

Overview

From September 18 to October 31, 2017, CN consulted with the public in Halton Region communities (Milton, Burlington, Oakville, and Halton Hills) and sought input on aspects of the proposed Milton Logistics Hub, including proposed mitigation measures and potential additional community benefits that the Project could provide. In the months prior to this consultation, CN reached out to local government representatives of the Halton Region (Milton, Burlington, Oakville and Halton Hills), local chambers of commerce, as well as provincial and federal government representatives to provide an update on the Project, answer questions, listen to feedback, and provide advance notice of the fall 2017 public consultation.

A Consultation Summary Report was developed by Kirk & Co., an independent firm specializing in designing and implementing comprehensive public and stakeholder consultation and engagement programs. That report summarizes the input gathered during the fall 2017 consultation, including the government and stakeholder outreach leading up to it. This community consultation process was open to anyone who wished to participate, and is over and above the on-going consultation between CN and Aboriginal communities, and separate from opportunities for public participation in the federal environmental review process.

This Consideration Memo was developed to demonstrate how CN has considered input from 2017 consultation, and how CN continues to consider input to incorporate feedback into the proposed Project.

Sources of fall 2017 input (identified in the Consultation Summary Report) reflected in the following table include:

- Five public open houses (Milton x2, Burlington, Oakville, Halton Hills)
- Two small group meetings (Milton)
- Online and printed feedback form
- Consultation poll
- Community correspondence (written submissions)
- Government and stakeholder meetings

Note: References are made in the following table to where topics have been considered in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and CN's responses to Information Requests (IRs) from the Review Panel. The EIS, IRs, and other documentation relating to the environmental assessment and panel review process can be found on the CEAA Public Registry, Reference Number: 80100.

CN's consideration of technical information and input from community consultation

Topics	CN consideration of input
<p>1. Terminal access / local traffic impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding traffic around the proposed facility, including trucks arriving at and leaving the facility. • Concern about local traffic impacts and whether the regional road network has the capacity to accommodate traffic associated with the terminal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have considered feedback from the community, including local government, to better understand concerns and find ways to minimize impacts to local traffic. • In response to early community feedback regarding traffic on local roads, the Project design was initially revised to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ move the access road for trucks to Britannia Road from Tremaine Road; ○ align the truck entrance with proposed intersection of the collector road for the Boyne Survey Secondary Plan and Britannia Road north of the Project, to improve safety and efficiency of traffic movement; ○ include a 1.7-kilometre inbound/outbound access road and overpass on CN property to keep queuing trucks off local roads; ○ include a proposed grade separation on Lower Base Line to eliminate conflict between road traffic and train operation at that crossing; ○ include an employee access on Tremaine Road designed following Halton Region guidelines; ○ direct trucks under CN control to use Highway 407 whenever practical and feasible. • CN will seek collaboration with Halton Region to install a signalized intersection, as necessary, on Britannia Road with a turning lane for trucks entering the terminal from the east to manage vehicle movements and the safety of other road users, including motor vehicle operators, cyclists and pedestrians (EIS, Appendix G.7 and IR2.33, Attachment 2.33-2). • Since we submitted the EIS in 2015, and in response to community concerns related to truck traffic, we undertook four additional traffic-related studies (further information is provided in response to IR2.33) to collect more information for consideration. • Some key findings of those studies include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ that the proposed Project would generate less traffic than what would occur from a comparably sized parcel with a different land use (retail, residential, office park, industrial park, distribution centre);



