

**Comments on the Proactive Involvement Plan**

<b>Commentor</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>How Addressed</b>
<b>CAG Members Comments on the Proactive Involvement Plan</b>			
Clarington	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider moving the last bullet to the first to emphasise the “Studies have shown” point</li> <li>• Change the order and wording to               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) To promote and facilitate early and continuous productive public and stakeholder involvement to ensure issues addressed prior to identifying a solution and EA submission.</li> <li>b) Foster and commit to honest communication and commit to transparent decision-making processes and informing stakeholders of such decisions in a timely manner.</li> <li>c) Commit to understanding and addressing stakeholder concerns.....</li> <li>d) Consider alternatives that add value to the community – <i>not clear on what activities this might include – would like to discuss further.</i></li> <li>e) Integrate and manage diverse...</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last bullet has been moved to the first to emphasize that early involvement leads to more participation</li> <li>• The order and wording has been changed to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Enable MTO to better understand / respond to public concerns and provide information on how decisions were made;</li> <li>b) Maintain open, timely and honest communications and decision processes;</li> <li>c) Promote and facilitate early and continuous public / stakeholder involvement to ensure timely input to decision processes;</li> <li>d) Consider strategies that add value to the process; and</li> <li>e) Integrate and manage diverse environmental and engineering technical resources.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Clarington	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider moving the last bullet to the first to emphasise the “Studies have shown” point</li> <li>• First principle should be to promote and facilitate early and continuous public involvement, and incorporate input early in the EA study.</li> <li>• Explain/address Project Purpose, Problem Statement and Need</li> <li>• Identify and consider community values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last bullet has been moved to the first</li> <li>• First principle is ‘Incorporate Early and Continuous Involvement’</li> <li>• Wording has been changed to: <i>Ensure that the ‘recommended solution’ will adequately address ‘Project Purpose and Need’ as defined by the Project Definition / Opportunity Statement. It should not only address ‘purpose and need’ in a functional ways, but also reflect a customer focus’.</i></li> <li>• Wording has been changed to include ‘Identify and...’</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property owners along the previously recommended route (1990s) should be notified of the current EA as soon as possible. MTO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no current property owners list based in the previous route</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>should have this historical information, as should local municipalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are still people who don't appear to understand that 1990s route has no official status and/or that this is a completely separate process and an unscoped EA – i.e. don't understand what that means, hence the many “why are we going backwards” questions.</li> <li>• Others may perceive the prev. identified route to be the preferred option of the Project Team, particularly given the documents produced in 2003 showing only minor deviations from that route in some areas. Property owners along prev. identified route continue to face hardships in some cases when wishing to sell their properties because of such perceptions. Should be formally encouraged/invited.</li> <li>• Project website -should be updated more often than in the past, particularly where dates shown earlier change, deadlines pass etc. Mass email could be sent out to Advisory Groups and those on e-mail list when important postings made – e.g. key document releases, upcoming consultation opportunities etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once the preferred route is selected, property owners along the route would be contacted directly.</li> <li>• The information is available on the project website, through the Project Team and advertisements of the Study.</li> <li>• Comment noted. MTO is not actively purchasing property. However, MTO has an advanced property purchase program for “hardship” cases. Advance purchase requests will be considered on a case by case basis. Property owners may contact the Project Team for more information as well as be added to the project mailing list to receive updates and clarification of the Study.</li> <li>• When appropriate, the website is updated on a weekly basis. When key documents or key consultation opportunities arise, an email will be sent out to all members notifying them of the update.</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second sentence -PICs should not be characterized as “drop-in” sessions, particularly as you say later at beginning of page 9 that they will be arranged “primarily as drop-in centers” – means there are other options. At certain stages formal presentations and Question and Answer sessions should be considered in addition to drop-in option. Presentations and Q &amp; As help foster informed debate and input, as opposed to venting if structured properly. Further, it helps build public confidence that PT knows what they are talking about, that individuals and groups are not being isolated, and that all being given the same information – implies consistency, fairness etc.</li> <li>• With drop-in sessions, the onus is on stakeholders to inform themselves about complex issues in a very short period of time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement has been changed to reflect the format of a PIC. The PIC ads will also clarify the format of the upcoming PIC. See revisions. Question and Answer sessions are not proposed for PIC's but may be considered as part of other consultation opportunities (i.e. workshops, community meetings etc.)