petitions to the Crown were submitted by First Nation signatories regarding these surrenders as early as 1866. They claimed they had an unsurrendered interest in the so-called “northern hunting grounds”. In response, the province of Ontario and Canada enlisted a Commission in 1916 to investigate the veracity of these claims once and for all. If the claims were found to be valid, the Commission was to negotiate a treaty. The Commission’s investigation found a number of places where the certainty of the validity of the surrenders was questionable, and recommended that new treaties be made. They appointed A.S. Williams to negotiate with the Ojibway in 1923. The areas of uncertainty were brought into the boundaries of the Williams Treaties to achieve certainty.

Unlike the terms of the Robinson Treaties in Ontario (1850) and the more recent numbered treaties in the west, the Williams Treaties were cash for land deals. Aboriginal (Ojibway) signatories surrendered all of their rights and benefits to the Crown on lands in central Ontario and the northern shore of Lake Ontario. The Potawatomi and the Mississaugas of the New Credit were not involved in these negotiations.

Since the signing of these treaties, there have been questions as to whether the signatory First Nations had surrendered all of their rights to hunt and fish. In 1994, this debate was ended by the Supreme Court of Canada, when in R. v. Howard, the Court decided that the seven First Nations Georgina Island, Mnjikaning and Beausoleil, Curve Lake, Alderville, Scugog and Hiawatha by way of the Williams Treaties “basket clause”, had knowingly surrendered all of their hunting, fishing and trapping rights (whether they be Aboriginal rights or treaty rights) outside of their existing reserves.

Litigation to resolve the allegations that Canada negotiated the Williams Treaties in bad faith was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations. A trial in this matter is scheduled to resume on October 22, 2012.
The signatories of the Williams Treaties are listed below.

| Alderville First Nation | Curve Lake
|------------------------|-------------
| Beausoleil             | Hiawatha First Nation |
| Chippewas of Georgina Island | Mississaugas's of Scugog Island First Nation |
| Chippewas of Rama First Nation |

**Treaty Land Entitlement (TLE)**

This term is used to describe treaty rights to reserve lands in the Prairie Provinces, northern Ontario and northern British Columbia which flow from Treaties 1 to 11, negotiated and confirmed between various First Nations and the Crown in right of Canada. It is a "subset of specific claims.

Treaty Land Entitlement claims are intended to settle the land debt owed to those First Nations who did not receive all the land they were entitled to under historical treaties signed by the Crown and First Nations. Settlement agreements are negotiated among First Nations, the Government of Canada and provincial/territorial governments. According to the terms of the agreement, a specified amount of Crown lands is identified and/or a cash settlement is provided so that a First Nation may purchase federal, provincial/territorial, or private land to settle the land debt. Once selected or purchased, this land can be added to the First Nations’ reserve under the Additions to Reserve process.

All selections and acquisitions are proceeding through the TLE and Additions to Reserves processes and are at various stages ranging from initial acquisition/selection to the Federal Order that would set the lands apart as reserve. For more information on Treaty Land Entitlement, please consult the AANDC website. [www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/enr/lds/tle-eng.asp](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/enr/lds/tle-eng.asp)

**First Nation/Aboriginal Community Information**

The following information is organized by First Nation in alphabetical order.

**Chippewas of Georgina Island First Nation**

Chief Donna Big Canoe *(tenure expires March, 2013)*

RR 2, PO Box 13

Sutton West, Ontario, L0E 1R0

Phone: (705) 437-1337   Fax: (705) 437-4597

[www.georginaisland.com](http://www.georginaisland.com)

**Treaty Area** - Williams Treaties of 1923

**Associate Organizations:**

Union of Ontario Indians
Ogemawahj Tribal Council
Chiefs of Ontario
Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties
Status: active litigation
Description: The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit and Moose Deer Point.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No.: T-195-92
Description: The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
Chief Thomas Bressette (tenure expires June 23, 2014)
6247 Indian Lane
Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, Ontario, N0N 1J1
Phone: (519) 786-2125     Fax: (519) 786-2108
www.kettlepoint.org/home.html

Treaty Area - Southern Ontario Treaties to open the Interior: 1815 to 1862

Associate Organizations:
Southern First Nations Secretariat (London District Chiefs Council)
Union of Ontario Indians
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
Name: Clench Defalcation
Status: active negotiations
Description: The Plaintiffs claim a misappropriation of sale proceeds.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Sarnia et al. v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Laurie Desautels, Polysar Hydrocarbons Limited
Status: active
Court File No.: 1796A/87
Description: In 1987, the Chippewas of Sarnia and Kettle Point (Chippewas) sued Ontario and Polysar for a declaration of Aboriginal rights recognized by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and
never ceded to the waterbeds of the St. Clair River and Lake Huron and damages for Polysar’s gas pipeline contained therein. The Plaintiffs allege that Ontario has breached its fiduciary duties and trust obligations to the band as a result of granting licenses to the various companies named as defendants. The plaintiffs seek damages and declaratory relief.

Name: Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point v. Attorney General of Canada et al.
Status: active
Court No: C22725
Description: The Plaintiffs allege that the 1927 surrender and subsequent letters patent for a portion of the Kettle Point Reserve is invalid, and that the beach front was not surrendered.

Name: Rosalie Winnifred Manning et al v. HMTQ
Status: active
Court File No: T-3077-94
Description: The plaintiffs, who claim to be members of the self-styled Stony Point First Nation, and the defendants, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point are recognized as one band by the department. The plaintiffs claim, among other things, that the Crown breached its fiduciary duty. They allege this occurred through the Crown’s failure to ensure the plaintiffs’ interests: with regards to the Stony Point Reserve; when represented in its negotiations with the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point Band; trespassing from 1942 to 1994; the environmental degradation of the land; and the plaintiffs loss of the use and enjoyment of the lands.

Name: Corporation of Township of Bosanquet v. Attorney General of Canada, Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
Status: active
Court File No: 24085/96
Description: The Town of Bosanquet has initiated a claim against Canada in which they are asking the court for a declaration that the beachfront at Camp Ipperwash is dedicated to public use and that any transfer of land to the First Nation would be restricted by the declaration. The land in question was originally surrendered by the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point in 1928 and subsequently sold to private individuals. In 1944, the land was transferred to the Department of National Defence and became part of Camp Ipperwash. In accordance with the 1981 Order in Council (PC 1981-499), Canada made the commitment to return Camp Ipperwash, including the portion obtained from private individuals in 1944, to the band when no longer needed for military purposes. Canada is negotiating the return of the land with the Kettle and Stony Point First Nation. In separate litigation involving Canada, the Town of Bosanquet and a number of private homeowners, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point are claiming a portion of the West Ipperwash Beach, which is adjacent to the Kettle Point Reserve.

Name: HMTQ v. David Cloud
Status: active
Court File No: to be determined
Description: This case relates to a criminal proceeding in the Ontario Court Provincial Division. The Plaintiffs allege that they have a treaty right to hunt and that the Game and Fish Act of Ontario is of no force and effect with respect to them by virtue of section 52 of the Constitution Act and by reason of their Treaty rights within the meaning of section 35.

Name: Reta George, Maynard George, Roy George, Noreen Kewageshig, Janet Cloud, Lee George v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Department of National Defence,
Status: active
Description: In 1942 approximately 2,111 acres of lands comprising the Stony Point Indian Reserve were expropriated by the Department of National Defence under the authority of the War Measures Act. Since the end of the war, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point have sought the return of this land to reserve status. In 1981, after extensive negotiations with the band council, the federal government entered into a settlement with the band and agreed to return the lands when no longer required for military purposes. In 1994, the government announced its intentions to return the lands to the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point. The plaintiffs claim to be members of the self-styled 'Stoney Point First Nation' which they claim is a separate First Nation from the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point and the rightful beneficiary of the Camp Ipperwash lands. The essence of their claim is that the 'Stoney Point First Nation' originally occupied the former Stony Point Reserve and therefore, the Crown should return the Camp to the members of the 'Stoney Point First Nation' rather than the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point. The Crown does not recognize the 'Stoney Point First Nation as a separate Band.

Name: Chippewas of Kettle and Stoney Point First Nation v. HMTQ in Right of Canada

Status: dormant

Description: In 1942, approximately 2,111 acres of lands comprising the Stony Point Indian Reserve were appropriated by the Department of National Defence under the authority of the War Measures Act. Since the end of the war the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point have sought the return of this land, now Camp Ipperwash, to reserve status.

Traditional Territory:
In March 2012 and March of 2013, the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation reaffirmed their claim (see above Chippewas of Sarnia et al. v. HMTQ) to the lakebed surrounding their First Nation in letters to AANDC. They wish to be notified by government, proponents, groups or individuals who use, or who plan to use, the area they consider their traditional territory. This area is described as such:

“from the point of intersection of the surrendered lands with Lake Huron at its most northerly point, extending directly out onto Lake Huron to the International boundary, then running along the international boundary to the southerly limit of the herein described lands at the water’s edge of the St. Clair River, and the land underlying this portion of Lake Huron (lake bed)"

Additions to Reserve:
Since 2009, the Province has been engaged with the First Nation to transfer the Ipperwash Provincial Park lands as an addition to their reserve. These lands are being transferred through the federal Additions to Reserve process.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.
Treaty area - Southern Ontario treaties to open the interior: 1815 -1862
The Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation occupy Neyaashiinigmiing Indian Reserve No. 27 on the eastern shore of the Saugeen Peninsula on Georgian Bay. This reserve is located within the boundaries of the Saugeen Peninsula Treaty No. 72 of 1854 of which the Saugeen Ojibway signed. The Chippewas of Nawash also fall under the governance of the Indian Act and receives funding from various federal departments for services. Thus, while the First Nation considers its territory unceded, the federal government does not admit that his term accurately characterizes the nature of those lands, and instead uses the term “title claim area”.

Associate Organizations:
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
No active claims to report.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, Saugeen First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-261134CM1
Description: The plaintiffs are claiming unextinguished Aboriginal title to the Saugeen Ojibway Nation Unceded Traditional Lands. These lands (and the land under water) include portions of Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, and the Bruce Peninsula, with the exception of lands on islands which are already subject to treaty, and any lands which are already owned by private parties in fee simple. The plaintiffs assert that Canada and Ontario have breached their fiduciary duties to protect the Aboriginal title to this land and have alienated portions of the land to third parties.

Name: The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation, Chippewas of Nawash First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Corporation of Township of Amabel, Corporation of Township of Albemarle, Corporation of Township of Eastnor
Status: active
Court File No.: 94-CQ-50872
Description: The Chippewas of Saugeen and the Chippewas of Nawash allege that the Crown breached its fiduciary duty because of the manner in which it concluded Treaty 72. The First Nations claim that they are legally entitled to be put in the position they would have been had the surrender never occurred.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation v. Status: active
Court File No.: PA-050251-1
Description: This matter involves an appeal of Order PO-2491, where the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC) directed that the Ministry of Natural Resources disclose a Fishing Agreement between the Province of Ontario, the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash v.
Status: settled through negotiations
Court File No.: not available
Description: This was a dispute over a native land claim within the city limits of Owen Sound, northwest of Toronto. A group of natives have occupied the properties of two homes which they claim are on native burial grounds. They argued that the burial ground had been set aside as a reserve in the Treaty No. 82 of 1857. The Chippewas of Nawash broke camp after a six-day occupation of the back yards of two home owners. The settlement involved the removal of the houses and the re-consecration of the burial site. Members of the First Nation are appealing to the public for the return of the artifacts taken from the burial ground. Their goal is to restore the site.

Fishing Rights:
Prior to the arrival of European settlers, the Saugeen Ojibway had occupied a vast area of what is now southwestern Ontario, and were involved in a very productive fishery trade. This was a community based, collective activity on either side of the Bruce Peninsula and other parts of the Lake Huron Eastern shore. Over the previous century, the Aboriginal right to fish commercially in the waters of the Bruce Peninsula were severely curtailed. This happened in spite of an 1847 Royal Declaration by Queen Victoria acknowledging the ownership of the Bruce Peninsula by the Saugeen Ojibway and their heirs, including the waters and fishing islands within a seven-mile limit of the shore all around the peninsula.

In the early 1990’s two members of the Saugeen Ojibway Nations Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon, were charged with fishing over their quota under the Fisheries Act. In June 1993, the court found that that the two Bands (Chippewa of Nawash and the Chippewa (Ojibway) of Saugeen have an Aboriginal and treaty right to fish for trade and commerce. It was further found that Ontario’s quota system had discriminated against the two Bands and violated their Constitutional rights.

Chippewas of Rama (Mnjikaning)
Chief Sharon Stinson Henry (tenure expires 2014)
5884 Rama Road, Suite 200
Rama, Ontario, L0K 1T0
Phone: (705) 325-3611 Fax: (705) 325-0879
www.mnjikaning.ca

Treaty Area - Williams Treaties of 1923

Associate Organizations:
Ogemawahj Tribal Council
Chiefs of Ontario
Specific Claims:
**Name:** 1923 Williams Treaties  
**Status:** active litigation  
**Description:** The United Indian Council alleges that the Williams Treaty was invalid, and inadequate compensation has been received for land taken. There has also been a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnijikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit, and Moose Deer Point.

**Legal Proceedings:**  
**Name:** Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in Right of Canada  
**Status:** active  
**Court File No.:** T-195-92  
**Description:** The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.

---

**Chippewas of the Thames First Nation**  
Chief Joe Miskokomon  
(tenure expires June 27, 2013)  
320 Chippewas Road  
Muncey, Ontario, N0L 1Y0  
Phone: (519) 289-5555  
Fax: (519) 289-2230  
www.cottfn.ca/index.html

**Treaty Area** – Southern Ontario Treaties to open the Interior: 1815 to 1862

**Associate Organizations:**  
Southern First Nations Secretariat (London District Chiefs Council)  
Union of Ontario Indians  
Chiefs of Ontario

**Specific Claims:**  
**Name:** Big Bear Creek Reserve  
**Status:** active negotiations  
**Description:** It is alleged that the 5,120 acre Big Bear Cree Reserve was patented and sold by the Crown in the 1830s without a proper surrender by the First Nation. Furthermore, the compensation paid by the Crown for the loss of the reserve in 1849-50 was inadequate. The land in question was reserved for the First Nation under the Longwoods Treaties (1819-1822). A community vote on whether to accept Canada’s offer to settle is expected to take place over the fall of 2012. The government has offered to pay the costs of acquiring land in Southwestern Ontario of the size believed to be the equivalent of the lost reserve (21 sq. Km).

**Name:** Caradoc Reserve 1834 Surrender  
**Status:** under assessment  
**Description:** The First Nation alleges that Canada breached fiduciary duties and duty of honour and integrity in relation to the 1834 Surrender.

**Legal Proceedings:**
Name: Ether Deleary, Virgil Wilson, Eldon French, George Henry, Mina Riley, Martha Albert, John Riley, Mark French, Merle Fisher, Chippewas of Thomas Band of Indians
Status: now pursued as a specific claim
Court File No.: T-541-83
Description: This action was instituted in February; 1983 but pursued as a specific claim. The plaintiffs; the Chippewas of the Thames allege that; as part of the surrender of their traditional lands in 1922; they were promised certain reserve lands. When the Caradoc reserve was set aside for this band; two parcels of land were not included which should have been; according to the band. The Town of Muncey is located on part of this disputed land. The plaintiffs ask for a declaration that these parcels are part of their reserve.

Agreement negotiations:
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

Mississauga’s of Scugog Island First Nation
Chief Tracy Gauthier (tenure expires June 27, 2013)
22521 Island Road
Port Perry, Ontario L9L 1B6
Phone (905) 985-3337 Fax (905) 985-8828
http://www.scugogfirstnation.com/

Treaty Area - Southern Ontario treaties to open the interior: 1815 to 1862

Associate Organizations:
Union of Ontario Indians
Ogemawahj Tribal Council
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
Name: 1923 Williams Treaties
Status: active litigation
Description: The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga’s of Scugog Island, Mississaugas of the Credit, and Moose Deer Point.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Alderville Indian Band et al v. HMTQ in right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No: T-195-92
Description: The Plaintiffs allege the Crown breached its fiduciary duty, and negotiated in bad faith, regarding the 1923 Williams Treaties. Litigation to resolve the allegations was launched in 1992 by the Alderville First Nation and six other First Nations, and is now at trial which is scheduled to continue October 22, 2012.
**Name:** Curve Lake First Nation et al, and Hiawatha First Nation et al, and Mississauga of Scugog Island First Nation v. HMTQ in Right of Canada  
**Status:** dormant  
**Court File No.:** T-1358-99  
**Description:** The Plaintiffs allege that the construction of Trent Severn Waterway resulted in the flooding of reserve lands held by the Crown for the use and benefit of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs further allege that the Crown breached a fiduciary duty to the Plaintiffs to hold the reserves for the use and benefit of the Plaintiffs. They maintain that the fiduciary duty was breached when the Crown failed to inform the Plaintiffs of the flooding, failed to consult with the Plaintiffs, and failed to compensate the Plaintiffs for their loss.

**Land Management:**  
The Mississauga’s of Scugog Island First Nation is party to the First Nation Land Management Regime. This Agreement was signed by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in 1996, and is an initiative allowing signatory First Nations the ability to take over management and control of their lands and resources outside of the Indian Act. For more information, visit: [http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1327090675492/1327090738973](http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1327090675492/1327090738973)

**Agreement negotiations:**  
Anishinabek Nation (UOI) negotiations on Governance and Education  
Please see “Other Considerations” below for more details.

---

**Mississaugas of the Credit**  
Chief Bryan Laforme *(tenure expires December 15, 2013)*  
2789 Mississaugua Road  
RR 6  
Hagersville, Ontario, N0A 1H0  
Phone: (905) 768-1133  
Fax: (905) 768-1225  
[www.newcreditfirstnation.com](http://www.newcreditfirstnation.com)

**Treaty Area** – Southern Ontario treaties for Settlement: 1783 -1815

**Associate Organizations:**  
Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians  
Chiefs of Ontario

**Specific Claims:**  
**Name:** 1923 Williams Treaties  
**Status:** active litigation  
**Description:** The United Indian Council alleged that the Williams Treaty was invalid. They state that compensation has been inadequate for land taken, along with a failure to provide reserves. The First Nations involved are: Alderville, Beausoleil, Chippewas of Georgina Island, Chippewas of Mnjikaning, Curve Lake, Hiawatha, Mississauga’s of Scugog Island.

**Legal Proceedings:**  
**Name:** Mississaugas of the New Credit – Toronto Purchase v.  
**Status:** inactive  
**Court File No.:** not available
Description: This concerns an 1805 surrender of land presumably by the Mississaugas of the New Credit. Documentation concerns discussions for a letter accepting settlement of the issue.

Name: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, Maurice Bryan Laforme, Kerri Louise King, Attorney General of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-12-373
Description: In this matter, the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation seeks a declaration of fee simple interest to a parcel of land in Hagersville which lies adjacent to the Applicant’s Reserve. The Applicant also seeks a declaration that the reservation of mines and minerals as set out in the original Crown Patent issued February 18, 1884 is null and void. The Applicant asserts that this property was originally part of a larger tract of land to which the Applicant had aboriginal rights, and that this larger tract of land was sold by the Applicant to the Crown in the 18th century. The Applicant claims that in 1999, the Applicant entered into a Land Claim Settlement Agreement whereby Canada agreed that it would recommend an addition to the Applicant’s reserve. The Applicant claims that following their application to the Crown to have the property added to its reserve, the Crown had concerns which prevented the completion of the Addition to Reserve process. The Crown’s concerns were regarding the capacity of a First Nation to hold title to lands in fee simple, and also about a reservation clause found in the original Crown Patent whereby the rights to all mines and minerals were reserved to the Government of Ontario.

Saugeen
Chief Randall Kahgee
RR1
Southampton, Ontario, N0H 2L0
Phone: 1-519-797-2781 Fax: 1-519-797-2978
www.saugeenfirstnation.ca

Treaty area -Treaties to Open the Interior: 1815-1862

Associate Organizations:
Chiefs of Ontario

Specific Claims:
No active claims to report.

Legal Proceedings:
Name: Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation v. Corporation of Township of Amabel, Barbara Twining, Larry Twining, David Dobson, Alberta Lemon, HMTQ in Right of Canada
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-253768-CM3
Description: This case concerns a dispute over the ownership of Sauble Beach. The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation take the position that Saugeen Indian Reserve No. 29 has always extended up the coast of Lake Huron to the front of Lot 31. However, the people of Amabel Township have used the beach property in front of Lots 25-31, Concession D, as their own land.
Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, Saugeen First Nation v. Attorney General of Canada, HMTQ in Right of Ontario
Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-261134CM1
Description: The plaintiffs are claiming unextinguished Aboriginal title to the Saugeen Ojibway Nation Unceded Traditional Lands. These lands (and the land under water) include portions of Lake Huron, Georgian Bay, and the Bruce Peninsula, with the exception of lands on islands which are already subject to treaty, and any lands which are already owned by private parties in fee simple. The plaintiffs assert that Canada and Ontario have breached their fiduciary duties to protect the aboriginal title to this land and have alienated portions of the land to third parties.

Name: Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation v. Ontario (Information and Privacy Commissioner)
Status: active
Court File No.: PA-050251-1
Description: This matter involves an appeal of Order PO-2491, where the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC) directed that the Ministry of Natural Resources disclose a Fishing Agreement between the Province of Ontario, the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, and the Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation.

Status: active
Court File No.: 03-CV-253768-CM3
Description: This case concerns a dispute over the ownership of Sauble Beach. The Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation claim that Saugeen Indian Reserve No. 29 has always extended up the coast of Lake Huron to the front of Lot 31. However, the people of Amabel Township have used the beach property in front of Lots 25-31, Concession D, as their own land and as a public beach for many years. Canada's position, in its defence to Ontario's cross-claim, is that Ontario alone is responsible: a) for any claim the private landowners might have should the court find that Sauble Beach is in fact reserve land, and b) for any liability for the pre-Confederation actions of the Crown in Right of the Province of Canada.

Name: Franklin Shawbedeese et al and all other members of the Saugeen Band of Indians, Chippewas of Saugeen v. HMTQ in Right of Canada, Canada
Status: dormant
Court File No.: T-2189-91
Description: The plaintiffs state that upon the surrender in 1854 of most of the Bruce Peninsula, they were to receive interest distributions from investments on the proceeds from the sale of the lands. The plaintiffs claim that certain individuals have erected structures and trespassed on a piece of land for which they have not received accurate compensation.

Fishing Rights:
Prior to the arrival of European settlers, the Saugeen Ojibway had occupied a vast area of what is now southwestern Ontario, and were involved in a very productive fishery trade. This was a community based, collective activity on either side of the Bruce Peninsula and other parts of the Lake Huron Eastern shore. Over the previous century commercial fishing by Aboriginal groups in the waters of the Bruce Peninsula were severely curtailed. This happened in spite of an 1847 Royal Declaration by Queen Victoria which described the territory of the Saugeen Ojibway and
their heirs on the Bruce Peninsula. The description included the waters and fishing islands within a seven-mile limit of the shore all around the peninsula.

**H.M.Q. v. Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon (1993)**
Two members of the Saugeen Ojibway Nations Howard Jones and Francis Nadjiwon, were charged with fishing over their quota under the Fisheries Act. In June 1993, the Ontario Court of Justice found that that the two Bands (Chippewa of Nawash and the Chippewa (Ojibway) of Saugeen) have an Aboriginal and treaty right to fish for trade and commerce in the waters of Lake Huron which is protected under Section 35 of the Constitution Act. It was further found that Ontario's quota system had discriminated against the two Bands and violated their Constitutional rights.