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ that the Region’s road network, including planned improvements, is designed to handle truck traffic in the community and is capable of handling traffic associated with the proposed Project; ○ that the proposed Project would result in higher truck volumes near the proposed truck entrance on Britannia Road, but is anticipated to be less noticeable further from the truck entrance, as it would be dispersed along the number of available arterial routes in the region; ○ recommendations for improving traffic flow and safety at the terminal entrance intersection and other intersections along truck routes. ● Additionally, during the fall 2017 consultation, we asked for feedback on potential additional community benefits that CN might consider, including potential investment in local transportation infrastructure. We are continuing to collaborate with local government partners and the community to improve infrastructure in the region that might help regional traffic flow. ● We are in the early stages of planning multi-stakeholder community roundtables in the coming months to seek further feedback and refine the list of potential additional community benefits. ● By the time the Project commences operation, it is anticipated that improvements to the road network to increase capacity for trucks made by the Province, Region, and/or Town will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Widening, extension and improvement of Tremaine Road, with a new interchange at Highway 401; ○ Widening and improvement of Britannia Road, including an overpass over the CN mainline; ○ Widening and improvement of the RR25 and Highway 401 interchange. ● For additional information on traffic-related questions, see EIS Sections 2.2, 3.3, 3.4, and responses to IRs 2.14, 2.15, 2.24, 2.25, and 2.33.
<p>2. Removing long-haul trucks from regional highways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recognition that intermodal trains help remove long-haul 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● During this fall 2017 consultation, participants expressed clear support for removing long-haul trucks from regional highways (87% in poll, 89% in feedback form). ● We believe this is one of the most significant benefits of the proposed Milton Logistics Hub.



Topics	CN consideration of input
trucks from regional highways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One intermodal train can transport the same number of containers as 280 long-distance heavy trucks. • CN's intermodal network removes approximately 2 million of these trucks from Canadian highways annually, 1 million of which would flow through the GTHA. This results in a 9,510-tonne reduction in greenhouse gas emissions every year. • In the absence of intermodal capacity in the GTHA, containers would continue to move by long-haul trucks, increasing congestion on regional highways. • Based on the GHG Study completed in response to Review Panel completeness IR10, the proposed Project will result in a net decrease in future GHG emissions of approximately 83 kt CO₂e in Ontario and 111 kt CO₂e annually within Canada.
<p>3. Additional transportation infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in investments CN could make to help improve local transportation infrastructure in the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our fall 2017 consultation, we began seeking community feedback on potential additional community benefits that might come with the Milton Logistics Hub. • One of the topics that we asked for input on was whether we should consider new investments in local transportation infrastructure. • As noted in response to section 1 above, we conducted four traffic related studies to better understand this key community concern (IR2.33). • Based on the expert conclusions, it is expected that trucks would travel along existing Regional arterial roads / designated truck routes that are designed to accommodate trucks; trucks are not permitted by local laws to use Town of Milton streets. • However, we want to continue to be good community partners. We are continuing to collaborate with local government partners and the community to improve infrastructure in the region that might help regional traffic flow. • We are in the early stages of planning multi-stakeholder community roundtables in the coming months to seek further feedback and refine the list of potential benefits.
<p>4. Traffic during construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding how CN plans to mitigate the effects of traffic during construction of the hub. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognize that there will be impacts to local traffic during construction if the proposed facility is approved. • We are proposing a number of measures to manage any adverse effects on local traffic during construction, including:



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a traffic control plan, construction signage and other traffic control measures to help manage traffic flows; ○ a comprehensive public notification plan in conjunction with local authorities regarding the location and scheduling of construction activities, temporary lane closures or detours.
<p>5. Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about public safety around the facility (i.e. traffic/rail safety). • Concern regarding the quantity and types of dangerous goods coming through the terminal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the fall 2017 consultation, some members of the community asked us about safety-related matters, including the movement of dangerous goods through the proposed terminal. • We are regulated by Transport Canada, and will continue to work with them to ensure we comply with all rules, regulations, and standards. • In a presentation to the Review Panel on March 1, 2017, Transport Canada noted it is responsible for regulations and safety standards for the transportation of dangerous goods. • Some regulated household commodities such as cans of paint, batteries, bleach, and windshield washer fluid are categorized as dangerous goods, and railways are required by law to carry any goods offered for carriage, known as common carrier obligation (more information is contained in IR2.37). • The terminal will only handle goods shipped in intermodal containers, of which a small percentage (approximately 2.7%) of goods may be considered dangerous goods. • The terminal will only handle intermodal containers, and will not handle bulk dangerous goods (EIS Section 3.4.2). • A Hazardous Materials Action Plan, Spill Response Plan, and CN Emergency Response Plan will be developed and implemented during construction and operations (see EIS, Appendix G.9). • In addition, additional traffic-related studies were undertaken following submission of the EIS, including two that address safety with recommendations for improving traffic flow and safety at the terminal entrance intersection and other intersections along truck routes. • CN will seek collaboration with Halton Region to install a signalized intersection, as necessary, on Britannia Road with a turning lane for trucks entering the terminal