</li> <li>• The intent is to include and continue to improve the materials and methods for encouraging public involvement. The Study</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>Presentations effective tool to convey complex material in user-friendly formats – video, slides with explanatory text in addition to handouts etc. Continue to provide drop-in options for those not wishing to attend presentations or take part in Q &amp; A, to talk to PT staff, view material etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Four sets of PICs...” . By limiting the number up front, statements about flexibility and responsiveness may be negated. Please consider adding, “<i>Additional rounds of PICs may be added as the study proceeds</i>” or some such sentence</li> </ul>	<p>includes a Process Enhancement Team which looks at other options and means of encouraging public involvement, public outreach as well as ensuring a clear and transparent process. There is always opportunity to request separate meetings to provide more details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement has been changed to include, ‘A minimum of four sets of PICs are proposed as part of the EA study at the following stages of the project’, which indicates the possibility of holding additional rounds of PICs.</li> </ul>
Clarrington	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EA Study broken down into 5 stages.</li> <li>• On page 9, Sec. 2.3 PT writes: “<i>workshops provide an effective way to gain facilitated focus input on a variety of study issues</i>”.</li> <li>• Workshops are considered for all other stages of EA, but not for the stages 1 and 2. The rest of the EA study follows from, and is determined by, key decisions taken at stages 1 and 2. If key assumptions and decisions not clearly explained, if scope of work deemed insufficient without clearly defined time limits for related input that would be incorporated prior to further decisions being made, may have the result of people losing faith in fairness of the process, the willingness of PT to truly engage in productive consultation opportunities and the value of participating in the EA and may mean PT must deal with these issues after submission.</li> <li>• Stages 1 and 2 are extremely complex yet are combined into one public consultation opportunity to deal with both– PIC 1.</li> <li>• One workshop could deal with the two sets of issues. Interactive workshops with education component can be particularly effective at communicating the assumptions adopted by Project Team (PT).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Workshop was held on Saturday February 4<sup>th</sup> 2006 to discuss the Alternatives to the Undertaking, factors and criteria to evaluate the Alternatives as well as the methodology for the Evaluation Phases 1 and 2. Within this Workshop, the Problems and Opportunities (and the report) were discussed. The studies that have been completed to “support” the Problems and Opportunities report are historical documents.</li> <li>• A workshop was held to discuss and receive input on the Alternatives To the Undertaking. Phase of the Study.</li> <li>• The Workshop dealt with the following areas                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EA Process</li> <li>• Problems and Opportunities, an overview</li> <li>• Alternatives To versus Alternative Methods</li> <li>• Alternatives To and the evaluation process</li> <li>• Alternatives To Factors and Criteria</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>PT could solicit stakeholder input on scope of work re transportation Problems and Opportunities, Need, identifying other alternatives, evaluation criteria etc. This input should be incorporated prior to identifying Preferred Alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I could provide PT with detailed info about two very productive community workshops held since 2000 in Durham; both achieved goals of soliciting detailed public input on complex topics.</li> <li>• IMPORTANT to advertise with accurate workshop description/objectives well in advance so as to reach interested parties, in addition to extending invitations to known stakeholders/interest groups/ratepayer assns etc. Require advance registration and provide briefing/support material to registered participants in advance of the workshop – e.g. could be ToR extracts, Trans Problem/Opportunities document and Alts To spread sheet, OEAA and extracts of CEAA, etc..</li> <li>• Independent party should facilitate workshop. Structure very important –set out workshop objectives, a clear achievable agenda. Education/explanatory component first e.g. give historical overview –where we are now, having someone like Tomasz W. of Gartner Lee do OEAA/CEAA overview, etc..</li> <li>• Sufficient time must be allotted to deal with workshop topics/agenda effectively, then panel/Q &amp; A session, then let people know what type of input is sought by PT and by when input is required. Commit to keeping attendees informed throughout EA through to approval – this is where many processes go off the rails, outline the process followed to achieve this and then ensure that internal processes in place to make sure that happens.</li> <li>• Happy to provide detailed suggestions at your convenience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A CAG meeting was held to provide education on CEAA/OEAA</li> <li>• Newsletters provide educational opportunities.</li>   <li>• Agreed.</li>   <li>• Workshops will be facilitated by an independent facilitator. Workshop #1 was facilitated by Ogilvie, Ogilvie Company.</li> <li>• Specialists from the relevant subject areas will be hand to carry out presentations as well as provide some clarification to guests’ questions and comments.</li> <li>• Agreed.</li>   <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Known interest groups, municipal committees should be provided with adequate notice of any activity/deadline so that it could be included on group meeting agendas for information, and discussed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The Project Team has committed to providing advance notice of upcoming meetings as soon as they have been confirmed.</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