**Agreements and Negotiations:**
Substantive Commercial Fishing Agreement between the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation and Saugeen First Nation and HMTQ in Right of Ontario as Represented by the Ministry of Natural Resources - updated March 2013

This agreement covers areas recognized by Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) as traditional waters: Waters surrounding the Bruce Peninsula from Point Clark in Lake Huron to the international border and around the Bruce Peninsula into Georgian Bay to Craigleith.

**Six Nations of the Grand River**
Chief William (Bill) Kenneth Montour (tenure expires December 6, 2013)
1695 Chiefswood Road
PO Box 5000
Ohsweken, Ontario, N0A 1M0
Phone: (519) 445-2201 Fax: (519) 445-4208
www.sixnations.ca

**Recognized Leadership and Consultation:**
The Federal Government recognizes the elected Chief and Council (who are elected under the Indian Act) as the official Canadian leadership of Six Nations. For consultation purposes, the Federal Government recommends that the elected Chief and Council of Six Nations be engaged.

**Associate Organizations:**
Chiefs of Ontario

**Land Grant:**
Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 and Simcoe Patent of 1793
The Six Nations were native to an area that lies within present-day New York State and were allied with the British Crown during the American War of Independence. As compensation for lands lost as a result of the war, the Six Nations and their descendants were granted lands six miles deep on each side of the Grand River, from its mouth to its source. The granted lands were within a portion of territory that the Mississauga surrendered to the Crown in the Between The Lakes Treaty of 1784/1792 (the 1784 agreement contained a boundary description that was geographically impossible and this error was addressed and corrected in 1792).
The Simcoe Patent of 1793 confirmed the lands granted to the Six Nations by the Haldimand Proclamation; However, it included only lands within the corrected 1792 surrender and thus did not extend to the source so the Grand River. It specifies that the Six Nations can surrender and dispose of their land only to the Crown. Any other leases, sales or grants to people other than Six Nations shall be unlawful and such intruders evicted. A link to a map and additional information can be found at: [http://www.aboriginalaffairs.gov.on.ca/english/negotiate/sixnations/sixnations.asp](http://www.aboriginalaffairs.gov.on.ca/english/negotiate/sixnations/sixnations.asp)

**Specific Claims:**

Between 1980 and 1995, Six Nations submitted 28 specific claims to Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada under its Specific Claims Policy. These claims focus on the government's management of their lands and other assets from 1784 to the present. In March 1995, Six Nations filed a lawsuit against the Government of Canada and the Province of Ontario, which also related to how Six Nations' lands and monies were managed by the Crown (refer to Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Court file no. 406/95 in the litigation section below for additional information). As there was significant overlap between the 28 specific claims and the claims put forward in the litigation, work on the specific claims was suspended.

**Other Claims:**

In 1994, Six Nations submitted a claim to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada regarding their “right to hunt and fish,” which was premised in part on the Nanfan Treaty of 1701. This Treaty (also known as the Treaty of Albany) was related to the protection of hunting and fishing rights in and around Lakes Erie, Huron and Ontario, as well as a portion of the United States. The Treaty was between representatives of the Five Nations (now the Six Nations) and John Nanfan, the acting colonial governor of New York. Six Nations were referred to the Province of Ontario for remedy, as the province has the primary responsibility for harvesting.

**Legal Proceedings:**

**Name:** Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario - Superior Court of Justice  
**Status:** active  
**Court File No.:** 406/95  
**Description:** The Plaintiffs claim an accounting of all Six Nations’ assets including money and real property held in trust by the Crown for the benefit of the Six Nations since 1784. The Plaintiff seeks a declaration by the Court that the Defendants are in breach of their fiduciary duties towards the Plaintiff, and are liable for replacing all assets or the value of all assets found to be missing, with compound interest. The allegation of repeated breaches of fiduciary duty is supported by examples of breaches, between 1784 and 1970, that can be separated into 14 discrete claims.

**Name:** Thahoketoteh of Kanekota v. HMTQ  
**Status:** active  
**Court File No.:** T-1396-12  
**Description:** In this claim, the Plaintiff seeks, among other things, the removal of alleged non-native squatters from Lot 1 Concession 11, Clearview Township, Simcoe County. He alleges that the Crown has not respected the Royal Proclamation of 1784 and he also seeks compensation from other parties, such as the Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc. and Enbridge Gas, for their alleged illegal involvement in the area.
Name: Thahoketoteh of Kanekota v. HMTQ  
Status: active (November 2012)  
Court File No.: T-2007-12  
Description: In this action, the Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant Canada has allowed federal and provincial law to apply to a tract of land described in the Haldimand Proclamation of 1784 in violation of an alleged British Order in Council dating from 1704, the Royal Proclamation of 1763, ss. 90, 91(24) and 109 of the Constitution Act, 1867 and an alleged Canadian Order in Council relating to disallowance, dating from 1875. The Plaintiff particularly alleges that Canada has violated its duty in allowing the Indian Act, the Supreme Court Act and the Ontario Public Lands Act to apply to the Haldimand Tract. The Plaintiff seeks as relief a declaration that Canada has the duty not to allow the application of federal or provincial law to the Haldimand Tract except by a treaty in compliance with the Royal Proclamation of 1763 with any dispute resolved by a Standing Royal Committee constituted under the alleged Order In Council of 1704. The Plaintiff seeks to have the declaration described above determined under Rule 220(1)(a) of the Federal Courts Rules, and in writing under Rule 369.

Name: Six Nations Elected Council on its own behalf and on behalf of the Six Nations of the Grand River v. The Corporation of the City of Brantford  
Status: active  
Court File No.: CV-08-361454  
Description: The Plaintiffs seek various declarations pertaining to Ontario and/or the City of Brantford’s constitutional duty to consult with and accommodate the Six Nations of the Grand River before considering or undertaking any planning activities and disposition of lands which could potentially affect the interests of the Six Nations of the Grand River.

Name: Aaron Detlor; the Haudenosaunee Development Institute v. the Corporation of the City of Brantford – Superior Court of Justice  
Status: active  
Court File No.: CV-08-356782  

Name: King Chief ah’she hodeeheehonto v. HMTQ in Right of Canada  
Status: active  
Court File No.: 10-20244 JR  
Description: This is a Notice of Constitutional Question which seems to involve an argument involving Six Nations that among other things relies on the Two Row Wampum Treaty and other Aboriginal and treaty rights, as protection from the jurisdictional obligation to follow Canada’s laws and other obligatory requirements.

Name: Regina v. Michael Clarence Monture  
Status: active  
Court File No.: not available  
Description: The defendant is a member of the Mohawk Nation from the Six Nations of the Grand River, and is seeking relief under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982. The defendant alleges that the sub-standard health facilities are infringing on and limiting his Aboriginal rights, as well as preventing him from delivering contemporary health care.

Out-of-Court settlement discussions:
Since 1999, the Government of Canada, the Province of Ontario and Six Nations have made several attempts to resolve the historical grievances raised in Six Nations’ 1995 lawsuit (refer to Six Nations of the Grand River Band of Indians v. HMTQ in Right of Canada and HMTQ in Right of Ontario, Court file no. 406/95 in the litigation section above for additional information) through out-of-court settlement negotiations. Information on these discussions, including the negotiation process that commenced after the occupation of the Douglas Creek Estates site in Caledonia, Ontario, can be found on the AANDC website at: http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100016334/1100100016335.

Unilateral Protocol:
The Six Nations of the Grand River published a unilateral consultation and accommodation policy in 2009. You may wish to review this protocol to better understand the First Nation’s perspective regarding consultation and accommodation. However, the federal government is not a party to this protocol and does not endorse the content. The link to the protocol is: http://www.sixnations.ca/admConsultationAccomodationPolicy.pdf

Other Considerations

Aboriginal Rights Assertions: the Métis
The inclusion of the Métis in s.35 represents Canada’s commitment to recognize and value their distinctive cultures, which can only survive if they are protected along with other Aboriginal communities. In 2003, the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed Métis rights under s.35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, in the Sault St. Marie area, in the Powley decision. For more information on the Powley decision visit the following link: www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014419

The Office of the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians (OFI) is aware that the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO), its regional and community councils, have asserted a Métis right to harvest in a large section of the province.

The provincial government has accommodated Métis rights on a regional basis within Métis harvesting territories identified by the MNO. These accommodations are based on credible Métis rights assertions. An interim agreement (2004) between the MNO and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) recognizes the MNO’s Harvest Card system. This means that Harvester’s Certificate holders engage in traditional Métis harvest activities within identified Métis traditional territories across the province. For a map of Métis traditional harvesting territories visit the MNO website at: http://www.metisnation.org/harvesting/harvesting-map.aspx

The MNO maintains that Aboriginal ‘rights-holders’ are Métis communities which are collectively represented through the MNO and its community councils. In partnership with community councils, MNO has established a consultation process. The MNO has published regional consultation protocols on their website which offer pre-consultation stage instructions on engaging the Métis through their community councils (via the consultation committee made up of an MNO regional councilor, a community councilor representative and a Captain of the Hunt). Please note however, that this organization does not represent all Métis in Ontario.

Métis Nation of Ontario
Métis Consultation Unit is located within the MNO head office.
500 Old St. Patrick Street, Unit 3
Ottawa, Ontario, K1N 9G4
Phone: (613) 798-1488 Fax: (613) 725-4225
www.metisnation.org/home.aspx

Métis National Council
4-340 MacLaren Street,
Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 0M6
Phone: (613) 232-3216 Fax: (613) 232-4262
www.metisnation.ca

For an indication of the population in Ontario who self-identify as Métis, visit the Statistics Canada website. The Ontario map indicates populations as small as 250 up to over 2,000 within its borders.

Legal Proceedings concerning the Métis in Ontario

Name: HMTQ in Right of Canada v. Michel Blais
Status: active
Court File No.: 08-213
Description: The Applicant is charged with unlawfully harvesting forest resources in a Crown forest without a license contrary to the Crown Forest Sustainability Act, 1994. The Applicant, a Métis, asserts that he is an Aboriginal person within the meaning of s. 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982 and that the alleged harvesting occurred in lands set apart for the Batchewana Band pursuant to the Robinson Treaty of 1850. He claims that the Batchewana First Nation may permit Métis persons to exercise the same Aboriginal and treaty rights as its members pursuant to this treaty.

Name: HMTQ in Right of Canada, Laurie Desautels v. Henry Wetelainen Jr.
Status: active
Court File No.: CV-08-151
Description: The defendant, Henry Wetelainen Jr., intends to question the constitutional validity of sections 28, 31 and 40 of the Crown Forest Sustainability Act (1994), S.O. 1994, c. 25 and Ontario Regulation 167/95, as amended, in relation to an act or omission of the government of Ontario. The defendant claims that he was exercising Aboriginal and treaty rights afforded by the Adhesion to Treaty 3, by harvesting wood within his traditional territory. He claims that he is a Métis/Non-Status Indian and that the imposition of payment for harvesting or use of the forest resource is an infringement and violates his constitutional rights.

Name: Ministry of Natural Resources v. Kenneth Sr. Paquette
Status: active
Court File No.: to be determined
Description: This Notice of Constitutional Question relates to a provincial prosecution involving a charge pertaining to hunting moose. The Defendant intends to assert his s. 35 right as a Métis person to hunt moose, and he also intends to seek a Charter remedy under s. 15 of the Charter.

Court Decisions concerning the Métis in Ontario

Three Métis defendants were charged with fishing violations and claimed that the decision of the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to prosecute them violated the terms of the Interim Agreement (2004) between the MNR and the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO). As the defendants
were indeed Harvester Card holders authorized to fish in the Mattawa/Nipissing territory, therefore, they were entitled to the exemption in the agreement.

The Court concluded that laying of charges against any valid Harvester Card holder who is harvesting in the territory designated on the card within 2 years of the 2004 agreement was a breach. The Interim Agreement itself was silent as to any geographic limitations. There was no mention of the Agreement only applying north and east of Sudbury. Further, the reliance on Harvester Cards, which explicitly contained the territorial designation of the cardholder, signified that the MNR accepted such designations for the purpose of the agreement. The Court was clear to note that this case did not make any ruling regarding the merits of any claim that the Mattawa/Nipissing area contains section 35 rights bearing Métis communities.

Harry Daniels (2013)
The Plaintiffs sought judicial declarations that: Métis and non-Status Indians are “Indians” under section 91(24); that the Crown owes a fiduciary duty to Métis and non-Status Indians as Aboriginal peoples; and, Métis and non-Status Indians have the right to be consulted and negotiated with in good faith by the government of Canada, on a collective basis through representatives of their choice. On January 8, 2013, the Federal Court ruled in favour of Harry Daniels et al and declared Métis and non-status Indians as “Indians” under section 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867. Canada appealed this decision on February 6, 2013.

First Nation Associate Organizations
First Nations may or may not delegate certain authority and/or powers to tribal councils to administer programs, funding and/or services on their behalf. The best source of information with respect to consultation is though individual First Nations themselves.

Specific claims
Specific claims refer to claims made by a First Nation against the federal government related to outstanding lawful obligations, such as the administration of land and other First Nation assets, and to the fulfillment of Indian treaties, although the treaties themselves are not open to re-negotiation. This response provides summaries of active and relevant claims that are current to the date of the response. Claims that have been settled or closed may also be included to give a sense of the First Nation’s claims history with the Crown.

As the claims progress regularly, it is recommended that the status of each claim be reviewed through the Reporting Centre on Specific Claims. A listing of concluded claims is also available through the Reporting Centre at: http://pse5-esd5.ainc-inac.gc.ca/SCBRI_E/Main/ReportingCentre/External/externalreporting.aspx

Self Government Agreement Negotiations
Self-government agreements set out arrangements for Aboriginal groups to govern their internal affairs and assume greater responsibility and control over the decision making that affects their communities. Many comprehensive claims settlements also include various self-government arrangements. Self-government agreements address: the structure and accountability of Aboriginal governments, their law-making powers, financial arrangements and their responsibilities for providing programs and services to their members. Self-government enables Aboriginal governments to work in partnership with other governments and the private sector to promote economic development and improve social conditions.
Anishinabek Nation (Union of Ontario Indians) negotiations on Governance and Education

In 1995, the Anishinabek Nation’s Grand Council authorized its secretariat arm, the Union of Ontario Indians (UOI), to begin self-government negotiations with Canada. Negotiations towards agreements in the areas of education and governance began in 1998.

An agreement-in-principle (AIP) on education was signed in November 2002. In February 2007, the parties signed the AIP with respect to governance. Final agreement negotiations are proceeding in parallel, and together these agreements would mark important steps towards the Anishinabek Nation’s long-term objective of supporting participating First Nations to move out from under the Indian Act.

The governance agreement will provide the establishment of the Anishinabek Nation government and the recognition of participating First Nation lawmaking authority in four core governance areas: leadership selection, citizenship, culture and language, and management and operations of government.

The education AIP authorized the parties to negotiate a final agreement with respect to lawmaking authority for primary, elementary and secondary education for on-reserve members, and to administer AANDC’s post-secondary education assistance program. Negotiations towards a final agreement with respect to education are nearing conclusion. The Province of Ontario is not a party to these negotiations but is engaged in tripartite discussions on particular issues that would assist in the implementation of the final agreement.

To prepare for self-government in member communities, the Union of Ontario Indians has undertaken a range of activities including a Community Engagement Strategy, the development of an appeal and redress process, a constitutional development process and a number of capacity development activities.

**Provincial guidelines**
Under its responsibility to promote stronger Aboriginal relationships, the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs has produced Draft Guidelines on Consultation with Aboriginal Peoples Related to Aboriginal Rights and Treaty Rights. These guidelines are for use by ministries who seek input from key First Nations and Métis organizations, all Ontario First Nations and selected non-Aboriginal stakeholders. To review the guidelines, visit:
December 6, 2013

Mr. Jeff Climans, M.A., MIMA, PLE
Director, Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination
100 Queen Street West
21st Floor, East Tower
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2
jcliman@toronto.ca

Re:  Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Supplemental Information Package for City of Toronto

Dear Jeff:

Since our meeting on September 19th, we have been working on the preliminary design and Environmental Assessment (EA) studies for UP Express electrification. The Notice of Commencement of the EA was issued the first week of December 2013, which initiated the 120 day Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). A second round of Public Open Houses are also planned for January/February 2014.

As discussed at our last meeting, we have prepared the following information package (including the attached study area map) for the City’s review/comment:

1. CityView Traction Power Substation (Hydro One Class EA)
   a. Location Map
   b. TPS Site Plan

2. Kodak Paralleling Station
   a. Location Map
   b. Site Plan of Kodak PS Location
   c. Site Plan for Gantry @ Ray Avenue (including duct banks/anticipated easements)
   d. Cross Section of Duct Bank

3. Ordnance Paralleling Station
   a. Location Map
   b. PS Site Plan/duct banks/gantries (to be updated to reflect future site conditions)
   c. Cross Section of Gantry/Duct Bank

4. EMU Maintenance Facility
   a. Location Map
   b. RRMF Site Plan/Layout
   c. Preliminary traffic modeling results (In progress)
   d. Preliminary employment information (In progress)
5. City-Owned Bridges - Rail Underpasses with OCS attachments (Spadina and Islington)

6. Summary of potential heritage impacts/mitigation

In addition, the following table provides a summary of additional questions/comments from City staff discussed at our previous September 16, 2013 meeting, and how they have been considered by Metrolinx.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Toronto Question/Comment</th>
<th>Metrolinx Response/How comment was considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Owned Bridges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical Maintenance Activity (no OCS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would inspection/maintenance/repairs to City Bridges occur once OCS is attached to the bridges?</td>
<td>1 Track patrol / visual inspection from ground level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Planned / Routine Maintenance of bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Extensive maintenance to bridge soffit in the vicinity of OCS attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested confirmation of who owns the retaining walls under the Strachan Avenue Bridge.</td>
<td>The retaining walls under Strachan Avenue Bridge are owned by Metrolinx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regarding Wallace Ave. Pedestrian Bridge: review of structural drawings and latest condition survey reports to determine if the bridge has the capacity for the additional required bridge barriers.</td>
<td>An additional review and condition survey will be carried out prior to implementation of electrification to determine if the bridge has the capacity for the required bridge barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested that Metrolinx confirm the new John Street, King Street and Church Street bridges (at the Weston Tunnel) have the required bridge barriers (for electrification) incorporated into their designs.</td>
<td>For the Church St. and King St. bridges, we have reviewed the designs for these two bridges and have determined that additional bridge barriers will not be required as part of electrification of the UP Express route. The current bridge barriers will provide adequate protection / pedestrian safety in relation to electrification of the UP Express route. The John St bridge is at 95% completion. Therefore, the final design will be reviewed to ensure that adequate protection / pedestrian safety for electrification is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will post-construction damage to be repaired?</td>
<td>A pre-construction conditions survey will be completed by the contractor prior to commencement of construction work. A post-construction conditions survey will be undertaken after completion of construction and final restoration sign-off will be required jointly between any affected parties and Metrolinx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS Portals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information requested regarding consideration of different options for portal styles (with different visual appearances).</td>
<td>Metrolinx’s Design Review Team will be involved in reviewing potential options for portal structure styles during the Detailed Design phase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Are there potential impacts related to stray current as a result of the electrified system? | In the case of AC traction (which will be implemented for UP Express Electrification), the earth (ground) is a part of the intended return current path for AC traction. Therefore, there is no stray current flow through the ground associated with AC traction. As a result, no corrosion of buried metallic bodies along the path of the return current is anticipated with respect to electrification of the UP Express. |

| At the Sudbury Street portal location (potential horizontal conflict), the City suggested a workshop with City Street Furniture Group to determine how best to locate the OCS poles in this area, which will consider the City’s restoration plan for this area from the current construction work in the area. | A follow up meeting has been scheduled for December 9th, 2013 with the City’s Street Furniture Group and Planning Department to discuss potential design options for the Sudbury Street portal location. |

| A meeting with the City Planning department is required in order to further discuss/confirm: Zoning as it relates to the proposed traction power facility sites, setbacks and urban design standards for industrial/commercial areas, confirmation of Site Plan approval requirements, etc. | A follow up meeting has been scheduled for December 9th, 2013 with the City’s Street Furniture Group and Planning Department to hold initial discussions regarding zoning, setbacks, site plan approval requirements, etc. It is noted that Metrolinx’s Design Review Team will be engaged in the review of traction power facility (TPF) designs prior to subsequent TPS design submissions/consultation with the City. |
We trust that you will circulate copies of this package to your colleagues at the City, as appropriate. We will continue to keep the City informed throughout the EA and preliminary design process and would appreciate receiving your comments on the enclosed information package and/or the previously submitted information (Bridge Barrier Designs, G&B Designs, etc.) by January 17, 2014. In addition, we would be happy to arrange a follow up meeting with you to further discuss the material provided.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2W3
Phone:  (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
Z. Trajkovic, PB
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield

Encl.
UP Express Route Study Area

UP Express Route

Proposed Paralleling Station (Metrolinx - Power Distribution)

Proposed EMU Maintenance Facility (Metrolinx)

Traction Power Substation and 230 kV Connection Line (Hydro One - Power Supply)

Existing Hydro One Transformer Station (TS)

Existing Hydro One 230 kV Transmission Line
Hello Jeff,

Thank you very much for the meeting yesterday. We appreciate your feedback on the information that we have provided to date. As mentioned, we are still working on refinements to the preliminary design and will continue to keep you informed. We will work to incorporate your comments on the draft preliminary designs submitted to date into the final design package and EPR as appropriate.

As a follow-up to our discussion at the meeting, we will consider your initial comments on the following as part of refining the preliminary design:

1. **Gantries** – we need to design 3 sets of gantries at the 3 traction power facilities (City View, Kodak and Ordnance Sites) – preferred locations to be confirmed as part of advancing the preliminary design. The main considerations for siting the gantries are as follows:
   - Close to the traction power facility
   - Complexity of the Track work (which determined the proposed locations)
   - 12m in height/2 m wide /14 m long
   - A secure fenced area (due to high voltage)
   - Sufficient access for a maintenance vehicle

Further review and consideration of measures to minimize visual impacts will be required.

2. **Facilities** – incorporate rail side of the buildings into existing infrastructure, if possible

3. **Heritage** – we will follow up directly with Mary McDonald

4. **Bridges** – we will provide an updated bridge matrix with ownership, including the preliminary identification of utilities (for both rail over road and road over rail)

This is an iterative process and it is very helpful for us to receive your early feedback. We will continue to provide you with updates as the design is refined prior to our final Environmental Project Report.

If you have any questions/concerns, please let me know.

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Hi Karen,

I received your voice message, please see attached the spreadsheet with comments from our Engineering and Construction Services, Linear & Structures Group for the bridges along the electrification corridor. The comments provided are only related to the road over rail bridges.

Thank you.
Regards
Doodnauth

Best regards
Doodnauth Sharma, M.Eng., PMP, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager, City of Toronto
Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination, City Hall,
100 Queen St. W., 21st Floor, East Tower.