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<p>from the east to manage vehicle movements and the safety of other road users, including motor vehicle operators, cyclists and pedestrians (EIS, Appendix G.7 and IR2.33, Attachment 2.33-2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CN Police Service will be used to promote public safety by monitoring truck traffic and enforcing traffic rules on property owned, operated or managed by CN. • For further information on safety-related matters, refer to the EIS, Section 6.6.2. • Finally, we are continuing to consider input from the community, and will provide further detail to the Review Panel in responses to IR5.19 to 5.24, which are expected to be submitted later this year.
<p>6. Alternative sites for the Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the location of the intermodal site, and whether more appropriate alternate sites are available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the fall 2017 consultation demonstrated that many in the community recognize the need for additional intermodal capacity in the GTHA to support the economy (72% poll, 56% feedback form), some participants raised concerns about locating the proposed terminal at a CN-owned site in south Milton. • In particular, some mentioned that they felt that a location in north Milton would be more suitable. • As part of our EIS, we conducted a thorough site assessment that considered alternative sites in the GTHA (see EIS section 2.2.1 and Appendix F, and responses to IRs 2.8 to 2.15). • From that work, only two technically and economically feasible alternatives were identified (North Brampton and South Milton). • The site in south Milton was selected as the best option for providing service to the growing GTHA, as it was found to meet the following major requirements of the Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adjacent to CN’s mainline ○ Land of sufficient size, grade, and configuration to safely and efficiently accommodate container trains moving into and out of the facility ○ Close to 400-series highways for truck-haul routes ○ In a region with growing demand for goods near existing transportation and logistics infrastructure ○ Located in an area with minimal intrusions on environmental features, such as woodlands and watercourses



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, as we noted in our response to IR2.5, many provincial, regional, and municipal planning documents recognize the proposed Project at the south Milton site, as well as importance of intermodal infrastructure more generally. We have provided the Review Panel with further information regarding why the site in north Milton is not technically feasible, in our response to IR2.
<p>7. Need for the Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition that the Project is needed to meet growing demand for goods in the GTHA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback received during the fall 2017 consultation showed that the community generally accepted there is a need for additional intermodal capacity in the GTHA. The consultation polling and feedback form indicated widespread recognition of the need for additional intermodal capacity in the GTHA to support the economy (72% poll, 56% feedback form), while this emerged as a key theme in small group meetings. In letters to the Review Panel, the Shipping Association of Canada (September 26, 2017) and the Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association (August 25, 2017) expressed concern regarding existing intermodal capacity, and expressed strong support for the urgent need for the proposed Project. The proposed Project is needed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the growing demand for household goods across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) Help local businesses in Milton and southern Ontario get their goods to and from critical markets Alleviate congestion on 400-series highways by removing long-haul trucks Support Canada’s international supply chains, and federal trade and climate goals We believe, if built, the Milton Logistics Hub will provide significant socio-economic benefits, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating local direct and indirect jobs Protecting the environment by displacing long-haul trucks Helping local businesses be more competitive globally
<p>8. Light and noise impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about potential light and noise impacts from the Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recognize that potential light and noise impacts remain a concern for some in the community.