Clarington	2.8	if applicable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would add fact sheets for Water Issues, Sustainability Program – what specific actions/criteria is the PT taking that promote/encourage development of a sustainable transportation solution, and Accessibility issues (e.g. Ontarians with Disabilities Act).</li> <li>• Fact sheets could itemize potential impacts/known areas of concern – or show links to sites describing these well, explanation of principles, objectives that will guide PT throughout EA and identification and assessment of impacts, proposed mitigation measures. Show links to relevant legislation/agencies governing such issues on each fact sheet.</li> <li>• Always describe how those not having Internet access can access info.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement in the PIP eludes to the possibility of more fact sheets being added to the list. As the study progresses and demand, more detailed, factor specific fact sheets will be created.</li> <li>• Fact sheets include information and potential impacts/areas of concern as well as known areas of concern. Factor Specific web links to relevant legislation / agencies are provided on each fact sheet.</li> <li>• Noted. It is indicated where ever materials are available at other locations in addition to the web.</li> </ul>
Clarington	3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a Durham Region Transit Authority rep been invited to MTAG?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• .Durham Region will be contacted to determine interest.</li> </ul>
Clarington	3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please consider placing advertisements when replacing CAG members as situation warrants, particularly for end of 2006/early 2007 after municipal elections – current municipal appointees may not re-apply or be reappointed. Ideal time at which to review commitment/performance of current CAG members.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team is considering selecting members who had previously applied to participate in the Workshop</li> </ul>
Clarington	4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-submission review – minimum of 8 weeks, 12 weeks if over summer or winter holiday period.</li> <li>• Agency Review – perhaps an explanation of role of Government Review Team role could be explained here – not completely clear to me.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presubmission review period is 5 weeks, however, the Project Team may consider extending should it be required.</li> <li>• The role of the Government Review Team has been indicated in the PIP as ‘responsible for reviewing and providing formal comments on the EA Report’.</li> </ul>
LG - Clarington	5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will be guiding principles for identifying community values? These need to be described. Specific input from advisory groups should be sought.</li> <li>• Statements in next section vague – going through such a process should result in commitments that WOULD –not may -be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The guiding principles will be explained in further detail in the Community Value Plan which will be developed in Phase 2 of the process, once a preferred alternative to the undertaking and study area have been confirmed, with the input of stakeholders and agencies.</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		implemented at some later stage. If people are going to participate in developing a community value plan, they need to know it was not in vain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement has been changed to: “The EA will identify special design features as commitments that will be addressed in more detail at subsequent design stages.”</li> <li>Statement has been changed to: Special design features such as heritage lighting, landscaping, decorative barriers, etc. can be considered as a means of incorporating community values and gaining public support.</li> </ul>
<b>RAG Comments on the Proactive Involvement Plan</b>			
CEAA	<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft Proactive Involvement Plan (PIP) does not appear to reference CEAA in terms of the potential for public consultation. It is likely that CEAA will be triggered once the preferred alternative is chosen. If a CEAA screening is required, then (a) Responsible Authority(ies) must make a decision on public consultation. If a comprehensive study under CEAA is required, then public consultation on the federal EA is mandatory. We believe the public deserves to have this general information up-front in the PIP you will soon finalize. Providing this information would also be consistent with the general principle of EA coordination/cooperation.</li> </ul> <p>We ask for a commitment from MTO to update the PIP (and make that update publicly available) when information becomes available on consultation decisions under CEAA (and, potentially, the coordination of federal consultation with consultation planned (as outlined in the PIP) for meeting Ontario's EAA). Looking forward to hearing back from MTO on this point.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to the Federal EA requirements for consultation has been added as Section 2.1.</li> <li>The document is a “living” document. It will be updated with new information and consultation processes as the Study progresses, specifically if CEAA is triggered. The version number / revision date will be indicated on the cover of the document to allow the public to be informed of any changes to the PIP. The ‘edit’ page on the website will notify members of the public of when and how the document was altered.</li> </ul>