T: 416.397.0784, F: 416.338.0808, E: dsharma@toronto.ca.
http://www.toronto.ca/mcic/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Bridge No.</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Bridge Name</th>
<th>Bridge Type</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Identified OCS Method</th>
<th>Ancillary Wires Attached to Bridge</th>
<th>Catenary Wires Attached to Bridge</th>
<th>Bridge Protection Barrier Required</th>
<th>City Comments/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Rogers Centre (Rod Robbie)</td>
<td>Ped Bridge over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Peter Street/Blue Jays Way Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Spadina Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Attach to bridge with tunnel arms on Track B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Portland Av. Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Ped Bridge over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Bathurst Street Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>Metropolitan/City (complicated)</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Port York Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Ped Bridge over Rail (not constructed)</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>Bridge not constructed</td>
<td>City design should make provisions for future track electrification. Additional costs for design/construction associated with provisions to be covered by Metrolinx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Sheppard Ave. Grade Separation</td>
<td>Road over Rail (under construction)</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Tunnel arms mounted to retaining walls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Are the superstructure and parapets designed to withstand the additional wind loading caused by barrier installation? If the City is responsible for the future maintenance of this bridge, maintenance issues associated with connections of OCS and Grounding Grid are a concern to the City. How will rehabilitation in these areas occur? Who will be responsible for removal and reinstatement of the elements to allow for rehabilitation? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Dundas Street Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>Wallace Av. Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Ped Bridge over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Rogers Road Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>40% Metrolinx, 60% City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Jane Street Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Has the bridge been evaluated to determine feasibility of installing protection barriers (capacity to withstand significant additional wind loading)? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>Weston Tunnel (John St., King St., Church St.)</td>
<td>Road over Rail (under construction?)</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Attach to tunnel with tunnel arms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Are the superstructure and parapets designed to withstand the additional wind loading caused by barrier installation? If the City is responsible for the future maintenance of this bridge, maintenance issues associated with connections of OCS and Grounding Grid are a concern to the City. How will rehabilitation in these areas occur? Who will be responsible for removal and reinstatement of the elements to allow for rehabilitation? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>Eglinton Ave. Bridge</td>
<td>Road over Rail</td>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>Free run without attachment except for Track W1, each will have using arms temporarily move OCS out of way to allow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does the connection of the OCS have the potential for galvanic reactions that may result in accelerated deterioration of the steel in that area? If transparent barriers are installed, who is responsible for maintenance/leaning?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 14, 2014

To: Doodnauth Sharma, Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination Office

From: Harold Madi, Director, Urban Design

Re: Metrolinx Union Pearson Express Electrification EA
Urban Design and Community Planning Comments

Overview

The Union Pearson Express corridor will become a major gateway to the city and should be a source of civic pride through its design.

Quality design should be the highest priority.

Ensure there is proactive design leadership throughout the detailed design process.

Carefully examine the need for all proposed infrastructure within the corridor, with the objective of installing it only where absolutely necessary (i.e. minimize the number of structures required).

Minimize the visual and physical impacts of the elements especially the gantries and the support structures.

Elements must not result in barriers or impediments to larger development opportunities along the corridor.

Integrate the individual elements into larger development (e.g. at Mount Dennis incorporate the Paralleling Station into the Maintenance and Storage Facility building).

Please see attached map, for reference, illustrating the proposed project elements which relate to comments herein.
Detailed Comments
Develop a comprehensive vision for the overall design, details and treatment, including materials, of all elements within the corridor. The vision should include objectives which strive to:
- enrich the pedestrian realm
- enrich the sensory experience of users along the corridor, creating a positive impression of this gateway to the city

Design elements should be cohesive and be reflective of this vision:
- Consider the various character areas within the corridor; different design treatments may be warranted to ensure they are contextually sensitive
- Integrate elements into larger developments. If this is not possible, ensure that the design of the elements adds positively to the experience along the corridor and contributes positively to the surrounding context.
- Group elements such as the Paralleling Stations and the Gantries, in order to reduce the number of structures
- Ensure treatments are coordinated with proposed Noise Wall designs, where proposed
- Create coordinated rhythms and sequences of elements

Bridges
Bridges are a relatively rare urban experience, therefore, their treatment requires special attention.

Views available from the Bridges of Interest include views to the city and of the skyline. They also provide a variety of perspective views along the rail corridor, such as from Dundas Street Bridge, and Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge. The views should be studied and preserved or enhanced.

Views to bridges should not be obscured by the OCS support structures. It is recommended that the wires be supported by the bridge structures rather than have the support structures located on either side of the bridges.

OCS should not be placed within right-of-way bridge vistas:
- Seek maximum 65m spacing distance between placement of OCS on bridges (See example below for clarification)
**Bridge Barrier Protections**
The requirement of 1.8 metre high Bridge Barrier Protections on all bridges over the rail corridor requires sensitive design solutions, unique for every bridge. Develop a creative design concept that is suitable to the significant civic importance of these structures:
- High quality design is required on all bridges
- Bridge Barrier Protections should not obscure views
- Design concepts should embrace the experiential quality of these structures from the perspective of a pedestrian
- The pedestrian experience should be enhanced, not detracted, by the Protection system as it relates to views and sense of openness that is afforded by bridges
- Concept should celebrate the civic gateway quality of the rail corridor; the Barriers should not detract from the visual appearance of the city

The Bridge Barrier Protection shown in the precedent image on page 26 of the document dated Feb 19th 2014 does not satisfy the above objectives, and is unacceptable to the City as a solution along this important gateway corridor.

**Place-making, Public Art, Lighting Plan**
Develop an integrated lighting plan for Bridge Barrier Protections to ensure a safe night-time environment.

Lighting and public art should be used to enhance the pedestrian experience and facilitate place making.

Different designs/expressions may be warranted to define exceptional locations and to help with place-making.

**Ordnance Street Gantry (Strachan Avenue)**
The City does not support the location of the proposed gantry at Strachan Avenue. A substantial investment has been made by the City and Metrolinx to improve connectivity in the rail corridor, as well as the quality of the urban environment so that Strachan will become a lively, liveable city street. The proposed gantry at Strachan Ave compromises this city building objective and the overall ambitions of the grade separation project by adding significant visual clutter to an area that has been carefully designed and "repaired" in recent years.

The following is recommended as an alternative:
- Relocate the gantry to an area that is less significant in terms of its gateway qualities, heritage context, and public realm impact
- If a suitable alternative location for the gantry cannot be found, work in consultation with the City and the local community to determine an appropriate treatment. This could include:
  o Locating the gantry fully underground
  o Locating it partially underground, and creating a screen by mounding and other landscape design techniques
  o Screening the gantry with vegetation or an integrated artistic design element, structure, screen, or veil
Paralleling Station / Communication Tower / Access Road (Ordnance Street)

Continue to work with city Staff, Friends of Fort York, the developers and their designers, and the local community to ensure the visual impact of the proposed paralleling station, access road, and relocation of the existing communication tower is minimized, and does not detract from the quality of the proposed public park, or from views and vistas in this vicinity (such as from the proposed pedestrian and cycling bridge, and from Fort York).

The grading of the proposed Ordnance Park should be finalized by city Staff, in consultation with Metrolinx, prior to the finalization of the design for the Paralleling station. Consideration should be given to locating at least part of the proposed paralleling station below-grade to ensure the station does not impact eastward views from the proposed Ordnance Park into the Downtown.

Metrolinx should provide information to the City for review detailing any potential noise and/or electromagnetic field issues which may impact public enjoyment of the adjacent park space.

Views to and from Fort York

Consult with city Staff, Fort York, and the Friends of Fort York on the position on the OCS to ensure views and vistas to this National Historic Site are not impacted.

Paralleling Station (3500 Eglinton Ave W – Mount Dennis)

Refer to the Metrolinx Mount Dennis Mobility Hub Study, particularly related to the Industry Street and Ray Avenue street frontages and the need to achieve active, interesting and attractive building edges facing the Black Creek Business Area within the Employment Area.

The proposed Paralleling Station should be integrated within the Maintenance and Storage Facility or alternatively, should be setback on the Metrolinx lands and should not occupy a prominent location along the street frontages. The street frontages are valuable and should be treated as such with active and animated buildings. The current proposed location for the Paralleling Station will prevent these objectives from being achieved.

Efforts should be made to reduce the amount of infrastructure required. A more compact proposal which reduces the length of the duct banks required and reduces the overall footprint of the proposals should be explored. The duct bank should be located on the Metrolinx lands rather than within the municipal right-of-way and should be buried by at least 1.5 metres of soil depth in order to accommodate tree planting along the Industry Street and Ray Avenue street frontages.

The location of gantries should minimize impacts on adjacent sensitive land uses including limiting the impacts upon views from the 15- and 10-storey buildings on Denarda Street and Oxford Drive.

It appears that the landscape triangle on the north side of Ray Avenue, west of the rail corridor, may be better able to accommodate the gantry and have a lesser impact upon residential lands.
Proposed Maintenance and Storage Facility at 50 Resources Road
Can the Mount Dennis Maintenance and Storage Facility be designed to accommodate the Union Pearson Express vehicles and eliminate the need for two Metrolinx Maintenance Facilities in such close proximity to one another?

The Site Specific By-law 844-2010 for 50 Resources Road prohibits the use of the site for a maintenance yard. A copy of the By-law is attached for reference. It is recommended that a Zoning Amendment/Site Plan application process be undertaken for the maintenance facility.

The impact of the maintenance facility on the adjacent land uses and proposed mitigation requires additional consideration. The proposal to construct a 4.5 metre high and 190 metre long noise barrier along the northern edge of the Weston Golf and Country Club appears to be excessive. Could the noise mitigation be achieved with a berm in combination with lower grades on the 50 Resources Road site?

Harold Madi  
Director, Urban Design  
City Planning

ATTACHMENTS:  
- Reference Map  
- By-law 844-2010
Metrolinx Electrification Environmental Assessment
City of Toronto Comments
March 17, 2014

A) Transportation Services

"Traffic Planning reviewed the traffic impact study (prepared by Hatch Mott MacDonald), dated February 12, 2014, that examines the traffic impacts of the proposed Resources Road Maintenance Facility; to be used as a rail car storage and servicing yard for the proposed Metrolinx "Union-Pearson Express Electrification - EA".

The proposed maintenance facility is to be situated at the south-east quadrant of the newly constructed public road (Street A) and Resources Rd roundabout intersection (in the Islington Ave/Hwy 401 area). The existing CNR rail corridor abuts the south side of site, which will be accessed to shuttle rail cars to be serviced/stored.

Both of these new road improvements were constructed in conjunction with the new commercial development (approved by Council in July 2010) along the east side of Resources Rd that includes: a Lowe's home improvement store and freestanding restaurant on the north side of the proposed public road extension east of Resources Rd (referred to as Street A); and, three separate office buildings and a hotel on the south side of this public road.

While the Lowe's development parcel is now complete, the office/hotel complex was not constructed, and is now to be occupied by the proposed maintenance facility development.

We wish to point out the traffic impacts of this commercial development was comprehensively reviewed by Lowe's traffic engineering consultant (Dillon Consulting) in 2009. In addition to the new Street A and the Resources Rd roundabout, other area road/operational improvements included: design modifications to the existing Hwy 401 on-ramp at Islington Ave (to separate the joint ramp to the existing one-way eastbound access to Resources Rd; and, traffic signal phasing changes at the Islington Ave/Hwy 401 eastbound ramp/Resources Rd signalized intersection.

The proposed maintenance facility is expected to operate 24 hours a day over three shifts, six days a week. Mott Hatch MacDonald indicates that employee traffic will represent the primary trip generator; visitor traffic and deliveries are expected to add only a few daily trips. On this basis, the facility is expected to generate a peak of 75 inbound/69 outbound trips in the am peak hour and 35 inbound/75 outbound trips in the pm peak hour.

Based on the projected volume of site-generated traffic, the proposed maintenance facility is expected to generate significantly less vehicle traffic compared to the previously approved 'as-of-right' hotel/office development. In addition, the peak in-and outbound traffic surges during the shift start times of 7:00 am, 3:00 pm and 11:00 pm do not coincide with the adjacent am and pm street peak hour periods, which further mitigates the impact on the adjacent street system.

In conclusion, the proposed Resources Rd maintenance facility is not expected to negatively impact the level of service of the adjacent street system.

Contact for follow-up:
**B) Toronto Water**

Information provided does not contain sufficiently detailed drawings showing where the proposed (4m by 1 m) electrification duct banks are to be located, consequently there are unresolved concerns as to:

- induced currents (from the 25kV duct bank cables) in adjacent Toronto Water metallic infrastructure / galvanic corrosion,
- telemetry interference with Toronto Water assets (Strachan Pumping Station & Western Beaches Battery Park PS) from duct banks, and
- physical access obstruction to Toronto Water infrastructure from the duct banks.

Additionally, the associated costs of (electrical) bonding of Toronto Water Infrastructure should be identified as part of the project, (similarly for any additional maintenance costs associated with the proximity of the duct banks to Toronto Water assets).

Contact for follow-up:

Brian Worsley, P.Eng., MICE, PMP  
Senior Engineer  
Policy & Program Development  
Toronto Water  
18th Floor, 55 John Street  
416-397-5383  
bworsle@toronto.ca

**C) Toronto Fire Services**

Toronto Fire Services provides the following comments regarding the Ordnance Street Paralleling Station:

1. The access drive is 6m wide and 300m long with no ability to turn around where it ends. A turn-around area sufficient to accommodate an aerial fire apparatus should be constructed at the end of the access drive.

2. The current proposal would only permit fire apparatus to line up in a queue, with only the lead apparatus close proximity to the station.

3. Clarification Required – Will Fire apparatus have access to the rail lines at the Maintenance facility at 50 Resources Rd. if required?

4. Clarification Required – Will Fire apparatus have access beyond the bridge protection barriers?

Contact for follow-up:

Mario Trevellin - District Chief  
Emergency Management  
Health & Safety  
Toronto Fire Services  
4330 Dufferin St.
Fire Prevention has reviewed UP Express Electrification EA Summary Documents dated February 28th, 2014. Based on the scope and stage of this project, Fire Prevention has no significant comments at this time. Fire Prevention reviews for fire department access to buildings and this is dealt with at the Site Plan Approval process.

If a proposed building is not subject to the Site Plan Approval process, the fire department access is reviewed by Toronto Building under the Building Permit process. Fire department access shall meet the requirements of the Ontario Building Code, Division B, Subsection 3.2.5.

When the design is complete, Fire Prevention should review the buildings at 50 Resource Road, the passenger terminals and at the Ordnance Street (Triangle) and any other associated buildings. Fire Prevention had previously provided comments for the Ordnance Street (Triangle), but as the design is still preliminary, final approval has not been given. When the fire access route exceeds 90 metres in length, a turnaround facility is required. See attached pdf for acceptable turnaround facilities.

Contact for follow-up:

Susan Ing
Toronto Fire Services
Fire Prevention
Fire Plans Examiner
South Command
(416) 338-9354
sing@toronto.ca

D) City Legal

I appreciate that this exercise is primarily one where operational issues are flagged for Metrolinx. However, I thought it would be worth identifying a just few of the legal issues that come to mind, at least on a high level, for City staff to keep in mind as this process moves forward.

1. In at least a couple of places in the EA summary documents, it is noted that there will be a review of individual board orders and agreements to identify costs to be borne by Metrolinx. While I may be mistaken, my sense is that Metrolinx is considering dealing with costs for each crossing work on an individual basis. We need to consider whether this is the best approach for the City or whether we’d prefer dealing with such costs differently. Do we want a general cost sharing arrangement; perhaps one that takes into account the work that has been done on the same line for the Union-Pearson Express? Certainly, if we have successfully negotiated template crossing agreements, the terms of those would likely be considered as part of our negotiating strategy. If we have a global cost-sharing arrangement, would we want to consider costs arising from mitigation measures that may need to be put into place as a result of electrification of the rails (e.g. bonding or grounding)?
2. Who is going to do any work to put in place mitigation measures, who will be paying for those, is Metrolinx going to indemnify the City for potential damage/claims that may arise from the installation of these measures, and who will be responsible for any increased operational/maintenance costs related to these measures/electrification? These are the kinds of questions that will need to be answered once we have more information on the work involved.

3. Once the design work is further along, do we need/want to formalize a design review process for work impacting City infrastructure?

4. Are the relocation provisions of any Municipal Access Agreement triggered by any relocations of telecom utilities? Who is responsible for these costs? Again, these are just some issues that come to mind that staff should keep in mind as this project moves forward. It's not clear to me that we need to flag these to Metrolinx just yet.

Contact for follow-up:

Katherine Frankl
Solicitor
City of Toronto/Legal Services
26th Floor, Metro Hall, 55 John Street,
Toronto, ON M5V 3C6
Telephone: (416) 397-5406
Fax: (416) 397-5624
kfrankl@toronto.ca
Hi James,

Please see attached zip file with Third Party & Utility Review requirements.

Thank you.
Regards
Doodnauth

Best regards
Doodnauth Sharma, M.Eng., PMP, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager, City of Toronto
Major Capital Infrastructure Coordination, City Hall,
100 Queen St. W., 21st Floor, East Tower.

T: 416.397.0784, F: 416.338.0808, E: dsharma@toronto.ca.
http://www.toronto.ca/mcic/

>>> Avi Bachar 20/03/2014 1:12 PM >>>
Hi Doodnauth

Attached is a ZIP file that contains the electronic copy of the Third Party Review, General Info document and associated documents (total 19 files). This document is something we send to new Applicants to help them and their consultant(s) through the review process of this project. To access the information in this document, open the file TPR__General_Info.pdf. This file has the links to all the associated documents. Please ensure to place these documents in the same folder, in order for the links in the TPR__General_Info.pdf document to function properly.

A.
To Derek Reynolds  
Account Executive, Hydro One - Customer Business Relations

From Karen Pitre, Executive Director Electrification

Date October 25, 2013

Re Metrolinx Electrification and Hydro One Clearance Requirements

Purpose

This memo outlines the electrical clearance requirements for Metrolinx electrification of UP Express. It will also serve to facilitate discussion on any conflicts between electrification overhead contact system (OCS) clearance requirements and Hydro One clearance requirements.

Background

Generally, the electrification system is comprised of a series of portal frame structures spaced along the railway corridor at intervals of up to 65m (213.25’) OSC lines strung from portal to portal. The OCS consists of several lines including the contact wire, the messenger wire, the negative feeder wire and the static wire.

Figure 1 shows a three-dimensional view of a typical layout arrangement of the electrification system in the vicinity of Hydro One transmission lines.
Hi James,

I’ve outlined Toronto Hydro’s comments below based on review of various documents from Metrolinx and the City of Toronto. For this email, ‘City Report’ refers to the draft document ‘City of Toronto Summary Package_Feb 2014 FINAL_Revision 1.pdf’. Other documents reviewed include presentations from Metrolinx, as well as reports from 2010-2012 available on the Metrolinx website.

1. The City Report indicates that all THESL overhead crossings will have to be relocated under the rail corridor. There are 44 locations identified in the report where THESL crosses the existing GO rail corridor with overhead infrastructure. These relocations will have a significant impact on THESL. The reason for relocation is cited from the Ontario Electrical Safety Code, Section 75. This point will need to be discussed in greater detail because, as a local distribution company (LDC), THESL is not governed by the Ontario Electrical Code.

2. What is the projected timeline for this project, and in turn, what is the required timeline for THESL relocations? THESL will require significant resources and time to complete any required relocations. The City Report estimates overhead to underground relocations for THESL to be $250,000 per location. Past experience has shown that overhead to underground relocation projects of this nature will be at least $1,000,000 per location. In addition to the incredible cost impact, past experience has shown that these type of relocation projects take 1-2 years per location. This could pose a challenge, given the extensive number of locations. Significant lead time is required for any THESL relocations. Metrolinx needs to engage Toronto Hydro Relocates at utility.relocations@torontohydro.com for all relocation projects.

3. Are there more details available to the timing of the other aspects of the project, such as financial approval, detailed design, construction staging, construction, and energization? When will Metrolinx be able to confirm that this project will be moving forward?

4. Will the construction methods used impact any existing THESL infrastructure outside of the rail corridor? Will any Metrolinx infrastructure be installed outside of the rail corridor that could be in conflict with existing THESL infrastructure?

5. Based on the report, it is assumed that no bridges will need to be reconstructed as a result of the electrification process. This leads to the assumption that the only impact to THESL infrastructure on bridges should be proper grounding and bonding.

6. Will Metrolinx require an additional low voltage, or high voltage, connections from THESL?

7. Prior to any mitigation measures being put into place, THESL will require additional time for the Standards team to review the following:
   - grounding and bonding techniques
   - the effect of radiated and conducted electrical emissions as a result of electrification

8. Based on the City Report (pg. 68), it is assumed that there is no stray current from the proposed electrification.
Metrolinx has initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25kms of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor from just west of the Union Station train shed to Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport.

As outlined in the attached letter and in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 (TPAP), Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we are requesting assistance from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs to identify potentially interested Aboriginal communities for this project. We have also sent an original copy of the letter to you in the mail.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
March 27, 2013

Ms. Wendy Cornet, Acting Manager
Consultation Unit
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs
9th Floor-160 Bloor Street East
Toronto ON M7A 2E6
Phone: 416-325-4044
Fax: 416-325-1066
E-mail: wendy.cornet@ontario.ca

Re: Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Ms. Cornet:

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union-Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25kms of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and the Kitchener rail corridor from just west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The EA study area also includes potential locations for proposed traction power facilities as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed (see key map below).

The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, engineering design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate new electrical connection facilities, which will be provided by Hydro One, including design of two new traction power substations and transmission line network connection(s). These particular project components are subject to Hydro One’s Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (1992). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One will carry out a Joint EA process in order to satisfy the requirements of O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as well as Hydro One’s Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities.

In accordance with TPAP requirements, Metrolinx has contacted the Ministry of Environment (MOE) to request a list of agencies that can assist in identifying interested Aboriginal communities. As per MOE’s direction, we are requesting assistance from the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs to identify potentially
interested Aboriginal communities for this project. Please note that Hydro One has also contacted the Ministry of Energy in accordance with their Class EA process to request direction with respect to the Crown’s duty to consult.

For additional information on this project, please visit the project website: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification project and we will continue to keep you informed as the EA progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Gibson, Ministry of Energy
General Contact, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
G. McNeil, GO Transit
M. Maracle, Hydro One
P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
April 19, 2013

Karen Pitre
Metrolinx
20 Bay St, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario
M5J 2W3

Re: Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment

Dear Karen Pitre:

Thank you for informing the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) of your project. Please note that MAA treats all letters, emails, general notices, etc. about a project as a request for information about which Aboriginal communities may have rights or interests in the project area.

For future Environmental Assessment (EA) inquiry correspondence to MAA, please take note of the following:

1. please send all future EA correspondence to the following email address: MAA.EA.Review@ontario.ca; or
2. if you prefer to send a hard copy rather than email, please address your correspondence as follows:
   Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs, Consultation Unit
   160 Bloor Street East, 4th floor
   Toronto, Ontario, Canada
   M7A 2E6.

As a member of the government review team, the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) identifies First Nation and Métis communities who may have the following interests in the area of your project:

- reserves;
- land claims or claims in litigation against Ontario;
- existing or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights, such as harvesting rights; or
- an interest in the area of the project.
MAA is not the approval or regulatory authority for your project, and receives very limited information about projects in the early stages of their development. In circumstances where a Crown-approved project may negatively impact a claimed Aboriginal or treaty right, the Crown may have a duty to consult the Aboriginal community advancing the claim. The Crown often delegates procedural aspects of its duty to consult to proponents. Please note that the information in this letter should not be relied on as advice about whether the Crown owes a duty to consult in respect of your project, or what consultation may be appropriate. Should you have any questions about your consultation obligations, please contact the appropriate ministry.

You should be aware that many First Nations and/or Métis communities either have or assert rights to hunt and fish in their traditional territories. For First Nations, these territories typically include lands and waters outside of their reserves.

In some instances, project work may impact aboriginal archaeological resources. If any Aboriginal archaeological resources could be impacted by your project, you should contact your regulating or approving Ministry to inquire about whether any additional Aboriginal communities should be contacted. Aboriginal communities with an interest in archaeological resources may include communities who are not presently located in the vicinity of the proposed project.