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to early feedback from the community, we studied the potential light and noise impacts and developed a mitigation plan (see EIS Sections 6 and 7, Appendix E.8, E.10, and E.12). • Mitigation measures to reduce the effects of noise and light incorporated into the Project design include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Constructing raised earthen berms or barriers, planted with vegetation to blend into the natural environment and reduce the effects of noise and light; ○ Scheduling construction during daytime hours where possible, and notifying nearby residents regarding significant construction activities; ○ Using noise mitigation measures on terminal and construction equipment; ○ Using downward directed lighting in active work areas; turning off lighting not being used for construction or operational activities; and using only enough lights for safety and security where required. • We measured existing ambient sound levels within the proposed Project area and conducted a noise assessment that determined, with mitigation measures in place, noise effects from the Project would be within acceptable levels specified by the relevant guidelines, including Health Canada. • In addition, preliminary lighting design shows lighting effects on receptors, nearby residences closest to the proposed terminal, to be below 15% of the E3 (suburban) environmental zone allowable 2 lux light spill guidelines (Appendix E.8, page 32). • The proposed Project was designed to use reach stackers to reduce light impacts compared to the alternatives considered (see IR2.17). • We are continuing to consider input, and will be providing more information to the Review Panel on light impacts in our response to IR4.
<p>9. Rail traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the number of trains and length of trains resulting from the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some members of the community raised concerns about potential rail traffic, and whether the proposed Project would lead to an increase in overall trains travelling along CN's mainline. • As noted in the EIS, the new facility would result in one additional train eastbound and one additional train westbound per day (relative to today's traffic) stopping at the proposed Project site in Milton.



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the proposed Project is expected to be served by four intermodal trains per day, as two trains would be serviced by the proposed Project which otherwise would be serviced at our intermodal facility in Brampton. • The train characteristics (length, number of cars and locomotives) will vary based on customer volumes and requirements. • Although the specific schedule of train arrival and departure at the terminal has not yet been confirmed, the trains are projected to arrive and depart mainly during morning and evening hours. This schedule is necessary to meet the needs of customers, most of whom operate mainly during day-time hours. • For more information on expected train characteristics see the response to IR2.29.
<p>10. Climate benefits of intermodal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions by moving goods by rail instead of truck. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe that moving goods by intermodal trains is more environmentally friendly than by trucks, and actually helps to reduce GHG emissions. • This is because one intermodal train can transport the same number of containers as 280 long-distance heavy trucks. • In fact, trains are 4 times more fuel efficient than heavy trucks and produce 75% less GHG emissions (EIS, Section 8.2.1) • CN's intermodal network removes approximately 2 million of these trucks from Canadian highways annually, 1 million of which would flow through the GTHA. This results in a 9,510-tonne reduction in greenhouse gas emissions every year. • In the absence of projects like the Milton Logistics Hub, containers would continue to move by long-haul trucks, generating four times more GHG emissions per container than by train. • Based on the GHG Study completed in response to Review Panel completeness IR10, the proposed Project will result in a net decrease in future GHG emissions of approximately 83 kt CO₂e in Ontario and 111 kt CO₂e annually within Canada. • This is echoed in a recent report by the Toronto Region Board of Trade titled <i>Toronto-Waterloo Corridor Movement of Goods Business & Consumer Impacts</i>, which states that shifting containers to intermodal rail would improve competitiveness and remove trucks from the road thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions (Pg. 11).