CEAA	<b>1.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest removing “<i>in Ontario</i>” and “<i>and the public</i>”. This will make the opening text more general, enough to incorporate consultation under the OEAA and CEAA.</li> <li>End of last paragraph - suggest adding “<u>If the process is modified,</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text has been changed to reflect comments.</li> <li>The statement has been added. Each time a revision or update to</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p><u>the Public Involvement Plan will be updated and made publicly available</u>". This could be accomplished by putting version numbers of the Plan and in releasing the PIP would improve transparency and increase long term benefits by people being able to question the consultation process.</p>	<p>the Report has been made, the version number / revision date will be added to the cover of the document, and then posted on the website.</p>
CEAA	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest adding as C) <u>Obtain input from government agencies on applicable legislation, regulations, policies and programs</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added as f) Obtain input from government agencies on applicable legislation, regulations, policies and programs</li> </ul>
CEAA	1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest removing "<i>public</i>" from bullet points as the Plan addresses more than public input.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text has been changed to reflect comment</li> </ul>
CEAA	2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest adding Subheading <u>Ontario Environmental Assessment Act</u></li> <li>• Stage 6 Review of EA Report - suggest including a short summary (of the EA Report?) to be consistent with the opportunities for input provided by MTO and required by OEAA.</li> <li>• Suggest adding "<u>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</u> The requirements of the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)</i> may also apply to the Ministry of Transportation's proposal. If this is the case, the Ministry of Transportation intends to work in a co-ordinated way with provincial and federal governments. Both governments have agreed to co-ordinate their respective EA processes established by the <u>applicable environmental assessment legislation</u>. If a decision is made that <i>CEAA</i> applies to the Ministry of Transportation's proposal, the federal government will decide on the type of EA required. In this case, the Ministry of Transportation will update the PIP to reflect applicable <u>consultation opportunities</u>."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ontario Environmental Assessment Act was added as Section 2.2. CEAA was added as Section 2.1 to create a more comprehensive document.</li> <li>• A 'Stage 6' has been added to this section and a description of the consultation activities which will take place during this stage have been described.</li> <li>• CEAA has been added as Section 2.1</li> <li>• Text has been added as recommended.</li> </ul>
CEAA	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest stating the location of the Project Office as it has been established and makes the process more transparent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of the Project Office has been added to the section.</li> </ul>
Environment Canada		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In referring to "<i>Interest based communities; residents in proximity to the study area</i>" Has it been determined what this means? Will it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title has been changed to: Interest-Based Groups. The word community was incorrect, as the 'communities' referred to in</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>be flexible during the study? Do you have a general guide as that would likely be helpful?</p>	<p>this section are actually Groups and organizations, not communities as described.</p>
Environment Canada	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest including a “<u>Natural Heritage</u>” Fact Sheet as there will likely be local concerns related to impacts to and loss of natural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A statement is provided in the PIP stating that factor-specific fact sheets will be added as necessary and deemed appropriate.</li> </ul>
CEAA	3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest moving – “<i>Certain provincial ministries, federal departments, First Nations and external agencies will have more interest in this project than others due to impacts of potential solutions on their mandates. Telephone contacts and meetings will be held as required to ensure that the latest data are available and that all relevant issues and concerns are identified early in the EA allowing time to resolve concerns and develop appropriate mitigation measures. In addition, meetings will likely be required prior to the EA Report submission to finalize specific details or approval requirements, such as conceptual fisheries compensation plans.</i>” To be second paragraph in Section 3 as it seems to get lost in the Federal section and also seems to apply better here.</li> <li>Request removing “<i>Certain provincial ministries, federal departments, First Nations and external agencies will have more interest in this project than others due to impacts of potential solutions on their mandates.</i>” As it is misrepresentative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Moved to second paragraph of Section 3.</li> <li>Wording has been changed to: “Provincial ministries, federal departments, First Nations and external agencies may have differing levels of involvement in this project, depending on their mandates and interests.”</li> </ul>
CEAA	3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest including <u>Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs</u> as Provincial Body.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ontario Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs has been added.</li> </ul>