With respect to your project, and based on the brief materials you have provided, we can advise that the project appears to be located in an area where First Nations may have existing or asserted rights or claims in Ontario’s land claims process or litigation, that could be impacted by your project. Contact information is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation</th>
<th>Chief Bryan LaForme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2789 Mississauga Rd., R.R. #6</td>
<td>(905) 768-1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGERSVILLE, Ontario</td>
<td>(Fax) 768-1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N0A 1H0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bryanlafrome@newcreditfirstnation.com">bryanlafrome@newcreditfirstnation.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information upon which the above comments are based is subject to change. First Nation or Métis communities can make claims at any time, and other developments can occur that could result in additional communities being affected by or interested in your undertaking.

Through Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development (AANDC), the Government of Canada sometimes receives claims that Ontario does not receive, or with which Ontario does not become involved. AANDC’s Consultation and Accommodation Unit (CAU) established a “single window” to respond to requests for baseline information held by AANDC on established or potential Aboriginal Treaty and rights. To request information from the Ontario Subject Matter Expert send an email to: UCA-CAU@aadnc-aandc.gc.ca

Additional details about your project or changes to it that suggest impacts beyond what you have provided to date may necessitate further consideration of which Aboriginal communities may be affected by or interested in your undertaking. If you think that further consideration may be required, please bring your inquiry to whatever government body
oversees the regulatory process for your project. MAA does not wish to be kept informed of the progress of the project; please be sure to remove MAA from the mailing list.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Heather Levecque  
Manager, Consultation Unit  
Aboriginal Relations and Ministry Partnerships Division
Re: Environmental Assessment for Electrification of the Airport Rail Link Service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

In July 2009, Metrolinx completed an environmental assessment for the Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union-Pearson Rail Link (GSSE-UPRL). This project includes a number of infrastructure improvements along the Kitchener (previously known as Georgetown) corridor, including a separate spur line to allow for operation of the Air Rail Link service between Union Station and Pearson Airport.

Following this, the GO Electrification Study was completed in December 2010. Based on the findings of this Study, Metrolinx has now initiated the electrification design and environmental assessment (EA) for Phase 1: the Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. A consultant team led by Parsons Brinckerhoff (engineering/design lead), along with Morrison Hershfield (EA lead) has been hired to support this work. The preliminary project study area includes the ARL corridor as well as potential locations for electrification infrastructure (see key map below).
The ARL Electrification project includes design and engineering of the power supply and distribution for the ARL corridor, as well as development of performance standards for electrification. In addition, as part of electrifying the ARL corridor, there are a number of related infrastructure requirements such as Traction Power Substation(s), Switching Station(s), and Paralleling Station(s). Metrolinx is working closely with Hydro One to identify potential locations for the required electrification infrastructure and to coordinate EA process requirements as they relate to the electricity supply portion of the project under Ontario Regulation 116/01. The project also includes assessment of Maintenance Facility(s) options.

The potential impacts of electrifying the ARL corridor will be assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as outlined in Ontario Regulation 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (Transit Projects Regulation). Metrolinx is currently in the Pre-Planning Phase of this process, and the project team has initiated data collection in relation to establishing baseline conditions in the project study area (see key map above).

With this in mind, the ARL project team would like to request species at risk, terrestrial and fisheries data in relation to the ARL Electrification project. The attached table outlines our fisheries data request including: fish species present, thermal regime, timing restrictions and sensitivity of the water body. With respect to terrestrial features, we currently have Land Information Ontario (LIO) and Natural Heritage Information (NHIC), however we would like to request any additional information on natural heritage features and species at risk as it relates to the project study area.

A number of public consultation events will be held throughout the study to provide project updates, share information, and seek feedback. Advance notice of these events will be published in local newspapers, posted on the project website (http://www.gotransit.com/estudy/en/default.aspx) and issued to those parties on the project Contact List. Consultation with the public, review agencies and aboriginal peoples is a key component of the ARL Electrification project, and we will continue to provide you with project updates and seek comments/feedback at key stages of the project as the study progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification

CC:
M. Harrison, Supervisor – Project Coordination, Ministry of the Environment, EAAB
R. Fisher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody Name and Location</th>
<th>Watercourse classification (i.e., warmwater, coldwater)</th>
<th>Habitat information/locations (fish passage barriers, known spawning habitats etc.)</th>
<th>Historical data on fish species present, including whether the subject waterbody(s) are considered to support any vulnerable, threatened or endangered aquatic species</th>
<th>Watershed Plans and Fisheries Management Objectives, if applicable</th>
<th>Interpretation of fish and fish habitat sensitivity (scale of high, moderate, low or unknown as per DFO's Risk Management Framework)</th>
<th>Fisheries Timing Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimico Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good Afternoon Ms. Pitre,

Please accept the attached letter in response to your species at risk information request.

Please provide us with the details of your proposal via the information gathering form accessed here:
http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/FormDetail?OpenForm&ACT=RDR&TAB=PROFILE&SRCH=1&ENV=WWE&TIT=0180&NO=018-0180E

Thank you.

Eva Bobak  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
Aurora District Office  
Tel 905.713.7398  
Fax 905.713.7361  
eva.bobak@ontario.ca
May 18, 2012

Karen Pitre
Project Director, Electrification Study
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

Re: Electrification of the Airport Rail Link System from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

Dear Ms. Pitre,

In your letter dated April 24, 2012 you requested information on natural heritage features and element occurrences occurring on or adjacent to the above mentioned location.

There are a number of Species at Risk recorded from your study area. We have records of Peregrine Falcon, Barn Swallow, Blanding’s Turtle, Milksnake and Butternut as well as historical records of Northern Map Turtle, Eastern Musk Turtle, Eastern Hog-nosed Snake and Eastern Ribbonsnake in the vicinity of your study area. Some of these species may receive protection under the Endangered Species Act 2007 and thus, a permit may be required if the work you are proposing could cause harm to these species or their habitat. Please provide additional information on your proposal to our office, and we will assess it to determine whether a permit under the ESA 2007 is required for the works to proceed.

Natural heritage features recorded for your area include the High Park Oak Woodlands ANSI, a number of identified wetlands as well as two Environmentally Significant Areas.

This species at risk information is highly sensitive and is not intended for any person or project unrelated to this undertaking. Please do not include any specific information in reports that will be available for public record. As you complete your fieldwork in these areas, please report all information related to any species at risk to the NHIC and to our office. This will assist with updating our database.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 905-713-7425.

Sincerely,

Melinda Thompson
Species at Risk Biologist
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Aurora District
Hello Stephanie,

No Redside Dace present in reaches of stream within your study area (Mimico Cr, Black Creek and Humber River).

Mimico Creek is a warmwater fish community comprised of a variety of baitfish including shiners, dace and minnows. Fish communities of the Black and main Humber are described in the Humber River Fisheries Management Plan.

Regards,

Mark Heaton
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
Aurora District

From: Stephanie Goom [mailto:SGoom@morrisonhershfield.com]
Sent: June 4, 2012 3:06 PM
To: Heaton, Mark (MNR)
Cc: Karen Pitre; Melinda Thompson; McAllister, Aurora (MNR); Bobak, Eva (MNR); Amber Saltarelli
Subject: RE: Electrification of the Airport Rail Link System from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

Hi Mark,

On behalf of Metrolinx, we requested fisheries and terrestrial data for the proposed ARL Electrification Project (please see attached). Eva kindly provided us with information on species at risk on May 18, 2012; however will still require fisheries data for the Baseline Conditions report, do be completed this month. We currently have the Fisheries Management Plan and background information from previous reports, however if there is any additional information on fisheries, can you please provide to us in the table attached. We checked the DFO SAR mapping, however we wanted to confirm the potential for Redside Dace (or other aquatic SAR) within the three ARL crossings at Mimico Creek, Black Creek and the Humber River.

Kind Regards,

Stephanie Goom, BES
Fisheries Biologist and Environmental Planner
SGoom@morrisonhershfield.com
Hello Eva,

On behalf of Metrolinx, thank you for the information you provided regarding species at risk as it relates to the ARL Electrification project.

Our April 24th letter also included a request for fisheries information (please see letter attached). Can you please advise on the status of this information request?

Thank you,

Amber Saltarelli, MCIP, RPP, PMP
Environmental Planner
asaltarelli@morrisonhershfield.com

From: Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2012 12:10 PM
To: Amber Saltarelli; Paul Draycott
Cc: James Hartley; George Ardavanis
Subject: FW: Electrification of the Airport Rail Link System from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

From: Bobak, Eva (MNR) [mailto:Eva.Bobak@ontario.ca]
Sent: May 18, 2012 2:58 PM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: Melinda Thompson; McAllister, Aurora (MNR)
Subject: Electrification of the Airport Rail Link System from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

Good Afternoon Ms. Pitre,

Please accept the attached letter in response to your species at risk information request.

Please provide us with the details of your proposal via the information gathering form accessed here:
http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/FormDetail?OpenForm&ACT=RDR&TAB=PROFILE&SRCH=1&ENV=WWE&TIT=0180&NO=018-0180E

Thank you.

Eva Bobak
Ministry of Natural Resources
Aurora District Office
Tel 905.713.7398
Fax 905.713.7361
eva.bobak@ontario.ca
Dear Jackie,

My apologies for the belated response and Happy New Year.

As a follow up to your December 5th 2013 email, we have provided the following additional information in response to your questions:

With regard to your first question, the preferred power distribution system for UP Express electrification is an Overhead Contact System (OCS) that is comprised of a wiring system which will provide power to the electric trains. The wiring system will be suspended from new OCS support structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track (See Photo #1), including on bridges/overpasses where required. The majority of OCS support structures will be situated within the existing Metrolinx rail Right-of-Way (ROW), except for a small number of locations where the structures cannot be accommodated within the existing ROW.

Photo #1 – Typical OCS Support Structures

In addition to OCS support structures, there are four facilities that will need to be built to support electrification, all of which are located outside of the rail corridor. The proposed locations of these facilities are shown on the attached map as follows:

1. Traction Power Substation (TPS) - in the vicinity of CityView Drive and the rail corridor
a. The TPS is being assessed under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities by Hydro One
2. Paralleling Station (PS) - in the vicinity of Eglinton Ave West and the rail corridor
   a. The PS is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process by Metrolinx
3. Paralleling Station (PS) - in the vicinity of Strachan Ave and the rail corridor
   a. The PS is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process by Metrolinx
4. Maintenance Facility - in the vicinity of Islington Avenue and the rail corridor
   a. The Maintenance Facility is being assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process by Metrolinx

Regarding your second question related to heavy equipment required for construction, the proposed methods for installing the new OCS portals/cantilever and overhead wires are as follows:

a) Installation of the OCS foundations (approximately every 50-65m along the corridor)

b) Installation of OCS Portal/Cantilever Structures
   - Once foundations are in place, OCS portal/cantilever structures will be installed - structures to be transported to the site either by truck or railcar.
   - For portals: structures are pre-assembled and ready to lift
   - Erect structures using track crane

c) Install OCS Wiring
   - Typically completed using a four vehicle wiring unit on the rail corridor

d) Construction of facilities – this will require the typical equipment used for construction of facilities

We trust the information provided above addresses your questions, however if you would like additional information or clarification, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com

Cc: P. Staite, Hydro One
    A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
Thank you for the notification. Is this telling me that the “electrification” will be contained within the existing rail routes and suspended from existing structures? Also, will any heavy equipment be necessary to install the wiring?

Jackie Burkart
District Planner
Ministry of Natural Resources | 50 Bloomington Road, Aurora, ON L4G 0L8 | Phone: 905-713-7368 | Fax: 905-713-7360 | Email: jackie.burkart@ontario.ca

From: Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
Sent: December 3, 2013 1:50 PM
To: Pickles, David (MAA); Kulpa, Paula (MTCS); Chrzan, Tom (MCI); Thompson, Melinda (MNR); Pella Keen, Debbie (MNR); Burkart, Jackie (MNR); Sanzo, Adam (ENE); Garcia-Wright, Agatha (ENE); Goyette, Dolly (ENE); Dufresne, Tina (ENE); rod.adams@ontario.ca; Posluns, Andrew (MTO); Petro, Charles (MTO); Mitchell, Steven (EDU); Springman, Hartley (ENERGY); Jenkins, Allan (ENERGY); bwilliston@trca.on.ca
Cc: ‘patricia.staite@HydroOne.com’; Amber Saltarelli
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification Project: Notice of Commencement

Importance: High

Please find attached the Notice of Commencement of Transit Project Assessment Process and Class Environmental Assessment for the Union Pearson Express Electrification Project.

Metrolinx is proposing to electrify the Union Pearson (UP) Express route beginning at the future UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at the future UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Toronto Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. Electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System (Metrolinx) and Traction Power Supply System (Hydro One). As a result, Metrolinx and Hydro One are carrying out a parallel EA process to satisfy both Metrolinx’s requirements under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Hydro One’s requirements under the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA).

Consultation with the public, review agencies, First Nations and Métis communities is a key component to the UP Express Electrification EA. Joint Public Open Houses are planned for winter 2014 to present a project update and seek feedback on both the TPAP (Metrolinx) and Class EA (Hydro One) project components. In the meantime, if you have any comments/feedback for the project team or would like additional, more detailed information, please contact us via e-mail or phone:

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification

Patricia Staite
Environmental Planner
Hydro One Networks Inc.
483 Bay Street TCT6
Toronto, ON M5G 2P5
Tel: 416-345-6799
patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
www.HydroOne.com/projects
Good morning Jackie,

As per our discussed, here is the overall route maps with additional maps to show the facility locations.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Regards,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
PS footprint approx. 45m X 20 m
Legend
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Project No.: 1124019.00
Date: August 2013
Agatha Garcia-Wright  
Director, Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Ave. W.  
Floor 12A  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5  
e-mail: agatha.garcia-wright@ontario.ca

Dear Ms. Garcia-Wright:

Re: Initiation of the Metrolinx Airport Rail Link Electrification Project and request for list of bodies that may assist in identifying Aboriginal Communities

Metrolinx is currently in the pre-planning phase of the Airport Rail Link (ARL) Electrification Project. Based on the findings of the GO Electrification Study completed in December 2010, Metrolinx has initiated the electrification design and environmental assessment (EA) for Phase 1: the Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. The preliminary project study area includes the ARL corridor as well as potential locations for electrification infrastructure (see key map below).
The ARL Electrification project includes design and engineering of the power supply and distribution for the ARL corridor, as well as development of performance standards for electrification. In addition, as part of electrifying the ARL corridor, there are a number of related infrastructure requirements such as Traction Power Substation(s), Switching Station(s), and Paralleling Station(s). The project also includes assessment of Maintenance Facility options.

As part of carrying out pre-planning activities, Metrolinx is working closely with Hydro One to identify potential locations for the required electrification infrastructure and to coordinate EA process requirements as they relate to the electricity supply portion of the project (Ontario Regulation 116/01). It is expected that Metrolinx will follow Ontario Regulation 231/08 (Transit Projects Regulation) for the ARL Electrification project.

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal peoples is a key component of the ARL Electrification project. In accordance with subsection 7(4) of O. Reg. 231/08, Metrolinx is requesting the list of bodies that may assist us in identifying and contacting Aboriginal communities that may be interested in this project. Metrolinx will contact those bodies you identify and ask that these bodies identify specific Aboriginal communities that should be consulted.

Currently, we anticipate holding our first Public Open House (POH) as early as June 2012 to introduce the project and obtain initial feedback. As previously discussed with Jeff Dea, Metrolinx and Hydro One would like to meet with MOE EAAB staff at your earliest convenience to discuss the ARL Electrification project in advance of holding the first POH. With that in mind, we would like to schedule a meeting for late May, if possible.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification

cc:
J. Dea – Special Project Officer, MOE EAAB
M. Harrison, Supervisor – Project Coordination, MOE EAAB
R. Fisher, Parsons Brinckerhoff
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
J. Salter, Account Executive Ontario Hydro
B. McCormick, Manager Environmental Services, Ontario Hydro
Re: List of Agencies to assist in identifying interested Aboriginal Communities & Notice of Commencement

Thank you for your May 8, 2012 letter regarding the Metrolinx’s Airport Rail Link Electrification Project. In your letter you request that the ministry provide you with a list of agencies that can assist you in identifying interested Aboriginal communities.

Aboriginal communities must be contacted prior to issuing a Notice of Commencement for the project. In response to your request, the ministry recommends that you contact the following organizations and resources to assist you in identifying interested Aboriginal communities for this project.


The ministry is pleased that you intend to follow the accelerated transit project assessment process as per Ontario Regulation 231/08 for your projects. Please provide us with advance notice prior to publishing your Notice of Commencement of the transit assessment process. Also can you please provide us with the web site address for this project when it is available.

Once your project timing is known; a Project Officer will be assigned to your project who will be responsible for coordinating the one window ministry review of your project. Should you have any further questions related to Ontario Regulation 231/08 and its requirements, please contact, the undersigned.
Yours Truly

Solange Desautels

Solange Desautels, Special Project Officer
Project Coordination Unit
Environmental Assessment Services Section
Environmental Approvals Branch
Ministry of the Environment
2 St. Clair Ave W
Toronto ON M4V 1L5
Ph: (416) 314-8360
Fax: (416) 314-8452
Electrification Update

Please join us!

PUBLIC MEETING

Metrolinx is holding a public meeting to provide an update on the Electrification of the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors, including the new Airport Rail Link (ARL) service.

We hope you can join us to learn about the process and discuss it with us further.

Wednesday June 27, 2012
6:30pm – 8:30pm
Lithuanian House, 1573 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M6P 1A6
This venue is wheelchair accessible

At this public meeting project team members will provide information and an update on the:

- Environmental Assessment process for electrification of the ARL service along the Kitchener corridor
- Electrification design for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors
- Development of performance standards for electrification for the Kitchener and Lakeshore rail corridors

We’re hoping you will join us to learn more about the project, and to help the Metrolinx Electrification team understand your interests and concerns on the subject as we proceed with the project. An RSVP is encouraged but not required. If you can attend, please RSVP via email to electrification@metrolinx.com

PLEASE PASS ON THIS MEETING NOTICE TO ANYONE ELSE YOU THINK MAY BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING

Additional Information
For additional information on the project, please see http://www.gotransit.com/estudy/en/default.aspx
If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the Electrification Project, please click here to e-mail the Project team.

Bianca Wylie
SWERHUN | Facilitation & Decision Support
720 Bathurst Street Suite 308
Toronto Ontario M5S 2R4
t. 416 572 4365 e. bwylie@swerhun.com
www.swerhun.com
Hello Thomas,

My apologies for the delay in our response. You raised a number of issues in your July 3rd, 2012 email regarding the Airport Rail Link Electrification EA. We’ve provided the following additional information related to: power pickup system for trains, anticipated size and spacing of power transformer stations, and projected size of trains, for your information. Excerpts from your original email have been included in italics, followed by our responses.

**Power Pickup System**

“I know that in Europe and in other parts of North America, power pickup for electrified heavy rail traditionally uses an overhead pantograph system, which is not normally found in Ontario. There might be noise issues connected with these or other differences which our noise team has not encountered previously.”

**Response**

The catenary for the ARL will be a constant tension system designed to provide for a smooth interface between the contact wire and the sliding pantograph. The ARL design will be similar to that used on Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor high speed line. Based on Parsons Brinckerhoff’s experience on similar projects, any noise levels generated by the pantograph/contact wire interface are typically minor and cannot be distinguished from the noise generated by the vehicles.

**Transformer Stations (Substations)**

“The one difference between a diesel and an electric line that I can confidently say will occur is the need for large power transformer stations at various locations along the line, which are not needed to power a diesel line. Given that there are active land uses, many of them sensitive, close to most of the length of the Air Rail Link, there could be challenging noise control issues from this area. Some basic order of magnitude information on the capacity of each transformer and how many might be needed to be spaced along the line would be very valuable.”

**Response**

There will be two traction power supply stations each containing one 40 MVA power transformer. One traction substation will be located at the north end of City View Drive along the ARL and the other near Mimico on the Lakeshore West corridor. These traction substations will convert 230 kV power supplied by Hydro One to 50 kV to power the catenary and distribution feeders. There will also be a switching station located in the vicinity of the central region of the Kitchener/ARL corridor (i.e., approximately Eglinton Ave. W. and Black Creek Dr. area) which will contain two 10 MVA autotransformers connected between the feeders and catenaries to boost the voltage. A paralleling station will also be required, to be located in the vicinity of Bathurst St./Ordnance St. where the Kitchener line splits from the Lakeshore West line. The
paralleling station will contain one 10 MVA autotransformer. The attached key map illustrates the areas being considered for locating the required facilities.

The project team is working closely with Hydro One, who will be responsible for designing the new substations and completing the noise analysis including identification of mitigation measures. With that in mind, it is expected that Hydro One will provide typical specifications for the substations, which will be required to assess potential operational noise impacts.

**Size of Trains**

“If a decision has been made as to the maximum size of electrified trains, that would be important as well. The diesel proposal for the line involved the equivalent of three self-powered rail cars per train; if the electrified line is to use more, this is important to know for noise purposes.”

**Response**

The electrified line will use the same size trains as the diesel proposal (three Electrical Multiple Unit (EMU) cars per train).

Please don’t hesitate to contact me should you require additional information or clarification.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
The one difference between a diesel and an electric line that I can confidently say will occur is the need for large power transformer stations at various locations along the line, which are not needed to power a diesel line. Given that there are active land uses, many of them sensitive, close to most of the length of the Air Rail Link, there could be challenging noise control issues from this area. Some basic order of magnitude information on the capacity of each transformer and how many might be needed to be spaced along the line would be very valuable.

If a decision has been made as to the maximum size of electrified trains, that would be important as well. The diesel proposal for the line involved the equivalent of three self-powered rail cars per train; if the electrified line is to use more, this is important to know for noise purposes.

In summary, any concept-level information you could provide regarding the power pickup system for trains, size and spacing of power transformer stations, and projected size of trains, would be most valuable for my preparation for this discussion.

Thomas Shevlin, P.Eng.
Senior Noise Review Engineer
Ministry of the Environment
Environmental Approval Services Section
Approval Services Unit, Team 3
2 St. Clair Ave. W., Floor 12A
Toronto ON M4V 1L5
Voice 416-314-8302 or 1-800-461-6290
Fax 416-314-8452

From: Greason, Ian (ENE)
Sent: July 03, 2012 2:08 PM
To: Shevlin, Thomas (ENE)
Subject: FW: Metrolinx Electrification EA

Tom:

Please follow up with Karen Pitre.

Thanks,
Ian Greason

Tel: (416) 212-3417
  1-800-461-6290
Fax: (416) 314-8452

From: Desautels, Solange (ENE)
Sent: July 3, 2012 12:31 PM
To: 'Karen Pitre'
Cc: Greason, Ian (ENE)
Subject: RE: Metrolinx Electrification EA

Thomas Shevlin worked on Georgetown and air rail link project FYI

Yours Truly

Solange Desautels
Solange Desautels, Special Project Officer
From: Karen Pitre <Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 1:15 PM
To: dan.panko@ontario.ca; marinha.antunes@ontario.ca
Cc: solange.desautels@ontario.ca; agatha.garcia@ontario.ca;
’patricia.staite@HydroOne.com’; Ashley.JONES@HydroOne.com; Amber Saltarelli; James
Hartley
Subject: FW: UP Express Electrification Draft Air Quality Work Plan - MOE submission
Importance: High

Hello Dan and Marinha,

As discussed at our March 25th meeting, please find attached the Draft Union Pearson Express Electrification EA Air
Quality Work Plan for your information/review. We would appreciate receiving your comments by Wed., July 17th. As
mentioned, we are following an integrated EA process with Hydro One to satisfy both the TPAP and Hydro One’s Class
EA for Minor Transmission Facilities processes.

