

HEARING SUMMARY – AMELIA LINZEY – ENGAGEMENT

Changes, errors or corrections

1. Since preparing my rebuttal evidence I have noted an error that I would like to rectify/change:
 - (a) In paragraph 3.2(c) I state that a meeting was held with T&G on 1st July 2016. To confirm, there was one meeting held 1st July 2015 and other meeting 11th July 2016.

Overview of your current position (taking into account EIC, conferencing and rebuttal)

My key conclusions/findings are:

2. Engagement has been undertaken through a number of phases of the Project from 2013-2017, in earlier phases this engagement was led jointly by the NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport and since 2015 through the EWL Project team. I personally have been involved in engagement since mid 2014.
3. I have sought to manage the engagement process to recognise the significant scope for feedback and input from a range of stakeholders to assist with understanding issues and opportunities, identifying options and confirming the alignment and design.
4. The engagement process has been consistent with best practice, demonstrated by a process that:
 - a) Has been responsive to the level of different stakeholders;
 - b) Has been transparent and outcome driven; and
 - c) Has clearly identified the purpose of engagement at each stage of the project process.
5. A range of engagement processes and tools have been used to enable different people and stakeholders to participate in the process. These have included:
 - a) Public communication channels including a dedicated Project website;
 - b) Public response channels, including a contact email address and 0800 phone number;
 - c) Public information has been provided through media releases, newsletters (hard copy and online) and advertisements;
 - d) Letters have been sent and delivered to individual businesses and landowners (including door-knocked distribution of information to residents);
 - e) Public open days, and community and stakeholder workshops have been held to share information and receive feedback; and
 - f) Project hui (e.g. with Mana Whenua, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and others) and face to face meetings with landowners, businesses and representative organisations have been held to discuss specific issues (including property and asset impacts).
6. In my opinion, the engagement with Project partners (including Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Mana Whenua) has been important. Engagement with these parties has informed the development and identification of the preferred corridor and in subsequent phases informed key

design elements of the Project and the measures proposed to manage potential adverse effects. I refer separately and specifically to engagement with Mana Whenua in a separate statement.

7. In my opinion, the input from engagement with the public, stakeholders and Project partners has assisted to inform development of the Project (including the consideration of alternatives) and the measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate potential adverse effects, particularly in respect of the proposed conditions.
8. In conclusion, it is my opinion that consultation with stakeholders and landowners has been appropriate and robust. While I accept that not all parties involved in the engagement agree with the Project or the specific measures to address potential effects of the Project, I consider this does not necessarily mean that their views have not been heard. Rather, it is my review that the consultation process has sought to identify issues and opportunities of the Project with specific regard to different stakeholders and, where practicable, has sought to respond to the feedback received by the Project team.
9. Subject to the amendment proposed to the Business Forum established by the conditions (discussed in respect of my Social Summary Statement), I consider the conditions appropriately provide for the engagement processes established in this Project and will support subsequent stages of design, construction and implementation of the Project.
10. As a minor clarification, in response to the submission of Mr Burns on behalf of The Onehunga Enhancement Society, I have reviewed the number of submissions in respect of the Waterview Project: being 252 submissions (5 subsequently withdrawn), with some 13% in support and 72% in opposition or partial opposition. The number of 156 referred to in the opening submission by The Oenhunga Enhancement Society appears to refer to the parties wishing to be heard in that process.