CEAA	3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The participation of federal <u>departments and agencies</u> will be sought in the same manner as provincial ministries and agencies. These agencies have also been included in the Regulatory Advisory Group.</i> <i>The involvement of federal <u>departments and agencies</u> in this project is being sought for several reasons.</i> <i>First, it will facilitate <u>co-ordination</u> between Provincial EA requirements and Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) requirements, if a federal EA is required. Second, it</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text now reads: “The participation of federal departments and agencies will be sought in the same manner as provincial ministries and agencies. These agencies have also been included in the Regulatory Advisory Group.</li> <li>The involvement of federal departments and agencies in this project is being sought for several reasons. First it will facilitate co-ordination between Provincial and Federal Environmental</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p><u>will allow federal departments and agencies to provide input regarding potential federal approval/permits that may be required (e.g., Transport Canada for Navigable Waters Protection Act approval, Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans for Fisheries Act approval etc.). Finally, federal departments will also be consulted to determine potential implications to federally owned lands within the study area.</u></p> <p><i>The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ontario Region was consulted during the ToR development and contact is being maintained as needed during the study to assist in the potential co-ordination of federal and provincial EA processes/approvals.</i></p> <p><i>At a minimum, the following federal government agencies will be consulted throughout the EA, as appropriate:</i></p> <p><b><u>Federal Departments and Agencies</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environment Canada</i></li> <li>• <i>National Energy Board</i></li> <li>• <i>Canadian Coast Guard</i></li> <li>• <i>Health Canada</i></li> <li>• <i>Fisheries and Oceans Canada</i></li> <li>• <i>Transport Canada</i></li> <li>• <u>Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency</u></li> <li>• <i>Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Canada</i></li> <li>• <u>Canadian Transportation Agency</u></li> <li>• <i>CN Rail</i></li> <li>• <i>CP Rail - St. Lawrence and Hudson Railway</i></li> </ul>	<p>Assessment requirements, if a federal EA is required. Second it will allow federal departments and agencies to provide input regarding potential federal approval/permits that may be required (e.g., Transport Canada for Navigable Waters Protection Act approval, Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans for Fisheries Act approval). Finally, federal departments will also be consulted to determine potential implications to federally owned lands within the Study Area.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List has been put in alphabetical order.</li> <li>• CEAA and the Canadian Transportation Agency has been added</li> <li>• The transportation category has been removed and put with the “Federal Departments and Agencies”</li> </ul>
CEAA	3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this FN Plan be publicly released?</li> <li>• Is there any additional/current information that can be included here?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A separate aboriginal consultation process will be implemented. The terminology has been revised to discourage the perception of a separate plan.</li> </ul>
Environment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• End of Section - suggest adding “<u>Input from the Ontario</u>”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement has been added to the end of the section.</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
Canada		<u>Secretariat for Aboriginal Affairs and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada was also sought in the development of the First Nations Consultation Plan.</u> ” Is there any additional information that could go here? If FN consultation plan has already been developed, the MTO should refer to those FN’s which will be consulted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once additional information and consultation has occurred, it will be incorporated into the PIP. The terminology has been revised to discourage the perception of a separate plan.</li> </ul>
CEAA	4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think we should have more information regarding Triggers and the type of EA.</li> <li>Agency Review, Paragraph 1 – What is the time frame? 5 weeks in consistency with the public pre-submission review? Is it concurrent with public review? In EC’s opinion EA Report review no less than 60 days, probably 90 for this project size.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Triggers and type of EA will be subject of further discussion with CEAA. The PIP will be updated as information becomes available.</li> <li>Concurrent with the public review, therefore a 5 week review period for both agencies and public.</li> </ul>
CEAA	4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 2 – Shouldn’t public be listed as having had a role?</li> <li>Legislation/Guideline list                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helpful to relate jurisdiction of each piece of legislation.</li> <li>Application of <u>Canadian Environmental Quality Standards and Codes of Practice - Emission/discharges of toxic substance</u></li> <li>Reference to the Canadian Wildlife Act would not be relevant to this project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. “Public” has been added to paragraph 2.</li> <li>Would be too much information for a Guide of this nature.</li> <li>Changed to: “Canadian Environmental Quality Standards and Codes of Practice”</li> <li>Canadian Wildlife Act removed.</li> </ul>
<b>MTAG Members Comments on the Proactive Involvement Plan</b>			