Please let us know if you have any questions or require additional information.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 13, 2014

TO: Adam Sanzo, Project Officer, EAB

FROM: Chunmei Liu, EA and Planning Coordinator, CR

RE: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
    City of Toronto and Hydro One
    Draft Environmental Project Report

We have reviewed the draft Environmental Project Report (EPR) for the above-noted project and offer the following comments for consideration:

**Air Quality Assessment Report (AQA)**

A qualitative emission loading assessment for DMUs and EMUs was done as summarized in Table 4-1 “Estimated UP Express System Wide EMU Regional 24-hr Contaminant Emission Rates” and Table 4-2 “Estimated UP Express System Wide DMU Local 24-hr Contaminant Emission Rates”. The reference(s) for the source of data presented in Table 4-1 and 4-2 should be integrated in the AQA.

Section 4.3 entitled “EMU Maintenance Facility” summarizes the maximum predicted and combined emissions from all the sources. Please clarify if the dispersion modelling has followed the ministry’s practices as stipulated in Guideline A-11 Air Dispersion Modelling Guideline for Ontario.

In regards to the emissions estimates for the EMU maintenance facility, please provide the estimated total dissolved solids content in the cooling water for the cooling tower.

Lastly, please provide a sample electronic AERMOD modelling input and output file for the EMU maintenance facility for our review.

**Surface Water**

Agreement to incorporate the flows from the EMU maintenance facility into the stormwater pond associated with the Lowes retail development should be secured at the EA stage. Information should be provided in support of utilizing the planned SWM pond and should include the level of treatment the SWM pond will achieve (with the additional flows) and the analysis that shows the pond will be able to handle the "excess" flows. Enhanced Level 1 Protection should be the minimum goal and should be clearly stated. The OGS (oil and grit separator) sizing and applicability to treat the stormwater from the site should also be discussed.

SWM measures were not discussed for the other site developments. SWM measures should be clearly stated and applied as part of a treatment train approach as described in the Ministry’s 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual.
The requirement of an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for any stormwater works (or modifications to an existing ECA if applicable) should also be discussed.

Please note that sewer discharges are not generally regulated by the TRCA (section 9.2.5).

Thank you for the opportunity commenting on this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 416-326-4886 or via email: Chunmei.Liu@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,
Chunmei Liu
March 17, 2014

TO: Adam Sanzo
   Project Officer

FROM: Enoch Tse, P.Eng.
       Senior Noise Engineer

RE: Draft Environmental Project Report – Noise and Vibration Review Comments
    Metrolinx UP Express Electrification Project - TPAP
    Noise EA File: E-0006-13

This is in response to your memorandum dated February 19, 2014.

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Project Report, regarding the proposed electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service beginning at UP Express Union Station in the City of Toronto and terminating at UP Express Pearson Station (Terminal 1, Pearson International Airport) in the City of Mississauga. The following documents have been reviewed:

   a. Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment, Draft Environmental Project Report, dated February 2014 (EPR);

The following are our noise and vibration review comments:

1. **Inclusion of Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) in the Baseline Conditions:** Section 4.9 of the EPR and Section 3.1 of Part A of the NVAR state that the approach of the assessment is to include the DMUs as noise sources when calculating the baseline conditions. This is an incorrect approach, because the purpose of the project is to replace the DMUs with Electric Multiple Units (EMUs). Therefore, DMUs should not be included as noise sources since their operations will cease once the EMUs are fully operational.

2. **Background Sound Levels for the Paralleling Stations:** Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 of Part A of the NVAR should provide information regarding the background sound levels, measured or predicted, at
the points of reception near the two (2) paralleling station locations. If no background sound levels will be used as criteria, then exclusion limits shall be used, as outlined in the NPC-300 guideline.

3. **Guidelines for Construction Activities:** Sections 3.3, 4.1.5 and 5.2 of Part B of the NVAR state that NPC-115 and the City of Toronto Municipal By-Law are the guidelines to be used for construction activities. However, there are other guidelines that should be included as well, including:
   
a. MOE Publication NPC-118, “Motorized Conveyances”;
   b. MOE Publication NPC-207, “Impulse Vibration in Residential Buildings”, November 1983; and
   c. City of Mississauga Noise Control By-Law 360-79;

4. **Noise Assessment for the EMUs:** Section 4.1.1.3 of Part B of the NVAR states that engine and wheel-rail will be the dominant noise sources for the EMUs, then Section 4.1.1.4 concludes that the noise levels of the EMUs will be equal to or lower than that of the DMUs. However, no assessment has been provided to compare the noise levels of EMUs and DMUs to support that conclusion. In addition, it is stated that catenary noise is the greatest at train speeds above 125 miles per hour. However, pantograph noise could be potentially significant as it is not speed dependent, and therefore should be assessed for the EMU noise levels.

5. **Noise Assessment for the Paralleling Stations:** Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 of Part B of the NVAR identify that each of the paralleling stations contains one (1) 10 MVA autotransformer and two (2) auxiliary transformers, but the section only considers the autotransformer as the significant noise source. There should be assessment conducted for the auxiliary transformers as well, since the nearest points of reception are only about 180 metres away, these transformers could potentially be significant noise sources. If not, rationale should be provided to justify the auxiliary transformers as insignificant noise sources.

6. Appendix D is missing from the NVAR. Only the cover page is present.

We trust the above review comments would be of assistance to you.

If you have any questions, please contact Enoch Tse, P.Eng. at 416-212-4201.

Enoch Tse, P.Eng.
Senior Noise Engineer

Ian Greason, P.Eng.
Director
appointed for the purposes of Part II.1 of the Environmental Protection Act
MEMORANDUM

DATE:   March 21, 2014

TO:    Adam Sanzo, Project Officer, EAB

FROM:  Chunmei Liu, EA and Planning Coordinator, CR

RE:    Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
        City of Toronto and Hydro One
        Draft Environmental Project Report

Further to our comments on March 13, 2014, we offer these additional comments for your consideration:

Hydrogeology

Metrolinx and their consultants have an adequate understanding of the geology and hydrogeology along and in the vicinity of the railway right-of-way. With respect to the proposed construction, most of the works will be shallow and installed above the water table; so, from a groundwater perspective, significant environmental impacts are not anticipated. However, some of the proposed works will have deeper foundations and groundwater control will very likely be required. In this regard, the Draft EPR draws attention to the construction of the proposed EMU maintenance facility.

In any event, a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) will be required if construction dewatering flows exceed 50,000 L/day. Please note that the PTTW technical review process looks in detail at the environmental impacts potentially associated with the groundwater taking.

Contaminated Sites

Metrolinx and their consultants have undertaken numerous Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) with respect to the UP Express Electrification project. Based on these ESA studies, it appears that Metrolinx and their consultants have a good understanding of potential and existing “site contamination issues” along and in the vicinity of the railway right-of-way (Draft EPR; February 2014; page 6-40).

Section 6.5 (“Natural Environment – Contaminated Sites”) “discusses the potential impacts of the UP Express Electrification project on, or relating to, existing contaminated sites” (Draft EPR; February 2014; page 6-40), which include the Ordnance St. paralleling station, the 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. paralleling station, the 50 Resources Rd. EMU maintenance facility, and the 175 City View Drive traction power substation.

With the exception of the Ordnance St. paralleling station, Metrolinx and their consultants discussed the types of contamination impacting the soil and/or the groundwater at these sites. In addition, they discussed the approach taken to manage the contamination at these sites. For
example, at the 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. paralleling station (where the soil and groundwater has been impacted by PHCs, VOCs, metals, and inorganics), in “accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04 a Risk Assessment (RA) approach is proposed (Golder Associates Ltd., January 2013) … to protect human health and the environment during and following construction” (Draft EPR; February 2014; page 6-41). The discussion concerning the types of contamination and the approaches taken to managing the contamination at these sites provides a basis for understanding their conclusions concerning potential footprint, construction, and operations/maintenance effects and recommended mitigative measures.

With respect to the Ordnance St. paralleling station, the type(s) of contamination impacting the soil and/or groundwater and the approach taken to managing the contamination are not discussed. As a reviewer, without some background information concerning these issues, it is difficult to understand how the conclusions and recommendations were reached.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 416-326-4886 or via email: Chunmei.Liu@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,
Chunmei Liu
Subject: FW: MOE Comments (Air Quality)_UP Express Electrification EA.docx [350453-002]

Importance: High

From: Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2014 10:40 AM
To: Adam Sanzo (Adam.Sanzo@ontario.ca)
Cc: James Hartley; Amber Saltarelli

Subject: FW: MOE Comments (Air Quality)_UP Express Electrification EA.docx [350453-002]
Importance: High

Adam,

Please see the attached. This is the sample electronic AERMOD modelling input and output file for the EMU maintenance facility that was requested by MOE.

This is in response to the comments received on March 13th.

Regards,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Thank you Rosi

We will keep you informed as the project progresses. We will also make the appropriate changes to our contact list.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com

From: Zirger, Rosi (MTCS) [mailto:Rosi.Zirger@ontario.ca]
Sent: December 18, 2013 2:08 PM
To: Karen Pitre; patricia.staite@HydroOne.com
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification EA

Dear Ms Pitre and Ms Staite

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) has received a Notice of Commencement for the project mentioned above. Please find attached our letter regarding this EA.

MTCS would be interested in remaining on the circulation list and being informed of the project as it proceeds through the EA process. We would ask that you update your contact list to remove the name of Paula Kulpa and send future notices to Rosi Zirger Heritage Planner at the address below.

Best regards

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
Culture Division | Programs & Services Branch | Culture Services Unit
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7
Tel. 416.314.7159 | Fax 416.314.7175| E-mail: rosi.zirger@ontario.ca
Good Afternoon,

As a follow up to your letter dated December 18, 2013, we have provided the attached response to your inquiries.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like further information.

Regards,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
January 21, 2014

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
Culture Services Unit
Programs and Services Branch
401 Bay St., Suite 1700
Toronto, ON M7A0A7

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment (Transit Project Assessment Process) – Archaeological and Heritage Assessments

Dear Ms. Zirger:

In response to your letter received on December 18, 2013, we have provided the following clarification with respect to your inquiry.

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was completed for all new properties identified for the proposed electrification facilities, i.e., Two Paralleling Stations, EMU Maintenance Facility, and Traction Power Substation, as part of the Metrolinx Transit Project Assessment Process and Hydro One Class EA process.

In addition, a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report has been completed by Metrolinx which includes an assessment of potential effects on Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes, as well as a description of proposed mitigation measures, as appropriate. A copy of this report will be provided to you for your information/review.

The results and recommendations of both the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment and Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment will be included in the Environmental Project/Study Reports.

If you would like additional, more detailed information, please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
Cc: P. Staite, Hydro One
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
Hi Karen

Thank you for the additional information regarding the Archaeological and Heritage Assessments for this EA project. The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s (MTCS) interest in this undertaking relates to its mandate to conserve, protect and preserve Ontario’s heritage.

Archaeology

Our records indicate that two Stage 1 archaeological assessments have been or are being undertaken for this project.

1. Under PIF P035-181-2012 a Stage 1 archaeological assessment was undertaken for seven potential facility locations. It appears that a further archaeological assessment has been recommended. Our records indicate that we have received this report but we still need to review it.

2. Under PIF P035-0206-2013 a Stage 1 archaeological assessments is underway for a potential facility location near Vulcan Street. Our records indicate that we have not yet received this report.

Could you please advise whether there are any other archaeological assessments that pertain to this project?

Please be aware that all archaeological assessments must be completed, reviewed by Archaeology Review Officer prior to any ground disturbance. In addition, reports are reviewed on a first in first out basis and ministry Staff may have additional comments when reviewing.

Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Your letter indicates that a Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment Report has been completed by Metrolinx. MTCS would like the opportunity to review this report prior to the EA being finalized. As such would you please forward this heritage report to us for review?

We noticed that one of the proposed facilities is located on the former Kodak lands at Eglinton Avenue West and Black Creek Drive. Our records indicate that on October 10, 2013 MTCS provided comments to Metrolinx on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EA project, which included comments about certain cultural heritage resources at this location. While there has been some communication between Metrolinx and MTCS heritage staff, it appears that a number of heritage matters remain outstanding.

In addition, would you also advise whether there are any other Metrolinx EA projects that my overlap with this Union Pearson Express project?

We would be happy to further discuss this further with you. Please feel free to call me.

Sincerely

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
Culture Division | Programs & Services Branch | Culture Services Unit
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7
Tel. 416.314.7159 | Fax 416.314.7175 | E-mail: rosi.zirger@ontario.ca
Hi Karen

Thank you for the additional information regarding the Archaeological and Heritage Assessments for this EA project. The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s (MTCS) interest in this undertaking relates to its mandate to conserve, protect and preserve Ontario’s heritage.

**Archaeology**

Our records indicate that two Stage 1 archaeological assessments have been or are being undertaken for this project.

1. Under PIF P035-181-2012 a Stage 1 archaeological assessment was undertaken for seven potential facility locations. It appears that a further archaeological assessment has been recommended. Our records indicate that we have received this report but we still need to review it.

2. Under PIF P035-0206-2013 a Stage 1 archaeological assessment is underway for a potential facility location near Vulcan Street. Our records indicate that we have not yet received this report.

Could you please advise whether there are any other archaeological assessments that pertain to this project?

Please be aware that all archaeological assessments must be completed, reviewed by Archaeology Review Officer prior to any ground disturbance. In addition, reports are reviewed on a first in first out basis and ministry Staff may have additional comments when reviewing.

**Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

Your letter indicates that a Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment Report has been completed by Metrolinx. MTCS would like the opportunity to review this report prior to the EA being finalized. As such would you please forward this heritage report to us for review?

We noticed that one of the proposed facilities is located on the former Kodak lands at Eglinton Avenue West and Black Creek Drive. Our records indicate that on October 10, 2013 MTCS provided comments to Metrolinx on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EA project, which included comments about certain cultural heritage resources at this location. While there has been some communication between Metrolinx and MTCS heritage staff, it appears that a number of heritage matters remain outstanding.

In addition, would you also advise whether there are any other Metrolinx EA projects that may overlap with this Union Pearson Express project?

We would be happy to further discuss this further with you. Please feel free to call me.

Sincerely

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
Culture Division | Programs & Services Branch | Culture Services Unit
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7
Tel. 416.314.7159 | Fax 416.314.7175 | E-mail: rosi.zirger@ontario.ca

---

**From:** Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
**Sent:** January 21, 2014 2:31 PM
**To:** Zirger, Rosi (MTCS)
**Cc:** Amber Saltarelli; ’patricia.staite@HydroOne.com’
**Subject:** UP Express Electrification EA
**Importance:** High

Good Afternoon,
As a follow up to your letter dated December 18, 2013, we have provided the attached response to your inquiries.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like further information.

Regards,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Hi Amber

Thanks for submitting the reports for the above mentioned project. I apologize for the late reply. The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s (MTCS) interest in this class EA project relates to its mandate of conserving, protecting and preserving Ontario’s cultural heritage, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes.

MTCS has reviewed the following documents prepared by Morrison Hershfield:

- Draft Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR) - UP Electrification EA
  - Part A: Existing Conditions (Final Draft - January 2014)
  - Part B: Impact Assessment (Draft - January 2014)
- Cultural Heritage Section 4.6 (Baseline Conditions) - Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR)
- Cultural Heritage Section 6.6 (Impact Assessment) – Draft Environmental Project Report (EPR)

**Background**

MTCS has previously reviewed and provided comments on the following two related EAs:

- Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union–Pearson EA
- Eglinton Crosstown LRT EA (Addendum)

The purpose of this current UP Express Electrification EA is to consider the electrification of one track within the rail corridor that was the subject of the Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union–Pearson EA. As such some of MTCS’s comments and recommendations previously provided may also be relevant to this EA.

**MTCS Comments and Recommendations**

1. **Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (2013)**

Both the CHAR and the Draft Environmental Project Report (Section 4.6) reference the “Metrolinx’s “internal Draft Heritage Protocol (Draft Protocol hereafter)”. Metrolinx finalized this document in Fall of 2013 under the title, *Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (2013)*. Accordingly, the reports for this EA should be revised to reflect the correct document.

In addition, the text in the CHAR (section 2.1 page 2-3) and the draft EPR (section 4.6.1 page 30-31) should be revised and updated to reflect the language and content of the *Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (2013)*.
For example, the term “qualified persons” should be used instead of “a qualified heritage specialist”. The evaluation process described would result in a CHER and a CHE Recommendation Report. We note that section 2.1 includes extensive description of the Process. This should be updated accordingly.

2. “Metrolinx Status”
The Draft EPR (section 4.6.2) and the corresponding Tables (Tables 4.2 and 6.2) use the term “Metrolinx Status” to “reflect the current status of each CHR in accordance with the evaluation process for determining cultural heritage value or interest” (page 31). Properties owned by Metrolinx are identified as “Potential Provincial Heritage Property” and those owned or co-owned by another party (i.e. the City of Toronto?) as being “Conditional Heritage Property”.

These terms are confusing and conflate two distinct concepts. From a heritage perspective, the term “potential” refers to a property that has been identified but not yet evaluated under O.Reg 9/06 or 10/06. As such the cultural heritage value or interest of the property has not yet been determined.

MTCS suggests, using the term “Heritage Status” instead of “Metrolinx Status”. The column could then record whether or not that property has been evaluated under the O.Reg 9/06 or 10/06 of the OHA and/or the result of the CHER.

An additional column could be added to indicate property ownership, and as such whether the Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&Gs) would apply.

3. Table 6.2 Draft EPR
In addition to the recommendations above, MTCS would suggest that the Table 6.2 include the specific potential impacts and also the proposed mitigation that is included in the body of the report. As an example, would be a format similar to Table 6.3.1.1-1 in the Environmental Project Report for the Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union-Pearson Rail Link.

4. Potential Footprint Effects and Mitigation Measures (Draft EPR-section 6.6 and CHAR section 3)

Section 1 – UP Express Union Station to UP Express Bloor Station
It is anticipated that three (3) CHRs will be impacted by the proposed undertaking in Section 1:

- Bathurst Street Bridge (CHR1)
- King Street Subway (CHR3)
- Fort York and Garrison Common Heritage Conservation District (CHR35)

Bathurst Street Bridge (CHR1)
The Draft EPR – section 6.6.1.1 (page 47) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the addition of a bridge protection barrier. We note the CHAR includes the potential Construction Impacts (Section 3.1.1.3 – page 9-10) that are not mentioned in the draft EPR.

The Draft EPR – section 6.6.1.1 (page 47) recommends the following mitigation/monitoring measures:

- Carry out a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) to identify heritage value and attributes (during detailed design);
- If found to have cultural heritage value in accordance with the Metrolinx Draft Heritage Protocol[1]
- Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be conducted (during detailed design) to further identify potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures;
- Undertake detail design of the bridge following the recommendations (e.g., heritage attributes to be conserved) outlined in the HIA;
- Follow Metrolinx Draft Heritage Protocol for managing heritage assets

MTCS Comments and Recommendations:

- Please be aware that the Bathurst Street Bridge is also listed on the Ontario Heritage Bridge List
- In addition of the recommendations in the Draft Environmental Project Report, MTCS recommends that the during detail design, the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) be development in consultation with MTCS and City Heritage Preservation Services

King Street Subway (CHR3)
The Draft EPR (page 49) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the addition of an OCS structure attachment to the bridge. We note the CHAR includes the potential Construction Impacts (Section 3.1.2.3 – page 11) that are not mentioned in the draft EPR.

The Draft EPR states that the mitigation/monitoring measures in section 6.6.1.1 of the Draft EPR (page 47) are also recommended for the King Street Bridge. Accordingly, MTCS Comments and Recommendations stated above should also be considered.

**Fort York and Garrison Common National Historic Site and Heritage Conservation District**

The Draft EPR (page 53) states the potential effects include potential displacement and/or disruption of the original alignment of Garrison Creek, obstruction/disruption of identified/protected views (Viewpoints 4, 9e, and 20), and/or disruption of setting through the introduction of light sources (required for safety/security).

In addition, the Draft EPR states that there will be additional impacts associate with the construction activities associated with installing bridge protection barriers, OCS attachments, and grounding grids to bridges will have potential short-term disruption effects (e.g., introduction of physical, visual, noise-related, and atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the character of the bridge) to the setting of those bridges that have been identified as CHRs, and to the setting of Fort York Precinct. In addition, the construction activities associated with installing the paralleling station components have the potential to disturb/displace the original alignment of Garrison Creek and the original topography of Garrison Creek Ravine through the removal of soil.

The Draft EPR (page 53-54) recommends the following mitigation/monitoring measures:

- A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) should be carried out to determine the impact of the Paralleling Station on identified viewpoints to and from Fort York;
- Carry out a Stage 2 archaeological assessment for the paralleling station site, as recommended through the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment completed as part of the EA (see Appendix D);
- During detailed design, lighting (required for safety/security) within the Paralleling Station should be designed to have minimal impact to the darkness of Fort York; and,
- The detail design plans for the Paralleling Station should be submitted to Heritage Preservation Services at the City of Toronto (http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/) and to the Friends of Fort York (http://www.fortyork.ca/contact.html) for review and comment prior to construction.

In addition the Draft EPR (page 54) recommends the following mitigation/monitoring measures for potential construction impacts:

- To minimize these potential temporary effects, staging areas should be carefully selected so that they are non-invasive and avoid all heritage attributes.
- In addition, pre-construction vibration studies may be required to mitigate any potential vibration related impacts (to be determined during detailed design).
- Pre-construction conditions should be re-established through post-construction landscape treatments, where appropriate. If possible, construction activities should avoid the removal of soil in the vicinity of Garrison Creek and the former Garrison Creek Ravine.

**Existing GO Rail Corridor (CHR28)**

The Draft EPR (footnote page 45) and CHAR (January 2014) indicate that heritage attributes of the rail corridor, which consist of the alignment, width right-of way, and arrangement of tracks, will not be impacted by the current proposed Electrification EA.

However, Table 10 of the CHAR states that “Portal structures to be erected approximately every 5—65 m along the rail”. Was the visual impact of these portal structures considered? This would be of particular concern where the corridor runs through or adjacent to Heritage Conservation Districts.

**Section 2 –UP Express Bloor Station to UP Express Weston Station**

The Draft EPR states that this section of the study area is located in proximity to:

- Phase 1 Weston HCD
- Phase 2 Weston HCD
- 3500 Eglinton Avenue West/Kodak Heights (CHR 29), and
In addition the following CHRs will be impacted by the proposed undertaking:

- Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (CHR 7)
- Rogers Road Bridge (CHR B5)
- Jane Street Bridge (CHR B8)

**Phase 1 and 2 Weston HCD**

See MTCS’s comments above regarding visual impacts of the portal structures along the rail line. Were visual impacts of the portal structures considered in regard to the HCDs?

**3500 Eglinton Avenue West (former Kodak Lands) (CHR 29)**

The footnote to Table 6.2 states: “The potential impacts and mitigation measures related to developing the entire 3500 Eglinton Ave. W. property were previously assessed as part of the Final Eglinton Crosstown LRT EPR Addendum (October 2013), therefore there will be no new adverse effects on CHRs associated with the paralleling station footprint on this site”.

