

A **Public Stakeholder Orientation Session** was held Tuesday May 1, 2007 at the Holiday Inn Burlington Hotel & Conference Centre (3063 South Service Rd.) from 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. This session was the second of three Public Orientation Sessions, with the first held in Hamilton (April 26, 2007), and a future session to be held in Welland (May 3, 2007).

An original invitation to RSVP for this event was distributed to all members of the public and interest groups (over 2,200 individuals) on March 19th, 2007. A follow-up notice (dated April 18th, 2007) was distributed to those that pre-registered for this event to provide additional meeting details. Twenty-two individuals attended this event.

Representatives from the Study Team included the Ministry of Transportation (John Slobodzian, Terry Hilditch, Frank Williams, Frank Pravitz, and Darlene Proudfoot), URS, TSH and MRC. Sally Leppard facilitated the meeting, with assistance from independent facilitators from Lura Consulting and GLPi.

Purpose of the Public Stakeholder Orientation Session

The purpose of the Session was to provide an update on study progress since the approval of the Terms of Reference, outline the planning, technical and public consultation approaches being proposed by the Study Team, and to obtain feedback and advice from stakeholders.

The Public Stakeholder Orientation Session involved a presentation regarding:

- The Study Team
- The Broad Context Overview
- The Overall Process
- The Study Plan
- Consultation: Principles, Events, Tools and the CAG
- Roles in Decision Making
- Measuring EA Success

Input and comments resulting from the presentation included:

- How the process is being coordinated with the GTTA to ensure that there is no duplication.
- There is a need for contact and coordination with U.S. and International initiatives, such as the American-based I-95 Corridor Coalition.
- How this consultation process is different from other MTO projects. The Study Team noted that this process builds upon the lessons learned through other projects.
- The need to carry forward relevant information provided by the public from previous work in this corridor. The Study Team noted that since the study will be different some input might no longer be relevant.
- Ensuring that the 'problems' will be defined, so that people know what the issues are.
- Can we ensure that the project will not change if a new government is elected.

A breakout session on the Consultation and Outreach Program was held after the Q&A session.

Summary of Comments Reported

- *Public Consultation and Outreach*
 - Information needs to be provided in a timely manner (min. 2 weeks ahead of meetings)
 - Ensure that the project has an education component
 - The concept of sustainability needs to be addressed
 - Need to resolve skepticism about the process and study

- Public input needs to be addressed in a timely way, and shared with all participants
 - Suggest a comparative transportation analysis of other jurisdictions (U.S./E.U.) to ensure that this is the best planning approach
 - Need to engage rural landowners as well as agriculture
 - Take into account rural/agricultural residents may only have dial-up internet access making it a difficult way to provide information
 - Ensure accessibility - hold events in smaller communities; reimburse for mileage costs and make the events worth the effort and time
 - Aim messaging at popular topics, such as pollution and climate change, to encourage public interest
 - Events in urban areas should be accessible by public transit
 - Convene more than four PICs and ensure flexible PIC framework (e.g. PICs should involve a presentation, Q&A, and be held in the afternoon and evening, or even during weekends, to accommodate varying work schedules)
 - Information needs to get out in a variety of ways (libraries, local television, local print sources [not just newspapers], internet, ENGOs, environmental networks, related conferences, schools, curriculum, non-environmental groups [such as Rotary])
- *Community Advisory Group*
 - General approval of the outline, work plan and approach, and of balancing interests/geographic locations
 - Involve younger participants
 - Need to clearly outline the purpose and mandate of the CAG, for members and the public
 - Participants should have to declare any conflicts of interest
 - Communicate with City Councils, or form specific CAGs for City Councils
 - Increase the size, as people may drop out over time
 - Be clear to participants about the commitment needed (assume there will be more than five meetings and the process may take longer)
 - Open the meetings to the public for observation

Overall observations:

- Participants were pleased with the open approach taken by the Study Team to the process.