Clarington	1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because of the sheer size of the interested public for the 407 East EA , as well as time and funding constraints , it will be a challenge for the Project Team to fully accomplish the objectives set out in the PIP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Wording of the PIP needs to be such that it is understood that best efforts will be made to achieve all objectives. The PIP will be modified as we move forward. Many of the activities discussed have already been undertaken and accounted for in the consideration of the schedule and funding.</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clarify the lead in sentence “The development of the PIP includes the following objectives”</li> <li>Please review the grammar of the second paragraph for clarity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text changed to “The PIP includes the following objectives”.</li> <li>Reviewed and modified.</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
Durham Region	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Public Involvement Methods” could be a more descriptive title for the chapter</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph - Please clarify that all comments will be taken into consideration but it is not always possible to accommodate all of the comments. Also suggest adding a statement that responses will be provided for all comments received by the Project Team or an explanation of why/why not it was incorporated.</li> <li>• Should Public <i>Consultation</i> Plan be reworded to Public <u>Involvement</u> Plan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title changed to “Public Involvement Methods”</li> <li>• Text changed to: “It is important to note that although all comments that MTO receives over the course of the Study will be taken into consideration and where applicable, responded to, it is not always possible to accommodate everyone or all requests.”</li> <li>• Comment considered, but preference of the Project Team to retain “Consultation Plan”, as it is referenced in a general light.</li> </ul>
Whitby	2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notifying Potentially Interested/Affected Individuals and Groups, mention is made of contacting potentially affected <i>residents</i> and businesses that may be directly impacted by route alternatives being considered to participate through mail or notice. I suggest clarification is needed here such that the contact of such persons should be by <i>mail</i> addressed to <i>landowners</i> which would include those property owners who do not necessarily reside on their property (especially if it is vacant land).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Property owners’ has been added to the statement. Once the preferred route is selected, property owners along the route would be contacted directly.</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refers to “Study Area of Focus”, please clarify if this is the same as the “Analysis Area”?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text has been changed to reflect “Analysis Area”</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PIP should more clearly recognize the differing levels of public involvement. For the vast majority of Durham Region residents, their level of interest will relate primarily to location and timing of the Highway. For these residents, the PICs will probably suffice, although greater effort should be given to explaining the EA process in simpler terms to these residents, especially given the length of time since the first EA was started.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you provide examples of technical specialists that could be called upon to attend?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text changed to: “Representatives”. Technical specialists will be invited at key points of the Study, these could range from Air Quality specialists to Road Design Specialists.</li> </ul>
Durham Region	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide examples of workshop topics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop topics are noted on the PIP Schedule (Exhibit 2-1). Reference has been made in this section.</li> </ul>
Durham Region	2.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide additional information regarding potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential newsletter topics have been added.</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		newsletter topics and/or what topics will typically be included <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include the Current Schedule in each newsletter and a section regarding “External Factors That May Affect Project Schedule” (e.g. external legislation). In other words, a proactive way of advising stakeholders that the project duration is going to be longer than expected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current and updated schedule will be added to all newsletters.</li> <li>• A footnote will be added to the schedule indicating that the “Schedule is approximate and subject to change.” The website will also be updated with the most up-to-date schedule.</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovative Advertising for Meetings                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ You shouldn't include this topic unless you have something to suggest. Otherwise, if no innovative approaches are ever suggested or used, it will look like you were unable to achieve that component of the PIP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title changed to ‘Innovative Notification for Meetings’ and examples have been added (e.g. Websites, posters in municipal buildings, newsletters, etc)</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Innovative Advertising) – Please provide examples</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples have been provided and as more methods are developed, they will be added to this section and updated</li> </ul>