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For more on CN’s sustainability efforts, please refer to our sustainability report available at cn.ca/delivering-responsibly
<p>11. Local job creation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in how the project might create local jobs, including interest in economic benefits to the local trucking community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants in the fall 2017 consultation considered creating local direct and indirect jobs an important goal of the project (79% poll, 75% feedback form). This was additionally an interest identified at open houses and small group meetings. We believe local job creation is an important benefit of the Project. The Project is expected to create approximately 1,000 jobs, including 130 direct jobs at the site. We are also working on a co-op program to provide experience and summer jobs for students at our intermodal facilities, and recruiting Wilfrid Laurier graduates in Logistics for jobs. Finally, we are actively considering additional community benefits that might come with the Project, which could also create more jobs and growth, such as new transportation or recreation infrastructure partnerships.
<p>12. Intermodal capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about whether CN had considered other ways of expanding intermodal capacity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One theme that emerged primarily from meetings with government and stakeholders was the consideration of alternative ways of expanding intermodal capacity. CN currently services the GTHA through the Brampton Intermodal Terminal (BIT); however, BIT is nearing capacity, and CN’s ability to expand or further increase the capacity of BIT to meet growing demand for container goods in the region is severely constrained. In fact, a recent study published by the Toronto Region Board of Trade titled <i>Movement of Goods Challenges in the Toronto-Waterloo Corridor</i> stated “intermodal rail is important for both imports and exports – but terminal capacity is being squeezed.” (pg. 20) BIT will remain CN’s primary regional intermodal hub, but additional capacity is required, in particular in the western GTHA. For more information on alternative means of carrying out the Project, see EIS section 2.2 and IR response 2.17.
<p>13. Effects on fish and fish habitat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We conducted assessments of fish and fish habitat that considered the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project on creeks and tributaries in the Project



Topics	CN consideration of input
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in ensuring that fish and fish habitat are protected through mitigation and offsetting during construction and operation of the hub. 	<p>area (Indian Creek and its tributaries), including effects on water quality, fish habitat, fish mobility, migration and passage, and fish mortality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential effects to fish and fish habitat would be managed through the implementation of proposed mitigation measures and an offsetting plan approved by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO). A number of mitigation measures are planned, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing an environmental protection plan to reduce the risk of impacts during construction and operation, as well as a spill response and contingency plan; Designing the Project to minimize disturbance of surface water features; Avoiding in-water work during sensitive fisheries timing windows; Conducting fish salvages with qualified aquatic biologists, where required; Realignment, naturalization and enhancement of Indian Creek and Tributary A using natural design principles and implementing recommendations of the Bronte Creek Watershed Study to address existing and future impacts, and to further enhance water quality and fish and fish habitat over existing conditions; Installing and monitoring sediment and erosion controls during all phases of construction; Managing surface runoff and drainage with diversion ditches, culverts and stormwater management ponds; Integrating oil-grit separators and shut-off valves in the design of the stormwater management system to reduce risk of accidental spills to the downstream environment. Monitoring will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effectiveness of mitigation measures during construction will be monitored by a field biologist; Modifications or changes to improve mitigation measures will be directed by the biologist as necessary; The Habitat Offsetting Plan will be monitored for effectiveness as required by the DFO Authorization.



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are continuing to consider input and responding to Information Requests from the Review Panel. Further information on these topics will be provided in responses to IR 4.40 to 4.51.
<p>14. Land use planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the Project is not compatible with local land use plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recognize that there remain concerns with some in the community, including local government officials, about the compatibility of the proposed Project with local existing and planned land use. Our typical practice and efforts on this proposed Project include considering the interests of local authorities. We have continued to engage in constructive dialogue with local authorities and welcome opportunities for further cooperation. We believe it is important to recognize that the proposed Project is located in designated Employment Areas and Strategic Future Employment Areas. And as noted in our response to IR 2.5, many provincial, regional and municipal planning documents recognize the importance of intermodal infrastructure in supporting goods movement and economic growth in the region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2011 <i>Halton Region Transportation Master Plan</i> states, “CN also owns land in Milton for which it has a long range plan for an inter-modal facility. It is understood that the current emphasis is on utilizing existing rail infrastructure and facilities; a new facility is considered to be a longer term project.” A 2007 report titled <i>Sustainable Halton Urban Infrastructure: Potential Long Term Growth Areas</i> by the Halton Region states, “[t]he area around the future CN Intermodal and Halton Waste Management site in southern Milton has existing transportation advantages in its proximity to Highway 407. If the CN Intermodal terminal is built, that would add a very significant additional transportation advantage.” We will continue to work with Halton Region and Town of Milton to develop within the employment areas and address considerations pertaining to planned land uses.
<p>15. Effects on wildlife and SAR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that impacts to wildlife and Species at Risk are mitigated or offset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential effects of the Project on wildlife and species-at-risk (SAR) – such as Snapping Turtle, and birds like Bobolink, Eastern Meadowlark and Barn Swallow – were assessed in the EIS. The EIS also included proposed measures to mitigate those effects, including:



