



NIAGARA TO GTA CORRIDOR PLANNING AND EA STUDY – Phase 1

Meeting: Municipal Technical Advisory Group (MTAG)
Location: Casablanca Winery Inn, Grimsby Meeting No. 1
Purpose: **MTAG Orientation Session** Date: March 27, 2007
Chair: Glenn Pothier (facilitator) Time: 1:00 PM - 4:00 PM

Present: **NGTA Project Team**

John Slobodzian, MTO	Terry Hilditch, MTO
Frank Pravitz, MTO	Darlene Proudfoot, MTO
Sam DiFelice, MTO	Sandy Nairn, Ecoplans Ltd.
Michael Chiu, MRC	Glenn Pothier, GLPi
Paul Hudspith, URS	Tyler Drygas, URS
Margie Gonzalez, URS	

MTAG Representatives

Mary Lou Tanner, Halton Region	Joanne Warner, Town of Milton
Scott McMillan, Town of Oakville	David Wong, Town of Oakville
Tom Eichenbaum, City of Burlington	
Christine Lee-Morrison, City of Hamilton	
Corwin Cambray, RM Niagara	Karl Dren, City of Niagara Falls
Tim Stuart, City of Port Colborne	Marzenna Carrick, City of Niagara Falls
Rudy Warkentin, Township of Wainfleet	Stephen Bedford, NOTL
Edward Soldo, County of Haldimand	Bob Wheildon, Township of Puslinch
Steve Miller, Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority	
Darren Kenny, Hamilton Conservation Authority	
Hal Morse, Greater Buffalo-Niagara Regional Transportation Council	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
1	<p><u>Introductions</u></p> <p>J. Slobodzian introduced the MTO members of the Study Team and P. Hudspith introduced the Consultant representatives of the Study Team. MTAG members present introduced themselves.</p> <p>G. Pothier, independent facilitator for the Study Team, presented the meeting agenda. It was noted that a summary of the meeting would be prepared and distributed to the Study Team and MTAG members.</p>	URS
2	<p><u>MTAG Orientation Session Presentation</u></p> <p>J. Slobodzian, P. Hudspith, and M. Chiu presented the following study topics (refer to the attached presentation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study Team Structure ▪ Study Overview ▪ Existing Policy Context ▪ Approved EA ToR ▪ Study Process and Objectives ▪ Study Plan ▪ Function of the Municipal Technical Advisory Group (MTAG) and Municipal Executive Advisory Group (MEAG) ▪ Stakeholder Consultation and Outreach ▪ Process for Generating and Evaluating Transportation System Alternatives <p>Subsequent to the presentation, breakout sessions were conducted to workshop the consultation and outreach approach, the CAG, and consultation with municipalities.</p> <p>G. Pothier started the presentation by discussing the ground rules for the meeting.</p> <p><i>Summary of Questions and Issues Raised</i></p> <p>The following outlines the comments and suggestions provided during the presentation:</p> <p>Tom Eichenbaum (City of Burlington) inquired about coordination with the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) and how their input will be incorporated in this study. J. Slobodzian responded that MTO formally requested that MPIR participate on the Project Team but they declined. They have agreed however to participate on the Regulatory Agency Advisory Group (RAAG). MTO will also be working with MPIR during the development of the Integrated Greater Golden Horseshoe Multi-Modal Transportation model (a.k.a. GGH Model).</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<p>Corwin Cambray (Regional Municipality of Niagara) asked when the decision point in Phase 1 occurs. P. Hudspith responded that the decision point would be reached in Summer 2009.</p> <p>C. Cambray inquired how federal agencies are being represented in the process including border authorities. P. Hudspith responded that the federal government comes into the process in a number of ways: RAAG, First Nations consultation and other Transportation Service Providers (TSP), including the border authorities. J. Slobodzian added that this study is being undertaken as a joint federal/provincial EA coordinated process.</p> <p>T. Eichenbaum inquired whether the MEAG has been selected/established? P. Hudspith replied that it has not been established and that selection criteria would be a topic of the workshop/breakout session.</p> <p>Tim Stewart (City of Port Colborne) inquired about the planning horizon for this study. P. Hudspith replied that the study would respond to a 25-year planning horizon (i.e., 2031).</p> <p>T. Stewart asked whether the estimated dates for PIC 2 (Winter 2008) and PIC 3 (Spring 2008) were correct. D. Proudfoot clarified that 'winter' refers to a period from December to March and 'spring' from April to June (approximately).</p> <p>C. Cambray inquired how transportation solutions under the jurisdiction of others would be addressed given that they are not under MTO's control? J. Slobodzian replied that the Study Team would invite all appropriate transportation service providers to participate throughout the study. As such, the study recommendations will be based, in part, on the input that they provide (i.e., short and/or long term business plans). It is also anticipated that this stakeholder group will advise what they would require from the government in order to make certain recommendations work.</p> <p>Bob Wheildon (Township of Puslinch) inquired about coordination with other studies (e.g., Highway 24 and GTA West). P. Hudspith replied that there is a strong level of coordination and overlap among the consulting firms conducting these studies. J. Slobodzian also added that there is coordination in terms of the baseline data being used (e.g., GGH model); and the application of the same process, factors and criteria for the generation, assessment and evaluation of transportation alternatives. The relationship and overlap of potential solutions between or among projects will also be considered.</p>	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
3	<p><u>Workshop/Breakout Group Discussion</u></p> <p>Subsequent to the presentation, the attendees separated into two working groups to discuss the questions provided in a workbook (copy attached). A spokesperson from each group presented the results of their discussion.</p> <p>The following outlines the comments and suggestions provided based on the workshop/breakout group discussion:</p> <p>Breakout Session #1</p> <p>Question A: <i>What are your perspectives on the public consultation and outreach approach? What enhancements or additional consultation tools/approaches do you think should be considered?</i></p> <p>MTAG representatives reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The consultation approach appears adequate/comprehensive but they would like more information provided. ▪ First round of consultation should be more than Public Information Centres (PICs) - it should also include newsletters, advertisements, and website. ▪ Information should be user-friendly and simple. ▪ There should be more bi-national stakeholders (e.g., Customs, NITTEC, U.S. municipalities, Bridge Authorities). ▪ Newsletters to Council should be considered as well as breakout sessions at PICs on specific regional issues. 	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CAG representatives should participate in the PICs to show the public that citizens are involved. ▪ Presentations should be available on the Internet with a feedback form. 	
	<p>P. Hudspith added that the study’s notification/ad campaign contains all ideas mentioned by the breakout groups, including websites, ads, notifications, newsletters, etc.</p>	
	<p>Question B: <i>What are your thoughts on the approach for recruiting and selecting the Community Advisory Group (CAG) membership? What enhancements or additional factors should be considered?</i></p>	
	<p>MTAG representatives reported the following:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30 CAG members are adequate. ▪ If the study affects open, rural areas, those individuals should be included, as well as special needs groups (e.g., tourism, local heritage). ▪ Subgroup meetings with common concerns should be considered where necessary. ▪ Specific groups established by the respective municipalities should be considered. ▪ Concern regarding disagreements between the public members of the CAG and policymakers in the CAG (i.e., Business Improvement Areas). ▪ Alternative representatives should be selected should CAG members be unable to attend. ▪ The CAG should consist of part community (e.g., landowners) and part knowledgeable citizens (e.g., academia). ▪ The CAG should consider transportation service providers; grape growers; and agricultural, tourism, and development representatives. ▪ The CAG should not be dominated by any particular group and should cover all issues. ▪ For the selection process, the Study Team should consider a lottery for each region or municipality, or each region could select its representatives. ▪ Look at the approach used by other studies (e.g., 407 East). ▪ Representatives from outside Niagara, Hamilton, 	