Clarington	2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facts Sheets                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ More attention is needed to the natural environment, in particular water quality and quantity (both ground and surface)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Factor specific worksheets will be added as the Study progresses and the need is established.</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest the following additional fact sheet topics:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Natural Environment – fisheries, vegetation, watersheds, etc</li> <li>◦ Agriculture</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Factor specific worksheets will be added as the Study progresses and the need is established.</li> </ul>
Durham Region	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will you measure the effectiveness of the notification methods? Suggest investigating possibility of doing random telephone survey, say of 100 Durham residents prior to PICs to ask if they have heard about the 407 meetings, where they heard of the meetings, if they know when the meetings are, if they plan on attending, etc. This will be very useful to measure the effectiveness of the advertising campaign</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was discussed at the MTAG meeting of January 17<sup>th</sup> 2006. Survey techniques are to be analyzed and discussed.</li> </ul>
Durham Region	3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health Canada is on the list twice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duplication removed.</li> </ul>
Durham Clarington	3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will only be a limited number of residents who will be sufficiently interested and be able to devote the time necessary to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Clarington CAC has been added as a ‘local community group’ in Section 2.2.1 “Notifying Potentially</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>provide comments of a more substantive nature. One of the groups that will be able to provide such input is the Clarington Highway 407 CAC. In this regard, I am disappointed that the PIP does not specifically recognize the CAC under Section 3.3 (Municipalities). This group of residents has taken a keen interest in the 407 and, as they have previously demonstrated, are capable of providing very insightful comments on the EA process. I would also suggest that, given the success of the Clarington 407 CAC, that the PIP suggest that other Municipal Councils, including Durham Region, explore the possibility of establishing their own CACs. This would allow a broader range of resident perspectives than is currently provided through the Community Advisory Group.</p>	<p>Interested/Affected Individuals and Groups”.</p>
Durham Region	3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest separating First Nations into its own section since no Plan is being provided at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The First Nations strategy and approach will be released upon its completion. It is currently being developed.</li> <li>The section provides an introduction to the First Nations strategy. Not separated.</li> </ul>
Whitby	4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is stated the public will be provided a 5 week pre-submission window to review and comment on the draft EA prior to submission to MOE. That time line seems tight and consideration should be given to lengthening it. The PIP also mentions pre-submission agency (like municipalities) circulation but provides no time line. IF the intent is a similar 5 week window, I believe this is inadequate for staff to review the document and report through Council. A longer period such as 8 weeks would be more appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Review period will be a 5 week period.</li> </ul>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest re-organizing Section to reflect the sequence of events (i.e. Draft Agency Review, Public Pre-Submission Review, Formal Submission – agency and public, MOE Comment Summary Report). It is difficult to understand the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section re-organized into: Pre-submission, formal submission and MOE Comments review.</li> </ul>
Clarington	5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Value Plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community values involve more than measures to maintain</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The values of the community will be taken into consideration at earlier stages of the Study through such consultation as the CAG,</li> </ul>

Commentor	Section	Comment	How Addressed
		<p>community character through design solutions. A previous comment regarding the Terms of Reference noted that individual community values may vary substantially (eg, Clarington vs. Pickering). An attempt should be made to reflect these differing values in the weighting and ranking of criteria to be used in the evaluation of <i>Alternatives To</i> and <i>Alternative Methods</i>. Although I don't disagree that individual design solutions are important once a Study Area has been defined, community values should be incorporated at a much earlier stage in the EA process.</p>	<p>MTAG, local communities, interest-based groups, affected residents and businesses. The Community Value Plan is specifically created to incorporate the needs of the community into the preferred design solution. That is not to say that the values of the community will not be considered throughout the rest of the process.</p>
Durham Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Value Plan - The scope of such plan(s) is not clear. Please clarify.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording has been changed to “The Community Value Plan and opportunities for involvement will be further developed as the Study progresses” – indicating that the Plan is not created or finalized and therefore the scope is not defined at this stage.</li> </ul>