On October 10, 2013 MTCS provided comments on the Eglinton Crosstown LRT EA (Addendum), including recommendations for the Kodak Property. At that time MTCS had not seen the CHER or the HIA that had been completed for the Kodak Property. We are still awaiting receipt of the CHER and Metrolinx’s Heritage Review Committee’s decision form confirming the cultural heritage value of this property.

**Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge (CHR 7)**

The Draft EPR (page 55) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the addition of a bridge protection barrier, attachment of a grounding grid, and potential alteration of the bridge deck to accommodate the OCS. We note the CHAR includes the potential Construction Impacts (Section 3.2.1.3 – page 26-27) that are not mentioned in the draft EPR.

The Draft EPR states that the mitigation/monitoring measures in section 6.6.1.1 of the Draft EPR (page 47) are also recommended for the Wallace Avenue Pedestrian Bridge. Accordingly, MTCS Comments and Recommendations stated above should also be considered.

**Rogers Road Bridge (CHR B5)**

The Draft EPR (page 56) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the addition of a bridge protection barrier, attachment of a grounding grid. We note the CHAR includes the potential Construction Impacts (Section 3.2.2.3 – page 27-28) that are not mentioned in the draft EPR.

The Draft EPR states that the mitigation/monitoring measures in section 6.6.1.1 of the Draft EPR (page 47) are also recommended for the Rogers Road Bridge. Accordingly, MTCS Comments and Recommendations stated above should also be considered.

**Jane Street Bridge (CHR B8)**

The Draft EPR (page 56) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the addition of a bridge protection barrier. We note the CHAR includes the potential Construction Impacts (Section 3.2.3.3 – page 29-30) that are not mentioned in the draft EPR.

The Draft EPR states that the mitigation/monitoring measures in section 6.6.1.1 of the Draft EPR (page 47) are also recommended for the Jane Street Bridge. Accordingly, MTCS Comments and Recommendations stated above should also be considered.

**Section 3 - UP Express Weston Station to Highway 427**

**Humber River Rail Overpass (CHR 13)**

The Draft EPR (page 57-58) states the potential effects to this CHR include displacement of heritage attributes and/or disruption of setting due to the proposed attachment of OCS portal structures to the bridge piers (via wall brackets).

The Draft EPR indicates additional impacts resulting from construction activities associated with attaching OCS portal structures to the bridge (e.g., introduction of physical, visual, noise-related, and atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the character of the bridge). And potential for short-term disruption effects to the bridge piers due to the use of scaffolding and attachment of brackets.
The Draft EPR recommends the following mitigation measures as outlined in Section 6.6.1.5 (i.e those for Garrison Creek) are to be implemented:

To minimize these potential temporary effects, staging areas should be carefully selected so that they are non-invasive and avoid all heritage attributes. In addition, pre-construction vibration studies may be required to mitigate any potential vibration related impacts (to be determined during detailed design). Pre-construction conditions should be re-established through post-construction landscape treatments, where appropriate. If possible, construction activities should avoid the removal of soil in the vicinity of Garrison Creek and the former Garrison Creek Ravine.

Please confirm that the reference to Section 6.6.1.5 is correct.

It should be noted that Golder Associates evaluated the bridge and found that the Humber River Rail Overpass (also referred to as the Humber River Bridge) was determined to have cultural heritage value and has local and provincial significance.

In 2011 MTCS provided comments on the Humber River Bridge as part of the Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union–Pearson EA. It appears that the CHER is under review by the Metrolinx Heritage Review Committee. MTCS is still awaiting the Committee’s decision form regarding this bridge.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the CHAR and the Draft EPR excerpts. Please feel free to call me if you need clarification or would like to discuss these comments further.

Sincerely

Rosi Zirger
Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport
Culture Division | Programs & Services Branch | Culture Services Unit
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7
Tel. 416.314.7159 | Fax 416.314.7175 | E-mail: rosi.zirger@ontario.ca

Dear Charlie and Rita:

Since our meeting on October 4th, 2013, we have been continuing the work on the preliminary design for the electrification of the UP Express. As discussed at our last meeting and based on your questions, we have prepared additional material for your information/review. As we discussed, the route for the electrified UP Express will go under the 401 and the 427 Highways. In order to support the wires for the electrified train, it will be necessary to attached the Overhead Contact System (OCS) to the underside of these bridges. We have attached two maps to show the specific locations where the electrified route will operate under the 401 and the 427.

Specifically, the material includes the following documents:

1. Overview of Electrification Design for MTO Bridges
2. UP Express Route Map
3. Tunnel Arm Attachment for 401 and 427
4. Resilient Arm Attachment for 401
5. Typical Bridge Barrier Design
6. Sketch - Typical Tunnel Arm Loads
7. Bridge Attachment Load Installation and Maintenance
8. Proposed Hwy 401 OCS Design
9. Proposed Hwy 427 OCS Design
10. October 4 2013 MTO Presentation

We are planning to issue our Notice of Commencement at the beginning of December 2013, which will start the 120 day Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). We are also planning Public Open Houses for February 2014. In addition, we would be happy to arrange a follow up meeting with MTO to further discuss the material provided in the enclosed package and/or the information provided previously.

Please consult with your colleagues and let us know if you would like to arrange a meeting to further discuss the material provided once you’ve had a chance to review. We would appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information provided by Friday, December 13th.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification
Hi Karen,

Sorry for the delay, but here are our comments to date. Our concerns include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Highway Engineering**

Our biggest concern is our near and long term construction projects.

We have some projects on Hwy 427 going over the next couple of years, including rehabilitation/widening of the 427 structure that these OCS will be attached to. Also, with the electrical facilities attached to our 401 and 427 structure, will we be able to complete a proper structure rehab in the future? It will be hard enough getting time to work, based on the expected frequency of the trains, but will we be able to remove the facilities when we do deck replacement in 20 years or so?

**Electrical**

There may be possible conflicts with MTO lighting systems on Hwy 401 and Hwy 427 where train structures will be constructed. Metrolinx must investigate and verify all existing MTO electrical systems in the area affected. Metrolinx must provide approved methods to maintain the MTO systems if affected. Please note that there is a Hwy 427 widening project, which may be tendered in the near future. Highmast lighting will be installed on Hwy 427 under this project.

**Structural**

1. MTO understands there is a structure just north of Site # 37-763 (on Kipling Avenue) within the UP Express route. MTO needs to be informed should the potential work on this structure affect Site # 37-763 and its ROW.
2. MTO requires an exhaustive repair to the soffit and fascia of the other 8 structures along UP Express route (6 structures at its intersection with Hwy 427 and two at 401),
3. MTO requires a structural evaluation to be performed on the above-mentioned structures to investigate the effect of any additional loading (including, but not limited to, the OCS attachments to the soffit) imposed on the structures as a result of this project.
4. Further drawings, to the standard accepted by MTO, are required to show the details of the OCS attachment to the bottom flange of pre-stressed CPCI girders for Site # 37-984/1 & /2 (Hwy 427) and the precaution measures undertaken to avoid any damage to the pre-stressed strands.

**Corridor Management**

MTO permits are required prior to any work taking place within or adjacent to the Highway ROW. MTO encroachment permits are also required for any investigation or survey work within the ROW prior to construction. Further information with respect to MTO permits may be obtained by contacting Mr. Marek Wiesek, Permits Officer, at 416-235-4570.

Please let me know if you would like to meet to discuss the issues associated with this project and the impacts on MTO facilities, and I will arrange to have MTO staff available.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information or clarification.
June 21, 2011

Mr. Greg Straatsma
GTAA
P.O. Box 6031, 3111 Convair Drive
Toronto AMF, ON
L5P 1B2

RE: Airport Project: Air Rail Link Electric Line- Mississauga/Toronto, ON
(See attached spreadsheet)

Mr. Straatsma,

We have evaluated the captioned proposal and NAV CANADA has no objection to the project as submitted based on adherence of the following maximum EMI emission levels within the VHF Communications and Navigational Aid frequency bands to meet the signal integrity requirements specified by ICAO:

(1) VHF Air Traffic Control (ATC) Voice Communication Receivers: as per CAO Annex 10, Volume 3, section 2.2 & 2.3 - any undesired signal must be 15 dB below 20 uV/m which is a minimum acceptable signal throughout the service volume. In addition, a 10dB margin is required to account for noise from other sources from within surrounding area.

(2) Localizer and Glide path/Instrument Landing System (ILS): as per ICAO Annex 10 Volume 1, section 3.1 - minimum signal of 40 uV/m is required within the ILS service volume. In addition, as part of the ILS operational certification, NC Flight Inspection standard procedure requires that any interference signals present within ILS service volume must not exceed 24.5 dBuV/m or 16.8 uV/m.

(3) DME (Distance Measuring Equipment): the following recommendation as per ICAO Annex 10, Volume 1, section 3.5.4 must be considered:

(a) Peak equivalent isotropically radiated power shall ensure -89 dBW/m² within collocated ILS service volume
(b) Receiver shall trigger transponder at -103 dBW/m² received peak power density;
(c) Recommendation: "Protection against interference outside the DME frequency band should be adequate for the sites at which the transponders will be used."

(4) Any other radio frequencies to be used in association with the operations of the proposed Air Rail Link, eg. Signalling, walkie-talkie etc. shall not generate intermodulation products among themselves or with other existing frequencies that will cause harmful interference to the existing NAV CANADA’s operational frequencies.

As submitted, the current EMI information provided is within the allowable tolerance for the ILS 23, DME and other communication frequency service volumes.

In the event that you should decide not to proceed with this project, please advise us accordingly so that we may formally close the file. If you have any questions, contact the Land Use Department by telephone at 1-866-577-0247 or e-mail at landuse@navcanada.ca.

NAV CANADA’s land use evaluation is valid for a period of 12 months. Our assessment is limited to the impact of the proposed physical structure on the air navigation system and installations; it neither constitutes nor replaces any approvals or permits required by Transport Canada, Industry Canada, other Federal Government departments, Provincial or Municipal land use authorities or any other agency from which approval is required. Industry Canada addresses any spectrum management issues that may arise from your proposal and consults with NAV CANADA Engineering as deemed necessary.
Yours truly,

[Signature]

Scott English for
David Legault
Manager, Data Collection
Aeronautical Information Services

cc  NOPR-Northern and Prairie Region, Transport Canada
    CYYZ-LESTER B. PEARSON INTL
    Huong Dang - NAV CANADA - Electronic Systems Engineer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Northing Zone 17</th>
<th>Easting Zone 17</th>
<th>LAT NAD27 dd mm ss.ss</th>
<th>LONG NAD27 ddd mm ss.ss</th>
<th>LAT NAD83 dd mm ss.ss</th>
<th>LONG NAD83 ddd mm ss.ss</th>
<th>Ground Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Structure Height (m)</th>
<th>Total Height (Feet)</th>
<th>Structure Y/N</th>
<th>Painted Y/N</th>
<th>Construction Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 + 150</td>
<td>4839765.50</td>
<td>611618.50</td>
<td>43 42 16.0633</td>
<td>-79 36 52.9300</td>
<td>43 42 16.2688</td>
<td>-79 36 52.2378</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>524.9344</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>575.1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 + 700</td>
<td>4839924.00</td>
<td>611910.60</td>
<td>43 42 01.5981</td>
<td>-79 36 40.2132</td>
<td>43 42 1.8038</td>
<td>-79 36 39.5199</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>544.6194</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>594.8163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 + 100</td>
<td>4839938.76</td>
<td>611999.10</td>
<td>43 41 49.0662</td>
<td>-79 36 36.5489</td>
<td>43 41 49.2719</td>
<td>-79 36 35.8558</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>551.4961</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>581.6930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 + 500</td>
<td>4838585.00</td>
<td>611817.70</td>
<td>43 41 37.7010</td>
<td>-79 36 44.9148</td>
<td>43 41 37.9068</td>
<td>-79 36 44.2225</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>544.6194</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>594.8163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 200</td>
<td>4837899.40</td>
<td>611679.10</td>
<td>43 41 15.5591</td>
<td>-79 36 51.6161</td>
<td>43 41 15.7649</td>
<td>-79 36 50.9250</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>557.7428</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>607.9397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 500</td>
<td>4837633.70</td>
<td>611544.20</td>
<td>43 41 07.0220</td>
<td>-79 36 57.8380</td>
<td>43 41 7.2278</td>
<td>-79 36 57.1475</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>564.3045</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>614.5014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 867</td>
<td>4837351.40</td>
<td>611765.70</td>
<td>43 40 57.7541</td>
<td>-79 36 48.1582</td>
<td>43 40 57.9601</td>
<td>-79 36 47.4674</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>547.9003</td>
<td>15.3000</td>
<td>50.1969</td>
<td>598.0872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heights Include Future Electric Trains
Hi Lorrie,

As a follow-up to our June 3rd meeting, I have attached the following web links to the key documents for your reference. If you would like them as a PDF, please let me know and I’ll send individually.

- 100% Airlinx Electrification design package for the Airport Spur (sent by email to Zurek Wojtek on June 5th)
- Performance Specifications. You had asked for the list below but all are available on the website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification
  - Traction Power System Supply
  - Traction Power System Distribution
  - Grounding & Bonding
  - EMI/EMC
- June 2013 Public Open House Display Panels - weblink: June 2013 POH Display Boards
- Power Simulation Report (December 28th 2012) – coming shortly. (too large to email – will separate into 2 PDF’s).
- Power Supply Report – coming shortly, we are just finalizing.

Please circulate to your team and ask them to contact me directly with any questions/comments. We would be happy to meet again after people have had a chance to review.

Thanks very much,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
Dear Lorri:

Since our meeting in July, we have been working on the preliminary design for the electrification of the UP Express. As discussed at our last meeting, we have prepared additional material for your information/review (in addition to the previously submitted information related to AirLinx 100% Electrification Spur Design, Traction Power System Modeling and Simulations and Electrification Performance Specifications – posted on our website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx).

We are planning to issue our Notice of Commencement at the beginning of December 2013, which will start the 120 day Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP). We are also planning Public Open Houses for January 2014. In addition, we would be happy to arrange a follow up meeting with GTAA/NavCan to further discuss the material provided in the enclosed package and/or the information provided previously.

Specifically, the material includes the following documents:

1. **Overview and Summary of Preliminary EMI and EMF Assessment (Airport Spur portion of UP Express Corridor)** described in the attached document.
2. **Traction Power Supply Report** - this report outlines the rationale for the Traction Electrification System design of a 2x25kv ac autotransformer-fed system plus a 1x25kV on the UP Express airport spur.

In addition, an Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC) Analysis Report and EMC Control Plan are being prepared which will outline compliance requirements related to immunity levels in order to ensure a reasonable level of EMC with other equipment within the local railway environment.

Copies of the draft EMC Analysis Report and draft EMC Control Plan will also be provided to NavCan/GTAA once available.

We trust that you will circulate copies of this package to Mr. Joe Fung (NavCan) and to your colleagues at the GTAA, as appropriate. We will keep GTAA and NavCan informed throughout the Environmental Assessment (EA) and preliminary design process.

Please consult with your colleagues and let us know if you would like to arrange a meeting to further discuss the material provided once you’ve had a chance to review. We would appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information provided by Friday, December 13th.

Thanks for your assistance.

Karen
Subject: FW: GTAA/Nav Canada Review of Diesel Hydraulic-powered ARL
Attachments: DOC012314-01232014204128.pdf

-----Original Message-----
From: Nowicki, Mark [mailto:mark.nowicki@gtaa.com]
Sent: January 23, 2014 4:17 PM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: Dang, Huong (DangH@navcanada.ca); Waechter, Eileen; McKee, Lorrie; Zurek, Wojtek; Straatsma, Greg; Corazzola, Gene
Subject: GTAA/Nav Canada Review of Diesel Hydraulic-powered ARL

Hello Karen;

Further to yesterday's meeting, please find attached correspondence relating to the review of the diesel hydraulic ARL by Nav Canada and the GTAA. Hopefully this clarifies things with respect to the design as now being implemented.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Nowicki, Manager, Aerodrome Planning Greater Toronto Airports Authority | Airport Planning & Technical Services P.O. Box 6031, 3111 Convair Drive, Toronto AMF, Ontario, L5P 1B2 Phone (416) 776-5022 | Fax (416) 776-4168 www.TorontoPearson.com

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender.

Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Greater Toronto Airports Authority.

Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defects that might affect any computer or IT system into which they are received, no responsibility is accepted by the Greater Toronto Airports Authority for any loss or damage arising in any way from the receipt or use thereof.
Max / Daryl, attached please find copy of letter dated May 18, 2011 as issued by NAV CANADA. As a caution, note that the letter as issued pertains to the use of a diesel rail spur line. As NAV CANADA notes in the letter, "... we need to further investigate the impacts of the electromagnetic emission and upon completion of that review, NAV CANADA will provide additional comments in regards to the future plans of an electric line". The GTAA will provide such further NAV CANADA comments upon receipt of same from NAV CANADA.

Regards
Cecil Holtrop

Cecil Holtrop P.Eng.
APMG Airport Program Management Group
Senior Program Manager
2720 Britannia Road East, Suite 306
Mississauga, ON
L5P 1A2
p: 905-694-8070
c: 416-543-9234
e: choltrop@gtaa-adp.com
May 18, 2011

Mr. Greg Straatsma
GTAA
P.O. Box 8031, 3111 Convair Drive
Toronto AMF, ON
L5P 1B2

RE: Airport Project: Air Rail Link - Mississauga/Toronto, ON
(See attached spreadsheet)

Mr. Straatsma,

We have evaluated the captioned proposal and NAV CANADA has no objection to the current project as submitted regarding the use of a diesel rail spur line. However at this time we need to further investigate the impacts of the electromagnetic emissions and upon completion of that review, NAV CANADA will provide additional comments in regards to the future plans of an electric line.

In the event that you should decide not to proceed with this project, please advise us accordingly so that we may formally close the file. If you have any questions, contact the Land Use Department by telephone at 1-866-577-0247 or e-mail at landuse@navcanada.ca.

NAV CANADA’s land use evaluation is valid for a period of 12 months. Our assessment is limited to the impact of the proposed physical structure on the air navigation system and installations; it neither constitutes nor replaces any approvals or permits required by Transport Canada, Industry Canada, other Federal Government departments, Provincial or Municipal land use authorities or any other agency from which approval is required. Industry Canada addresses any spectrum management issues that may arise from your proposal and consults with NAV CANADA Engineering as deemed necessary.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Scott English
for
David Legault
Manager, Data Collection
Aeronautical Information Services

cc NOPR-Northern and Prairie Region, Transport Canada
CYYZ-LESTER B. PEARSON INTL
CPA6-TARTEN
CPLB-CARDINAL COURIERS
CPYS-WILSON'S
March 10, 2014

Mr. Greg Straatsma
GTAA
P.O. Box 6031, 3111 Convair Drive
Toronto AMF, ON
L5P 1B2

RE: Airport Project: Air Rail Link - Mississauga, ON
(N43° 41' 38.9069" W79° 36' 36.1731" / 50.1969' AGL / 614.5014' AMSL)

Mr. Straatsma,

Further to the NAV CANADA letter dated June 21, 2011 regarding the proposed Air Rail Link (ARL) initially using “diesel-hydraulic” locomotives and in response to the proposed electrifications of the ARL (MetroLinx Union-Pearson (UP) Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Notice of Commencement), we offer the following comments.

As discussed at previous NAV CANADA/GTAA/MetroLinx meetings, the issue of electromagnetic interference (EMI) generated by the proposed ARL – specifically, the potential impact on existing NAV CANADA communications, navigation, and surveillance (CNS) facilities – will be addressed in the EMI/EMF assessment and the EMC Control plan to be developed by MetroLinx. The EMI/EMF assessment must take into consideration CNS system performance specifications as per the current International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Annex 10 (Aeronautical Telecommunication - International Standards & Recommended Practices). Below are the minimum signal field strength and the maximum tolerable noise levels taken from Annex 10 for a few existing operational CNS system at Pearson International Airport (CYYZ).

- **VHF Air Traffic Control (ATC) Voice Communication Receivers (Annex 10, Volume 3, Part II, Section 2.2 & 2.3)**
  - Any undesired signal must be 15 dB below 20 uV/m (which is a minimum acceptable signal throughout the service volume). In addition, a 10 dB margin is required to account for noise from other sources from within surrounding area.

- **Instrument Landing System (ILS) including Localizer and Glidepath (Annex 10, Volume 1, Section 3.1)**
  - Minimum signal of 40 uV/m is required within the ILS service volume.
  - In addition, NAV CANADA Flight Inspection standard require that any interference signals present within ILS service volume must not exceed 24.5 dBuV/m or 16.8 uV/m as part of the ILS operational certification.

- **Distance Measuring Equipment (DME) (Annex 10, Volume 1, Section 3.5.4)**
  - Peak equivalent isotropically radiated power shall ensure -89 dBW/m² within collocated ILS service volume
  - Receiver shall trigger transponder at -103 dBW/m² received peak power density;
  - Recommendation: “Protection against interference outside the DME frequency band should be adequate for the sites at which the transponders will be used.”

- **Multilateration (MLAT) information is being requested and will follow.**

Any other radio frequencies to be used in association with the operations of the proposed ARL (signalling, walkie-talkie, etc.), shall not generate intermodulation products among themselves or with other existing frequencies that will cause harmful interference to existing NAV CANADA operational frequencies.

MetroLinx will provide the complete EMI/EMF assessment and the EMI/EMC control plan reports for review by NAV CANADA prior to commencement of the ARL operation. The EMI/EMC control plan will include the field test plan to verify no harmful EMI interference to NAV CANADA CNS facilities.
In addition, the general guidelines provided in Part II of the current Transport Canada TP1247 (Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports) should be observed. Any deviation to the guidelines can potentially have an impact on existing operational CNS facilities, thus will need to be addressed in the EMI/EMF Assessment and Control plan. For example, the attached pdf shows the Electromagnetic Noise (EMN) protection zones for the ILS runway 23 and 24R, as well as the 500m EMN zone around the existing NAV CANADA ATC Tower Contingency and GTAA’s Apron Management Unit communication sites.

Due to the proximity of the ARL link to Pearson International Airport and the approach to runway 23 in particular, the EMI/EMF assessment must also consider EMI protection for the radio equipment in the aircraft. While the ICAO Annex 10 document mentioned above includes some specifications for the avionics portion, it would be prudent for Metrolinx to consult with the avionic industries and/or authorities such as Transport Canada as necessary to ensure any EMI issue is properly addressed.

As requested by MetroLinx, we have attached a map of the existing operational CNS facilities at Toronto PIA, including the two MLAT Remote Units (RU) located very close (< 100 meters) to the proposed ARL; these units are part of the currently-operational MLAT system at CYYZ.

If you should decide not to proceed with this project, please advise us accordingly so that we may formally close the file. If you have any questions, contact the Land Use Department by telephone at 1-866-577-0247 or e-mail at landuse@navcanada.ca.

NAV CANADA’s land use evaluation is valid for a period of 12 months. Our assessment is limited to the impact of the proposed physical structure on the air navigation system and installations; it neither constitutes nor replaces any approvals or permits required by Transport Canada, Industry Canada, other Federal Government departments, Provincial or Municipal land use authorities or any other agency from which approval is required. Industry Canada addresses any spectrum management issues that may arise from your proposal and consults with NAV CANADA Engineering as deemed necessary.

Yours truly,

David Legault
Manager, Data Collection
Aeronautical Information Services

cc
ONTR - Ontario Region, Transport Canada
Karen Pitre, Executive Director – Electrification, Metrolinx-GO Transit
James Hartley, Metrolinx-GO Transit
Thank you for the information regarding the above referenced project. We have reviewed the information, and note the following:

Please update your correspondence list – Please remove Monique Mousseau and replace with:
Environmental Coordinator
Transport Canada - Ontario Region
4900 Yonge Street 4th Floor (PHE)
North York, ON
M2N 6A5

There is a federal property in the general vicinity of the project. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (2012) includes requirements and provisions for projects involving federal lands. Please review the Directory of Federal Real Property (http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/dfrp-rbif/) for additional information, and if your project will potentially interact with any of these sites please notify the appropriate federal department or agency as soon as possible.