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
--------------	--------------------	-------------------

and Halton should be considered. How do we get communities in the outer ring involved in the CAG?

Breakout Session #2: *How can the Study Team most effectively engage Municipalities in a manner that promotes effective two-way communication?*

Question A: *What is needed for the MTAG to effectively participate in this study?*

MTAG representatives reported the following:

- Be provided with materials ahead of meetings.
- Have meetings scheduled well in advance on a regular basis.
- The Study Team should communicate their expectations of the MTAG.
- At some point, all advisory groups should interact to gain others' perspectives.
- If interaction is not possible, the other groups' perspectives should be circulated to the MTAG.

Question B: *How best can the Study Team exchange study information with the MTAG?*

MTAG representatives reported the following:

- Put information on a secure (password protected) website and send email to notify members when information has been posted.
- More time for data collection. Presently the amount of time given for the data required has been insufficient. Three to four weeks would be helpful for large amounts of data.
- The Study Team should also send information to one individual per municipality to avoid duplication of work.
- Periodic quick summaries of other advisory group meetings would be beneficial.
- Question: What would be the best method to get information to the Study Team? M. Chiu replied that he would be the point of contact for all MTAG enquiries. J. Slobodzian added that emailing the Study Team email (project_team@niagara-gta.com) is also an option. Provide "attention to" name so that the email is properly directed.

Question C: *Do you feel it would be beneficial to hold*

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
--------------	--------------------	-------------------

“geographic” MTAG meetings? If so, when should these meetings be held and how should they be structured?

MTAG representatives reported the following:

- The central location of Grimsby is fine for MTAG meetings.
- Very specific geographic issues could be addressed at a geographic MTAG meeting that should be scheduled regularly and separately from general MTAG meetings.

Question D: *Do you feel it would be beneficial to hold technical/working group meetings (with technical municipal staff) in addition to the regularly scheduled MTAG meetings? If so, at what stages in the study should these meetings be held?*

MTAG representatives reported the following:

- Technical/working group meetings (with technical municipal staff) in addition to the regularly scheduled MTAG meetings would be beneficial at key points.
- This issue should be reviewed after more information is provided regarding the study schedule.
- The GTTA and local transit providers should provide on-going input.

Question E: *When in the study process would it be most effective to engage Municipal Councils? What approach should be employed to engage Municipal Councils?*

MTAG representatives had conflicting opinions on when would be the most effective time to engage Councils. They reported the following:

- The most effective time to engage Municipal Councils during the study process would be at regular intervals before PICs so Council is aware of what is happening when they receive questions from citizens regarding the study. Also, Council meetings should be televised.
- Provide an information presentation to Councils (upper tier) after each of the PICs because they like to hear what the public had to say.
- Invite lower tier Councils to attend as well.
- Have an Open House so all can attend.

<u>Items</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Action by:</u>
5	<p>Question F: <i>What do you feel should be the role and function of the Municipal Executive Advisory Group (MEAG)?</i></p> <p>MTAG representatives reported the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The role and function of the MEAG should be relaying Council input back to the Study Team, and provide feedback on local technical issues. ▪ The role and function of the MEAG should be to provided inter-regional advice, flag specific issues, and inform municipalities. <p>J. Slobodzian added that the MTAG members are welcome to bring additional staff to meetings, based on what is being presented. Advance notice of additional staff should be provided so as to accommodate the appropriate number of attendees.</p> <p><u>Next Steps</u></p> <p>P. Hudspith provided the following, regarding next steps in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ April 11th, 2007: Regulatory Agency Advisory Group Orientation Session. ▪ Late April 2007: Stakeholder Orientation Sessions. ▪ First round of PICs will take place in June 2007. 	