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retaining natural vegetation around the boundaries of the Project, where possible; ○ Minimizing extent of disturbance of woodlands and wetlands as much as possible; ○ Shielding outdoor lights to minimize light spillage beyond the required areas; ○ Creating, securing, and managing off-site grassland habitat to support species such as Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark; ○ Implementing turtle habitat enhancements in Indian Creek and on-site ponds; ○ Providing employees with sensitivity education for on-site wildlife encounters. ● We are continuing to consider input and answer questions from the Review Panel. Further information has been provided in the responses to IR3.46 to 3.50, and more will be provided in the responses to IR4.52 to 4.58.
<p>16. Archaeological and cultural heritage resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interest in ensuring archaeological and cultural heritage resources are properly protected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Members from three First Nations have been involved in the Project as on-site monitors and field liaison representatives, and have contributed to the review of archaeological studies. ● In addition, we have completed all necessary archaeology studies (Stage 1AA to Stage 4AA), including carefully removing and documenting archaeological artifacts that could be affected by construction as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. ● Reports from archaeology studies have been and will continue to be reviewed by the Province. ● We will implement an Archaeological Resources Protection Plan, a worker education program and Archaeological Chance Find Protocol. ● CN remains committed to meaningful engagement with Aboriginal communities in all subsequent stages of the Project. ● During our fall 2017 consultation, the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and Six Nations participated in our open houses by setting up tables to share information with members of the public about their Nations and their involvement in the Project.



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finally, both the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and Six Nations have written to the Review Panel indicating that CN has developed respectful relationships with them and satisfied their questions and concerns.
<p>17. Local recreation infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in how CN could support the development of local recreation infrastructure, such as bike paths, walkways, or parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in a number of sections above, in our fall 2017 consultation we asked for early feedback on what potential additional community benefits we should consider in the community. We asked a representative sample of Halton Region residents, as well as those who filled out our feedback form, to rank some potential benefits from a list we created based on feedback from the community. One of the potential benefits identified through discussions with local stakeholders included additional investment in recreation infrastructure, such as a cycling path, walking trail or athletic fields. We want to continue to be good neighbours, and so we are actively considering the feedback from this consultation. As noted earlier in this document, we are in the early stages of planning multi-stakeholder community roundtables in the coming months to seek further feedback and refine the list of potential additional community benefits.
<p>18. Property values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about how the Project might impact property values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While housing markets are difficult to predict, we are not aware of any evidence to suggest that the facility will have a negative impact on surrounding property values. The Halton Region, and Milton in particular, have experienced significant growth over the last number of years alongside considerable industrial and commercial development.
<p>19. Additional transit options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in how CN could partner with governments to expand transit options in the region, such as GO Train. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While it is not the responsibility or within the mandate of CN or the proposed Project to provide additional transit options for Milton or the Halton Region, we will continue to coordinate with Metrolinx and VIA to ensure that the obligations outlined within any existing agreements are met if the Project becomes operational. In June 2016, we announced an agreement-in-principle with Metrolinx on a potential new Freight Bypass project in the Brampton-Kitchener corridor.



Topics	CN consideration of input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="716 245 1906 337">• The agreement is intended to support a major provincial and local government goal of an electrified, bi-directional commuter service that provides seven days per week service for the Kitchener corridor.<li data-bbox="716 345 1877 368">• More information will be provided to the Review Panel in response to IR4.17 and 4.18.