Transport Canada is responsible for the administration of the Navigable Waters Protection Act (NWPA), which prohibits the construction or placement of any “works” in navigable waters without first obtaining approval. If any of the related project undertakings cross or affect a potentially navigable waterway, the proponent should prepare and submit an application in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the attached Application Guide and Form. Any questions about the NWPA application process should be directed to the Navigable Waters Protection Program at (519) 383-1863 or NWPontario-PENontario@tc.gc.ca.

Please review the Minor Works and Waters (Navigable Waters Protection Act) Order, established to outline the specific standards and criteria under which Transport Canada considers a work as a minor and does not require an application under the NWPA. It is the responsibility of the applicant, prior to submitting an application to the Navigable Waters Protection Program for review, to assess whether their work meets the criteria, as described, and, therefore, falls within one of the excluded classes. An application will only be required if it is determined that the work cannot meet the criteria established for that particular “class” of excluded work.

Transport Canada is also responsible for inspecting and auditing federally regulated railway companies that are subject to the Railway Safety Act. Transport Canada also regulates some provincial shortlines from the Province of Ontario that are part of an Agreement between the Federal Government and the Province of Ontario. The Railway Safety Act, with related regulations and rules, provides the legislative and regulatory framework for safe railway operations in Canada. The rail safety program develops, implements and promotes safety policy, regulations, standards and research, and in the case of railway grade crossings, subsidizes safety improvements. A list of all the Rail Safety legislations (the Act, Regulations, Rules, Guidelines, Policies and Standards) that applies to the federally regulated railways, can be found here:

The Act also addresses the construction and alteration of railway works, the operation and maintenance of railway equipment and certain non-railway operations that may affect the safety of federally regulated railways. If a proposed railway work is of a prescribed kind, pursuant to the Notice of Railway Works Regulations, the proponent shall not undertake the work unless it has first given notice of the work in accordance with the regulation. More information related to railway works is available at the following internet sites:


General inquiries about the Rail Safety Program can be directed to RailSafety@tc.gc.ca or by calling 613-998-2985.

Please address future correspondence to the Environment and Engineering group to the undersigned address:

Thank you,

Environmental Coordinator, Transport Canada - Ontario Region (PHE)
4900 Yonge Street, North York, ON M2N 6A5 EnviroOnt@tc.gc.ca

---

From: Karen Pitre [mailto:Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com]
Sent: Monday, May 27, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: rob.dobos@ec.gc.ca; Mousseau, Monique; melanie.lalani@hc-sc.gc.ca; lorrie.mckee@gtaa.com; CAU-UCA; paul.lacoste@otc-cta.gc.ca; LegaultD@navcanada.ca; FungJ@navcanada.ca; Amber Saltarelli
Subject: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Public Open House

Good afternoon.

Metrolinx, an agency of the Province of Ontario, is helping to transform the way the region moves by championing and delivering mobility solutions for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Areas (GTHA).

Metrolinx completed the GO Electrification Study in December 2010, which examined electrification of the entire GO Transit rail system as a future alternative to diesel trains currently in service. Based on the findings of this study, Metrolinx initiated the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express service from Union Station to Toronto Pearson International Airport. The proposed undertaking involves electrification of approximately 25km of track along the Union Station Rail corridor and Kitchener rail corridor, beginning west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The key map below shows the EA study area, including proposed locations for traction power facilities and a maintenance facility, as well as a section within the Lakeshore West GO Transit rail corridor where a low voltage electrical feeder line is proposed.

Electrification of the UP Express will necessitate up to two new transformer stations (see key map), which will be supplied from the Hydro One network. The scope of the project includes development of performance standards for electrification, design of the electrical power supply and distribution for the UP Express service, and completion of an EA study to assess the potential effects of converting the UP Express service from diesel to electric power in accordance with O. Reg. 231/08 - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).
As part of the EA process, Metrolinx is holding a series of Public Open Houses to share a project update, and seek feedback on the following:

- Overview of Conceptual Design for UP Express Electrification:
  - Traction power supply
  - Traction power distribution
  - Maintenance requirements
- Overview of EA Studies
- Next Steps

Interested persons are encouraged to attend the Open House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, June 4, 2013</th>
<th>Monday, June 10, 2013</th>
<th>Tuesday, June 11, 2013</th>
<th>Wednesday, June 12, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Pearson International Airport</td>
<td>Metro Hall</td>
<td>Mimico Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Mount Dennis (Weston) Legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Station</td>
<td>Room 314</td>
<td>119 Mimico Ave.</td>
<td>1050 Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Viscount Rd., Mississauga ON</td>
<td>55 John St.</td>
<td>Etobicoke, ON</td>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information on this project, please visit: [www.gotransit.com/electrification](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification).

Consultation with the public, review agencies and Aboriginal communities is a key component of the UP Express Electrification EA. If you would like to submit a comment or question, or to receive additional information related to the UP Express Electrification Project, please send an e-mail the project team at: [electrification@metrolinx.com](mailto:electrification@metrolinx.com)
Sincerely,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx  
20 Bay St., Suite 600  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3  
Phone: (416) 874-5910  
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com
Dear Ms. Williston:

Re: Environmental Assessment for Electrification of the Airport Rail Link Service from Union Station to Pearson International Airport

In July 2009, Metrolinx completed an environmental assessment for the Georgetown South Service Expansion and Union-Pearson Rail Link (GSSE-UPRL). This project includes a number of infrastructure improvements along the Kitchener (previously known as Georgetown) corridor, including a separate spur line to allow for operation of the Air Rail Link service between Union Station and Pearson Airport.

Following this, the GO Electrification Study was completed in December 2010. Based on the findings of this Study, Metrolinx has now initiated the electrification design and environmental assessment (EA) for Phase 1: the Air Rail Link (ARL) from Union Station to Pearson International Airport. A consultant team led by Parsons Brinckerhoff (engineering/design lead), along with Morrison Hershfield (EA lead) has been hired to support this work. The preliminary project study area includes the ARL corridor as well as potential locations for electrification infrastructure (see key map below).
The ARL Electrification project includes design and engineering of the power supply and distribution for the ARL corridor, as well as development of performance standards for electrification. In addition, as part of electrifying the ARL corridor, there are a number of related infrastructure requirements such as Traction Power Substation(s), Switching Station(s), and Paralleling Station(s). Metrolinx is working closely with Hydro One to identify potential locations for the required electrification infrastructure and to coordinate EA process requirements as they relate to the electricity supply portion of the project under Ontario Regulation 116/01. The project also includes assessment of Maintenance Facility(s) options.

The potential impacts of electrifying the ARL corridor will be assessed under the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as outlined in Ontario Regulation 231/08, *Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings* (Transit Projects Regulation). Metrolinx is currently in the Pre-Planning Phase of this process, and the project team has initiated data collection in relation to establishing baseline conditions in the project study area (see key map above).

With this in mind, the ARL project team would like to request species at risk, terrestrial and fisheries data in relation to the ARL Electrification project. The attached table outlines our fisheries data request including: fish species present, thermal regime, timing restrictions and sensitivity of the water body. With respect to terrestrial features, we currently have Land Information Ontario (LIO) and Natural Heritage Information (NHIC), however we would like to request any additional information on natural heritage features, flora, fauna and species at risk as it relates to the project study area.

A number of public consultation events will be held throughout the study to provide project updates, share information, and seek feedback. Advance notice of these events will be published in local newspapers, posted on the project website [http://www.gotransit.com/estudy/en/default.aspx](http://www.gotransit.com/estudy/en/default.aspx) and issued to those parties on the project Contact List. Consultation with the public, review agencies and aboriginal peoples is a key component of the ARL Electrification project, and we will continue to provide you with project updates and seek comments/feedback at key stages of the project as the study progresses.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director
Electrification

cc:
M. Harrison, Supervisor - Project Coordination, Ministry of the Environment, EAAB
R. Fisher, Project Manager, Parsons Brinckerhoff
A. Saltarelli, Environmental Planner, Morrison Hershfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody Name and Location</th>
<th>Watercourse classification (i.e., warmwater, coldwater)</th>
<th>Habitat information/locations (fish passage barriers, known spawning habitats etc.)</th>
<th>Historical data on fish species present, including whether the subject waterbody(s) are considered to support any vulnerable, threatened or endangered aquatic species</th>
<th>Watershed Plans and Fisheries Management Objectives, if applicable</th>
<th>Interpretation of fish and fish habitat sensitivity (scale of high, moderate, low or unknown as per DFO's Risk Management Framework)</th>
<th>Fisheries Timing Windows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimico Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: RE: TRCA Areas of Interest - Metrolinx Electrification EA

From: Karen Pitre
Sent: July 17, 2012 4:06 PM
To: 'Renee Afoom-Boateng'
Cc: Beth Williston; Daniel Brent
Subject: RE: TRCA Areas of Interest - Metrolinx Electrification EA

Hello Renee,

Thanks for the message. Here are the properties that we are looking at for the electrification EA. Please review and let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com

From: Renee Afoom-Boateng [mailto:RAfoom-boateng@trca.on.ca]
Sent: July 16, 2012 4:19 PM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: Beth Williston; Daniel Brent
Subject: TRCA Areas of Interest - Metrolinx Electrification EA

Hi Karen
It was good to finally speak to you. As discussed, please send me a map or aerial showing your areas or the potential properties that Metrolinx may need as apart of the Georgetown South Expansion Electrification EA study. I will have these properties screened to confirm any TRCA Areas of Interest. This will hopefully help us scope the level of our review as well as identify (possibly) the level of our involvement in your EA.
Once this is done, we can discuss the way forward and whether we need to actually meet to get a briefing/project initiation from your team at Metrolinx.
Thanks Renee

Renee Afoom-Boateng, MES, RPP, MCIP
Planner II, Environmental Assessment Planning
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive, Toronto, Ontario, M3N 1S4
“PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE”

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.

Thank you.”
May 31, 2013

BY E-MAIL ONLY (Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com)

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3

Dear Ms. Pitre:

Re: Response to Notification of Public Open House
Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
Don and Humber River Watersheds; City of Toronto – North York, Toronto and East York

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received notice of the upcoming Public Open House scheduled for June 4, 2013.

TRCA staff has expressed interest in this project. It is our understanding that this undertaking involves electrifying train service along the Union Station rail Corridor and the Kitchener (previously Georgetown) rail corridor as an alternative to the current diesel trains in service. The route is approximately 25 km of track and begins west of the Union Station train shed to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new Union Pearson Express spur link into Terminal 1 at Pearson Airport. The rail line is targeted for completion prior to Toronto’s hosting of the Pan Am Games.

Staff may have interest in the conceptual design if there are structural changes/construction activities required for traction power supply, traction power distribution and maintenance requirements within the study area in relation to TRCA program and policy areas.

While staff is unable to attend the meeting, please forward one copy of any handouts or display materials from this meeting for our files. Please include a digital copy of all materials as part of your submission. As the detailed design process moves forward, please confirm permit requirements under Ontario Regulation 166/06 with TRCA staff. Furthermore, please also include a copy of the draft EA document.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5217 or at bwilliston@trca.on.ca.

Yours truly,

Beth Williston
Senior Manager, Environmental Assessment Planning
Planning and Development

cc:

Metrolinx: Project team, (electrification@metrolinx.com)
July 11, 2013

Beth Williston
Senior Manager, Environmental Assessment Planning
Planning and Development
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON
M3N 1S4

Re: Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Copies of June 2013 Public Open House Material

Dear Ms. Williston:

As requested via your May 31, 2013 letter, we have enclosed both a printed and digital copy of the Public Open House Display Panels for your information.

In addition, we will keep TRCA informed throughout the Environmental Assessment (EA) and preliminary design process, including confirmation of permitting requirements under O. Reg. 166/06 and opportunities to provide comments and feedback on the draft EA document.

Sincerely,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx
20 Bay St., Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2W3
Phone: (416) 874-5910
karen.pitre@metrolinx.com

cc:
A. Saltarelli, Morrison Hershfield
December 10, 2013

BY E-MAIL ONLY (karen.pitre@metrolinx.com)

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON  M5J 2W3

Dear Ms. Pitre:

Re:  Response to Notice of Commencement
Union Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment - Schedule C
Mimico Creek, Humber River and Waterfront Watersheds; City of Toronto – Etobicoke, Toronto
and East York and City of Mississauga

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received the Notice of Commencement for the above
noted Environmental Assessment (EA) on December 03, 2013.

It is our understanding that this undertaking involves the conversion of the UP Express route from diesel to
electric power. This is part of Metrolinx’s regional transportation plan “The Big Move”. The route is
approximately 25 km of track beginning at the future UP Express Terminal west of the Union Station train shed
to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new Union Pearson Express spur link (under construction) into
Terminal 1 at Toronto Pearson International Airport. The electrification of the UP Express route will be achieved
through a Traction Electrification System which will provide electricity to the trains by means of a Traction Power
Distribution system by Metrolinx and a Traction Power Supply System by Hydro One (thus an integrated EA
process by Metrolinx and Hydro One).

Staff further understands that the traction power distribution system is an Overhead Contact System comprised
of wires that provide power to the trains along and over the track. The Traction Power and Distribution System
includes two facilities, a switching station located near Eglinton and Black Creek and a paralleling power station
at Bathurst and the existing UP Express rail corridor. These facilities are to boost the voltage along the UP
Express route and also split the electrical sections.

TRCA Areas of Interest

Staff has identified the following Areas of Interest within the study area:

Regulated Areas

- Regulation Limit
- Crest of Slope
- Lake Ontario Shoreline
- Meander Belt
- Regulatory Flood Plain

- Wetlands
- Watercourses

TRCA Program and Policy Areas

- Aquatic Species and Habitat
- Aquifers and Hydrogeological Features
- Archaeological and Heritage Resources
Available mapping and program information regarding these Areas of Interest were sent out to you as per your request on July 30, 2012 for your reference. Please ensure that the status, potential impacts and opportunities for enhancement related to these Areas of Interest are documented and assessed through a review of background material, technical study, field assessment and detailed evaluation, as appropriate.

Selection of Alternatives

In consideration of TRCA’s Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program, Ontario Regulation 166/06, and TRCA’s other programs and policies, staff requires that the preferred alternative meets the following criteria:

1. Prevents the risk associated with flooding, erosion or slope instability.
2. Protects and rehabilitates existing landforms, features and functions.
3. Provides for aquatic, terrestrial and human access.
4. Minimizes water/energy consumption and pollution.
5. Addresses TRCA property and heritage resource concerns.

TRCA staff recommends that a summary of detailed design commitments be included in the EA as a Pre-design Brief. This summary should include, but not be limited to:

a. An aerial photo indicating the study area, regulated area, existing conditions and preferred solution/design;
b. Text indicating the preferred alternative solution/design;
c. A Reference list of alternative solutions and designs considered;
d. A synopsis of all TRCA requirements and technical commitments.

It is intended that the proponent and their consultants, as well as TRCA, would use the Pre-design Brief during the preliminary stages of detailed design. In the Pre-design Brief, commitments made during the EA would be clearly articulated in order to facilitate a 90% detailed design submission to TRCA for all required permits. TRCA staff would then be able to review the required studies, reports or plans; and confirm any additional study requirements or revisions to the submitted materials. Ideally, the completion of the Pre-Design Brief will result in a more timely and streamlined permit approval process in the future.

TRCA Review

Prior to selecting the preferred alternative solution and design, please arrange a meeting to discuss issues that relate to our program and policy concerns. In addition, please add TRCA’s Watershed Specialists Chandra Sharma, Nancy Gaffney, and Sonia Dhir to the project mailing list to receive any public information updates.

A copy of the TRCA Environmental Assessment Review Program Service Delivery Standards and a
summary chart is enclosed for your reference. We recommend you refer to these submission standards during the study to facilitate TRCA review. Please provide the following submissions to expedite TRCA review:

- Notices of public meetings and display material and handouts
- Four hard copies of the Phases 1 and 2 Report
- Four hard copies of the Phase 3 Report
- Four hard copies of the Draft EA Document
- One hard copy of the Final EA Document.

Please include a digital copy of all submitted material. Materials must be submitted in PDF format, with drawings pre-scaled to print on 11"x17" pages. Materials may be submitted on discs, via e-mail (if less than 2.5 MB), or through file transfer protocol (FTP) sites (if posted for a minimum of two weeks).

Should you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5714 or at rafroom-boateng@trca.on.ca.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Renee Afoom-Boateng
Senior Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning
Planning and Development

/cm

Encl.: TRCA Areas of Interest Summary Table
       Service Delivery Standards - Recommended TRCA Contact Points

BY E-MAIL
cc: Hydro One: Patricia Staite, Environmental Planner (patricia.staite@hydroone.com)
    Beth Williston, Senior Manager, Environmental Assessment Planning
    Chandra Sharma, Watershed Specialist, Mimico Creek
    Nancy Gaffney, Waterfront Specialist, Watershed Management
    Sonia Dhir, Project Manager, Humber River Watershed
    George Leja, Real Estate Coordinator
    Margie Kenedy, Archaeologist

    TRCA: Nancy Gaffney, Waterfront Specialist, Watershed Management
          Sonia Dhir, Project Manager, Humber River Watershed
          George Leja, Real Estate Coordinator
          Margie Kenedy, Archaeologist
**EA Requirements**

Document and assess the status, potential impacts and opportunities for enhancement that relate to the following Areas of Interest through a review of background material, technical study, field assessment and detailed evaluation, as appropriate. Make reference to the applicable Program and Policy documents. Include in the EA Document appendices any minutes, structure summary sheets for watercourses or wetlands, or other material collected through meetings with TRCA staff. Natural features may need to be confirmed on site by TRCA staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest / Data Availability</th>
<th>Program and Policy Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRCA REGULATED AREAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Regulation Limit                    | In accordance with Ontario Regulation 166/06 (Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses), a permit is required from the TRCA prior to any development (e.g. construction) if, in the opinion of TRCA, the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches or pollution or the conservation of land may be affected. The Regulation Limit defines the greater of the natural hazards associated with Ontario Regulation 166/06 (listed below).

NOTE: The Regulation Limit provides a geographical screening tool for determining if Ontario Regulation 166/06 will apply to a given proposal. Through site assessment or other investigation, it may be determined that areas outside of the defined Regulation Limit require permits under Ontario Regulation 166/06. In these instances, it is the text of the regulation that will prevail; modifications to the regulation line may be required.

Any development within the Regulation Limit must comply with the applicable sections of TRCA’s *Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program*. |
| GIS data available                  |                             |
| Crest of Slope                      | Valley and stream corridors are dynamic systems that provide important natural functions and linkages for the physical, chemical and biological processes of wildlife, watercourses, and other natural features. The Crest of Slope identifies the physical limit of these corridors; however, due to ecological sensitivities, development restrictions typically extend beyond the actual Crest of Slope. |
| Lake Ontario Shoreline              | The Lake Ontario Shoreline consists of sensitive bluffs and dynamic beach systems. Any development near the Lake Ontario Shoreline may impact these sensitive natural features, or may be impacted by associated flooding or erosion hazards.

Applicable programs and strategies for work near the Lake Ontario Shoreline may include: *The Lake Ontario Waterfront Development Program; The Toronto Waterfront Aquatic Habitat Restoration Strategy (TWAHRS); The Integrated Shoreline Management Plan: Tommy Thompson Park To Frenchman’s Bay.* |
| Meander Belt                        | Channel migration has a significant impact on infrastructure, structures and property located near river systems. Determining channel stability is important to ensure that damage from erosion, downcutting or other natural channel processes is avoided.

TRCA may require a meander belt delineation study or fluvial geomorphology analysis to confirm that any development does not conflict with natural channel processes. |
| Regulatory Flood Plain Engineered maps may be available | The Regulatory Flood Plain is the approved standard used in a particular watershed to define the limit of the flood plain for regulatory purposes. Within TRCA’s jurisdiction, the Regulatory Flood Plain is based on the greater of the regional storm, Hurricane Hazel, and the 100 year flood.

Any development or alterations to existing structures within the Regulatory Flood Plain may introduce risk to life or property, and may not be compatible with existing natural features. TRCA’s framework for Flood Plain Management is the *Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program*. 

TRCA may require a flood study or hydraulic update to confirm that there will be no impacts to the storage or conveyance of flood waters. |
### TRCA AREAS OF INTEREST

| Wetlands | Wetlands are sensitive natural habitats that play an important role in numerous physical, chemical and biological processes, including storm water control, natural habitat and water quality improvement. Most wetlands are designated by the Ministry of Natural Resources as Provincially Significant or Locally Significant. Other wetlands have also been identified on a site specific basis by TRCA. All of these are regulated under Ontario Regulation 166/06. TRCA may require an environmental study or site confirmation of wetlands locations. |
| Watercourses | Typically, watercourses are associated with aquatic species and habitat. Any alteration or interference to a watercourse (e.g. straightening, diverting, realigning, altering baseflow) has the potential to impact fish communities, but may also affect the Regulatory Flood Plain, erosion or other natural channel processes. TRCA may require an environmental study or site confirmation of watercourse locations. |

**Partial GIS data available**

### TRCA PROGRAM AND POLICY AREAS

**Note:** Additional program and policy information may be available at [www.trca.on.ca](http://www.trca.on.ca), or by request.

| Aquatic Species and Habitat | Under the *Fisheries Act*, the Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction (HADD) of fish habitat is prohibited, unless authorized by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). TRCA reviews projects under the *Fisheries Act* based on our Level III Agreement with DFO to ensure that any potential impacts to fish habitat are appropriately mitigated, or that adequate compensation is provided where a HADD is unavoidable. Alternatives should be designed with appropriate mitigation measures to avoid a HADD. If a HADD is unavoidable, a suitable compensation plan must be developed, and Authorization from DFO will be required. TRCA may require a quantification and assessment of existing conditions and proposed changes to fish habitat and communities to confirm impacts to these resources. |
| Aquifers and Hydrogeological Features | The extraction and discharge of groundwater has the potential to negatively impact surrounding natural features. Even small amounts of groundwater extraction may reduce contributions to groundwater dependent features such as wetlands, springs, or fish spawning habitat. In addition, the discharge of groundwater must be controlled to avoid impacts to watercourses and fish habitat from erosion, sedimentation and water quality concerns. TRCA may require geotechnical or hydrogeological investigations to confirm dewatering and discharge requirements, and to identify appropriate mitigation measures with respect to potential impacts to natural features (i.e., wetlands, watercourses, natural features and aquatic habitat). |

**GIS data available**

<p>| Archaeological and Heritage Resources | TRCA watershed strategies include recommendations for the management of archaeological and heritage resources in accordance with Ministry of Culture and Municipal standards. Preserve and protect archaeological resources where possible. TRCA may require a Stage 1, 2, 3, or 4 archaeological assessment to confirm impacts to these resources. Note that an archaeological investigation by TRCA's archaeological staff must precede any disturbance to TRCA property, at the cost of the proponent. Scheduling will be subject to weather, seasonal programs and other field work. |
| Conservation Land (TRCA Property) | If TRCA property is needed for the implementation of the preferred alternative, permission and approval from TRCA and the Minister of Natural Resources are required. The design must demonstrate that TRCA program and policy objectives are met. Formal approval typically takes 12 to 18 months from the completion of the EA document. As noted above, an archaeological investigation by TRCA's archaeological staff must precede any disturbance to TRCA property. Applicable programs and strategies for works on TRCA property may include: TRCA Strategy for Public Use of Authority Lands, TRCA Greenspace Strategy, Archaeological Resource Management Procedures: Guidelines, master plans for specific conservation lands, watershed strategies, or other programs or policies referenced in this document. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmentally Significant Areas</th>
<th>Environmentally Significant Areas have been identified by TRCA based on a set of ecological criteria regarding the function, significance and rarity of the features or species found in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS data available</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living City Programs</td>
<td>The Living City is a vision adopted by TRCA for a new kind of community, where human settlement can flourish forever as part of nature’s beauty and diversity. The key objectives of the Living City are: healthy rivers and shorelines; regional biodiversity; sustainable communities; and business excellence. Programs associated with TRCA’s Living City include: trails enhancement, renewable energy, sustainable communities, and the <em>Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program</em> (STEP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS data available</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Policy Areas</td>
<td>Developed areas that have historically existed within a flood plain may be designated as Special Policy Areas (SPA) as permitted under the 2005 <em>Provincial Policy Statement</em>. Policies for development and land use in these areas address the social, economic and cultural factors that support the continuation of the community. SPAs allow development and land uses that would not otherwise be permitted by the provincial policies on flood plain management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS data available</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Natural Heritage System Strategy</td>
<td>TRCA has identified the need to improve both the quality and quantity of terrestrial habitat. TRCA’s <em>Terrestrial Natural Heritage System Strategy</em> sets measurable targets for attaining a healthier natural system by creating an expanded and targeted land base. It includes strategic directions for stewardship and securement of the land base, a land use policy framework to help achieve the target system, and other implementation mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS data available</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Species and Habitat</td>
<td>The terrestrial system includes landscape features, vegetation communities and flora and fauna species. Terrestrial species and habitat should be assessed based on their conservation status according to sensitivity to disturbance and specialized ecological needs, as well as rarity. TRCA may require a site assessment and terrestrial inventory to confirm impacts to these resources. TRCA’s <em>Terrestrial Natural Heritage Strategy</em> may be applicable to any work that impacts terrestrial species and habitat. In addition, relevant legislation (e.g. <em>Migratory Bird Convention Act, Species at Risk Act</em>) should be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIS data available</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL PROGRAM AREAS**

| Province | Province Significantly Significant Wetlands | Province Significantly Significant Wetlands are identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) according to a provincial evaluation guide that considers soil composition, hydrology and plant species. The 2005 *Provincial Policy Statement* states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in these areas. Contact MNR for more details. |
Service Delivery Standards
Recommended TRCA Contact Points in the Municipal Class EA Planning & Design Process

Pre-Consultation:
- Submit Letter of Project Initiation
- Meet with TRCA
- Send out Request for Proposals
- Hold bidder's meeting, Request TRCA presence if required
- Hire consultant

Phase 1:
- Identify problem or opportunity
- Submit Notice of Commencement/Initiation
- Meet with TRCA
- Submit Notice of Public Information Centre (PIC)/Public Consultation Centre (PCC)
- Host PIC/PCC

Phase 2:
- Identify alternative solutions
- Evaluate alternative solutions & select preliminary preferred solution
- Submit draft Phase 1 & 2 Report
- Meet with TRCA
- Submit Notice of PIC/PCC
- Host PIC/PCC

Phase 3:
- Identify alternative design concepts for preferred solution
- Evaluate preliminary alternative design concepts & select preliminary preferred design
- Submit draft Phase 3 Report & technical appendices
- Meet with TRCA
- Submit Notice of PIC/PCC
- Host PIC/PCC
- Select preferred design

Phase 4:
- Submit draft Environmental Study Report (ESR)
- Meet with TRCA if required
- Submit Notice of Completion & final ESR

Phase 5:
- Obtain regulatory approvals, tender, construct, & monitor

Event Progression:
- Decision Path

Recommended Contact with TRCA

Please note:
This chart presents a simplification of the EA process and is not meant to replace Exhibit A.2 of the Municipal Class EA Terms of Reference.
Hello Karen

This is Renee Afoom-Boateng. The morning of Tuesday January 28, 2014 will work better for TRCA staff. I am assuming the meeting will be held in our office so I have booked a meeting room from 10am (for an hour and a half) at our head office. Please note that I will be taking over this file from Caroline on behalf of TRCA so feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Also if possible, please send an agenda and meeting materials to me closer to the date of the meeting. If you need directions to our offices, please let me know as well.

Thanks Renee

Hello Caroline,

We would be happy to meet with the TRCA. I would like to propose a meeting on either January 27th or the morning of the 28th.

Could you please advise whether either of these dates work?

Regards,

Karen Pitre

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
From: Caroline Mugo [mailto:CMugo@trca.on.ca]
Sent: December 10, 2013 11:04 AM
To: Karen Pitre
Cc: Beth Williston; Renee Afoom-Boateng; patricia.staite@hydroone.com; Chandra Sharma; Nancy Gaffney; Sonia Dhir; George Leja; Margie Kenedy
Subject: Letter form Renee Afoom-Boateng regarding CFN 50130- UP Express EA

Caroline Mugo
Planner I
Environmental Assessment Planning
Planning and Development
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
5 Shoreham Drive | Toronto, ON M3N 1S4
☎ 416.661.6600 x5689 | ✉ 416.661.6898 | ✉ cmugo@trca.on.ca

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.
Thank you."

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.
Thank you."
January 29, 2014

BY E-MAIL ONLY (Karen.pitre@metrolinx.com)

Ms. Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx Rapid Transit Implementation
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2W3

Dear Ms. Pitre:

Re: Response to Notice of Public Open Houses
Union Pearson Express Electrification
Transit Project Assessment
Waterfront, Humber River and Mimico Creek Watersheds; City of Toronto, Toronto East
York and Etobicoke – York

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff received notice of the upcoming Public Open Houses scheduled for January 20, 2014 and February 3rd, 4th and 10th, 2014. Further to TRCA correspondence dated December 10, 2013, staff has expressed interest in this project. While staff is unable to attend the open houses, please forward one copy of any handouts or display materials for our files. Please include a PDF copy of all materials as part of your submission, with drawings pre-scaled to print on 11”x17” pages. Materials may be submitted on discs, via e-mail (if less than 2.5 MB), or through file transfer protocol (FTP) sites (if posted for a minimum of two weeks).

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 416-661-6600 extension 5714 or by email at rafoom-boateng@trca.on.ca.

Renee Afoom-Boateng, MES, RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning

BY E-MAIL
Hydro One: Patricia Stalte, Environmental Planner (community.relations@hydroone.com)
TRCA: Beth Williston, Senior Manager, Environmental Assessment Planning
Chandra Sharma, Watershed Specialist Mimico Creek
Nancy Gaffney, Waterfront Specialist
Sonia Dhir, Project Manager, Humber River Watershed
From: Renee Afoom-Boateng [mailto:RAfoom-Boateng@trca.on.ca]
Sent: February 6, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Karen Pitre
Subject: RE: Response to Public Open Houses - Metrolinx Hydro - UP Express Electrification Project

Thank you very Karen. Hope your public meetings went well with good and positive public turn out. I will look out for the EA report. Renee

Renee Afoom-Boateng, MES, RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning
TRCA, 5 Shoreham Drive, Downsview, ON M3N 1S4
Tel: 416-661-6600 ext. 5714
Email: rafoom-boateng@trca.on.ca

From: Karen Pitre <Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com>
To: Renee Afoom-Boateng <RAfoom-Boateng@trca.on.ca>, "community.relations@hydroone.com" <community.relations@hydroone.com>,
Cc: Beth Williston <BWilliston@trca.on.ca>, Chandra Sharma <CSharma@trca.on.ca>, Nancy Gaffney <NGaffney@trca.on.ca>, Sonia Dhir <SDhir@trca.on.ca>
Date: 02/05/2014 12:57 PM
Subject: RE: Response to Public Open Houses - Metrolinx Hydro - UP Express Electrification Project

Renee,

In addition to the Metrolinx Boards, here are the Hydro One materials from the meetings.

We’ll stay in touch and will forward the Natural Environment Assessment Report to you shortly.

Thanks very much,

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com
From: Karen Pitre
Sent: February 5, 2014 12:51 PM
To: 'Renee Afoom-Boateng'; community.relations@hydroone.com
Cc: Beth Williston; Chandra Sharma; Nancy Gaffney; Sonia Dhir
Subject: RE: Response to Public Open Houses - Metrolinx Hydro - UP Express Electrification Project

Thanks Renee,

Here are the display boards from the Public Open Houses. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Karen

Executive Director
Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
T: 416-874-5910
C: 416-729-2186
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.metrolinx.com

---

From: Renee Afoom-Boateng [mailto:RAfoom-Boateng@trca.on.ca]
Sent: January 29, 2014 3:41 PM
To: Karen Pitre; community.relations@hydroone.com
Cc: Beth Williston; Chandra Sharma; Nancy Gaffney; Sonia Dhir
Subject: Response to Public Open Houses - Metrolinx Hydro - UP Express Electrification Project

Hi Karen

Great meeting you yesterday. As discussed, TRCA staff will not be able to attend the various public open houses coming up in the next 2 weeks. Please find attached our response to the public notice.

Do feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Renee

Renee Afoom-Boateng, MES, RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner, Environmental Assessment Planning
TRCA, 5 Shoreham Drive, Downsview, ON M3N 1S4
Tel: 416-661-6600 ext. 5714
Email: rafoom-boateng@trca.on.ca

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please resend this communication to the sender and delete it permanently from your computer system.

Thank you." [attachment "Traction Power Supply System panels FINAL.PDF" deleted by Renee Afoom-Boateng/TRCA]

"*PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT WHEN DECIDING TO PRINT THIS MESSAGE*

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Confidentiality Notice:
The information contained in this communication including any attachments may be confidential, is intended only for use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Reviewer ID</th>
<th>Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #</th>
<th>Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)</th>
<th>Response &amp; Details (Designer)</th>
<th>Action 1 / 2 / 3* (Designer)</th>
<th>Status O / P / C** (Reviewer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENG-EP&amp;M</td>
<td>TTC-001</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>There is no information (voltage, AC/DC, isolated/grounded, etc) about the traction power system to help us evaluate any interaction between TTC traction power network and the proposed electrification. The EA concentrates only on OCS and bonding and grounding for utilities. We should recommend that EA to further investigate possible interaction between proposed electrification system and existing TTC traction power network. The locations where the 2 systems will be in close proximity and to be further investigated are the following: 1. Union Station - subway station and streetcar tunnel crossing below Union Station rail tracks; 2. Spadina between Front and Bremner - streetcar tracks on bridge over rail tracks; 3. Bathurst between Fort York and Front - streetcar tracks on bridge over rail tracks; 4. King West between Strachan and Dufferin - rail tracks on bridge over streetcar tracks; 5. Queen West @ Dufferin - rail tracks on bridge over streetcar tracks; 6. Dundas West @ Lansdowne - streetcar tracks on bridge over rail tracks; 7. Bloor West@ Dundas West - rail tracks crossing over subway tunnel; 8. St. Clair West between Keele and Old Weston - rail tracks on bridge over streetcar tracks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RI-EE</td>
<td>TTC-002</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Metrolinx to investigate potential impacts of electrolysis caused by the electrification of the GO line with respect to existing TTC rails/poles on bridge decks and submit mitigation report/recommendations prepared by a NACE certified consultant for review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RI-EE</td>
<td>TTC-003</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>TTC rails cannot be grounded within 10m zone. Metrolinx to provide alternate recommendations for review,(see comment TTC-002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RI-EE</td>
<td>TTC-004</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Detailed design of bridge deck modifications affecting poles supporting TTC overhead to be submitted for review and comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Reviewer ID</td>
<td>Dwg. #/ Spec Section/ Page #</td>
<td>Review Comment (Metrolinx, Third Party Reviewers)</td>
<td>Response &amp; Details (Designer)</td>
<td>Action 1 / 2 / 3* (Designer)</td>
<td>Status O / P / C** (Reviewer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENG-STR</td>
<td>TTC-005</td>
<td>City of Toronto Summary Package-Feb 2014_FINAL</td>
<td>Before drilling into the bridge structure in order to attach wires, OCS, or any other equipment, locates have to be done. Drilling through bridge reinforcement must be avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ENG-STR</td>
<td>TTC-006</td>
<td>City of Toronto Summary Package-Feb 2014_FINAL</td>
<td>City comments already cover bridge maintenance and rehabilitation issues related to installation/attachment of new cables, OCS or any other equipment. City comments also already cover issues related to design and maintenance of bridge barrier protection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td>TTC-007</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Please verify whether any provision has been made to conduct investigation into the whether the UP electrification and associated infrastructure may impact TTC assets as a result of stray currents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J10
Utility Letters
March 24, 2014

Mr. Doug Daniels
Allstream
200 Wellington Street, Suite 1400
Toronto, ON M5V 3G2

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Daniels:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

![Project Location Map](image-url)
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Allstream utilities, two (2) known crossings/locations have been identified at this stage, based on the available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11+540</td>
<td>Allstream</td>
<td>Fibre Crossing in Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Ray Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17+220</td>
<td>Allstream</td>
<td>Underground Duct Bank</td>
<td>Highway 401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underground Conduit Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Concrete (100%)</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duct Bank Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014.

Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Canada Packers Inc
2200 St Clair W
Toronto, Ontario
M6N 1K4

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
Project Overview

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

Work Completed to Date

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures

With respect to the Canada Packers utilities, six (6) crossings/locations have been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.
Table 1 - List of Known Canada Packers Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>200mm Water Main</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>Hydrogen Pipeline</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Gunns Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>Steam Pipe</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8+530</td>
<td>Canada Packers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Conduit Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encased in Steel Casing Pipe</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen/Steam Pipeline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen/Steam Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In
addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre  
Executive Director, Electrification  
Metrolinx-GO Transit  
20 Bay Street, Suite 600  
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3  
Tel: 416-874-5910  
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com  
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr D. Rick Lowes  
Senior Vice President, Business Development and Operational Services  
Canadian Gypsum Company Inc.  
350 Burnhamthorpe Road West, 5th Floor  
Mississauga, ON  L5B 3J1

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Lowes:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Canadian Gypsum Company utility, one (1) known crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

### Table 1 - List of Known Canadian Gypsum Company Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>15+190</td>
<td>Canadian Gypsum Company</td>
<td>Ditch Culvert</td>
<td>Parke St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch Culvert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic (100%)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ditch Culvert Total** | 1 |
**Next Steps**

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr. Dennis Stolfi
Planning Manager
Enbridge Gas
500 Consumers Road
North York, Ontario
M2J 1P8

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Stolfi:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

![Project Location Map](image-url)

---

97 Front Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 1E6

97, rue Front Ouest
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 1E6
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Enbridge Gas utilities, 44 known crossings/locations have been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.
### Table 1 - List of Known Enbridge Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1+965</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Tecumseh St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1+965</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>75mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Tecumseh St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2+560</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Strachan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2+560</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Strachan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3+205</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>400mm Gas Main</td>
<td>King St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3+525</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Sudbury St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3+960</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Queen St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3+960</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Queen St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3+960</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Queen St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4+055</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Dufferin St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4+490</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main on North side of corridor</td>
<td>Brock Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>5+020</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Lansdowne Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6+920</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Ruskin Ave. &amp; Jerome St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>7+035</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Ruskin Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7+405</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Dupont Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7+405</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Dupont Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>8+270</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Cawthra Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>900mm Gas Main</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8+530</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>500mm Gas Main</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8+530</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8+530</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>9+045</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>Pipe Crossing in 750mm Casing</td>
<td>North of St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>9+880</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>West of Rogers Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>10+975</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Eglinton Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>10+990</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Eglinton Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11+540</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Ray Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11+585</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Ray Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12+390</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Jane St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>12+700</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Lippincott St. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>12+795</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Denison Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>12+810</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Denison Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mile</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approximate Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>12+810</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Denison Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>13+585</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Lawrence Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>13+890</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>John St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>14+065</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>King St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>14+390</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>200mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Church St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>15+305</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>150mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Weston Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>16+755</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Islington Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>17+765</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>East of Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>17+815</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>17+945</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Oil Pipeline</td>
<td>West of Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>18+880</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>300mm Gas Main</td>
<td>West of Martin Grove Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>18+910</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>Gas Main – Size to be Confirmed during Detailed Design Phase</td>
<td>Martin Grove Rd. - West side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>18+960</td>
<td>Enbridge</td>
<td>100mm Gas Main</td>
<td>Martin Grove Rd. - West side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encased in Steel Casing Pipe</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Next Steps**

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Colleen Mitchell
Imperial Oil
100-Fifth Concession Road East
Waterdown, ON L0R 2H1

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Ms. Mitchell:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Imperial Oil utilities, one (1) crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

**Table 1 - List of Known Imperial Oil Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17+865</td>
<td>Imperial Oil</td>
<td>High pressure oil pipeline</td>
<td>West of Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal (wood, etc...)</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic (100%)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the utility, one (1) known crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

**Table 1 - List of Known Utility Crossing the Rail Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8+465</td>
<td>Private Owner - to be Confirmed during Detailed Design Phase</td>
<td>300mm Storm Drain</td>
<td>St. Clair Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic (100%)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr. Jim Dunn
Rogers
3573 Wolfdale Road
Mississauga, Ontario
L5C 3T6

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Dunn:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Rogers utilities, seven (7) known crossings/locations have been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

**Table 1 - List of Known Rogers Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11+540</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Overhead Wire</td>
<td>Ray Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>14+390</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Church St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16+735</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Overhead Wire</td>
<td>Islington Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>17+815</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>18+880</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Martin Grove Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>18+925</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>Martin Grove Rd. - West side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>19+910</td>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Duct West side of South Lanes</td>
<td>Hwy 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underground Conduit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Conduit Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td>Not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct Bank Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>Relocate overhead wires to under tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electrical clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Line Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr. Paul Lane
Sun-Canadian Pipe Line Company Limited
P O Box 470
Waterdown, Ontario
L0R 2H0

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Lane:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
Project Overview

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

Work Completed to Date

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures

With respect to the Sun-Canadian Pipe Line utility, one (1) known crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

Table 1 - List of Known Sun-Canadian Pipe Line Utility Crossing the Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>17+990</td>
<td>Sun-Canadian Pipe Line</td>
<td>Oil Pipeline – Size to be Confirmed during Detailed Design Phase</td>
<td>Namco Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal (wood, etc...)</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic (100%)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr Stephen Hoy
Network Planning Manager
Access Planning
TELUS Integrated Communication
5 2700 Matheson Blvd East
Mississauga, ON L4W 4VN

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Hoy:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

[Project Location Map]
Project Overview

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

Work Completed to Date

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures

With respect to the Telus utility, one (1) crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

Table 1 - List of Known Telus Utility Crossing the Rail Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>19+910</td>
<td>TELUS</td>
<td>Duct Bank</td>
<td>Hwy 27 East side of North Lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duct Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete (100%)</td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct Bank Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Trans-Northern Pipelines

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Sir/Madam:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
**Project Overview**

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

**Work Completed to Date**

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

**Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures**

With respect to the Trans-Northern Pipelines utilities, one (1) crossing/location has been identified at this stage, based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

**Table 1 - List of Known Trans-Northern Pipelines Utilities Crossing the Rail Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17+865</td>
<td>Trans-Northern Pipelines</td>
<td>High pressure oil pipeline</td>
<td>West of Kipling Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal (wood, etc...)</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metallic (100%)</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx.

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification
March 24, 2014

Mr Chris Edge  
Project Director  
Woodbine Entertainment Group  
P.O. Box 156, 555 Rexdale Blvd  
Toronto, ON M9W 5L2

Re: Metrolinx Union-Pearson Express Electrification Environmental Assessment – Potentially Affected Utilities

Dear Mr. Edge:

Metrolinx is undertaking the Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment (EA) for electrification of the Union Pearson (UP) Express (see location map below). The project involves the electrification of approximately 25 km of track along the Union Station GO railway corridor and Kitchener GO railway corridor to Highway 427, where the route then follows the new UP Express spur link line (currently under construction) into Toronto Pearson International Airport (Toronto Pearson). The purpose of this letter is to inform relevant utility providers of the project and extent of proposed works as well as potential future implications for plant that cross or run parallel to the rail corridor(s).

Project Location Map
Project Overview

Electrification of the UP Express will be achieved through a Traction Electrification System (2x25 kV), which will provide electrical power to the trains by means of a Traction Power Distribution System comprised of an Overhead Contact System (OCS) (a wiring system providing power to the trains). The wiring system will be suspended from a number of OCS structures (i.e., portals, cantilevers) placed along and over the track. The Traction Power Distribution System also includes two Paralleling Stations (PS) to boost the voltage along the UP Express route, as well as gantries (which provide power to the OCS) located in the vicinity of each PS. In addition, a new electrified maintenance facility will need to be built to carry out maintenance on the new electric trains.

The project is following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), and the planned submission date for the Final Environmental Project Report is April 1, 2014.

Work Completed to Date

As part of the UP Express Electrification EA, existing public and private utilities and underground infrastructure (utilities) were identified within the study area. These locations were based on plans from the Georgetown South (GTS) Expansion project and the Union Station Rail Corridor (USRC). Field investigations and detailed utility searches were not undertaken as part of the EA. Rather, these more detailed investigations would need to be undertaken during the subsequent detailed design phase.

It is also noted that there are a significant number of utilities being relocated as part of the Georgetown South construction work that is currently ongoing along the corridor. As a result, the assessment of any additional utility conflicts due to UP Express Electrification will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx as part of the Detailed Design phase.

In addition, a general assessment of how utilities may be affected by the implementation of electrification project components has been undertaken. A summary of this initial assessment has been provided below.

Overview of Potential Effects and Mitigation Measures

With respect to the Woodbine utilities, three (3) known crossings/locations have been identified at this stage based on available information. Table 1 provides additional utility description and location information. Potential impacts on utilities related to UP Express Electrification components have been identified in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mile</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>21+020</td>
<td>Woodbine</td>
<td>300mm Water Main</td>
<td>East of Carlingview Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>21+020</td>
<td>Woodbine</td>
<td>300mm Water Main</td>
<td>East of Carlingview Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>21+020</td>
<td>Woodbine</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer – Size to be Confirmed during Detailed Design Phase</td>
<td>Carlingview Dr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 - Proposed Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Utility Sub Type</th>
<th>Utility Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Non-metal</td>
<td>Non-metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reinforced Concrete</td>
<td>Reinforced-concrete</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Metallic</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Two Grounding Connections and insulated joints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encased in Steel Casing Pipe</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Steps

The UP Express EA will be completed April 1, 2014. At this time, there will be time for public comment and Ministry of Environment review. If there are no objections, a Statement of Completion will be issued in June 2014. Following the required environmental approvals, the project needs to be funded prior to starting the detailed design and construction of the infrastructure required for electrification.

Any potential utility impacts, as summarized above, will be further reviewed and confirmed during the detailed design phase, in coordination with affected utility providers, in order to determine the specific mitigation measures to be implemented. A case-by-case analysis of potential conflicts will need to be undertaken. In addition, follow up discussions/negotiations with affected utility companies to resolve potential conflicts will be undertaken prior to the commencement of the tendering and construction period.

If you would like to discuss the project, or would like additional, more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact me or visit the project website at: [http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx](http://www.gotransit.com/electrification/en/default.aspx).

Regards,

Karen Pitre
Executive Director, Electrification
Metrolinx-GO Transit
20 Bay Street, Suite 600
Toronto ON, M5J 2W3
Tel: 416-874-5910
Karen.Pitre@metrolinx.com
www.gotransit.com/electrification