

3 CONSULTATION

3.1 Consultation Overview

From the outset of the study, the study team realized that the Detroit River International Crossing project would benefit and have impacts on many stakeholders throughout the Windsor and Essex County area. Therefore, the team set out to develop a consultation framework that would include a wide variety of stakeholders and allow opportunities for meaningful two-way dialogue throughout the project. To this end, the study team established the following consultation groups early in 2005:

- **Municipal Advisory Group (MAG):** Consisting of area municipalities and the County of Essex. As the study progressed, school boards were also invited to join the MAG.
- **Canadian Agency Advisory Group (CANAAG):** Consisting of agencies involved in the review and approval of the provincial EA Report and the federal CEAA Screening Report.
- **Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG):** A bi-national consultation group. There were invitations sent to several business owners and associations in Canada and the U.S.
- **Crossing Owners/Operators/Proponents (COOP):** Consisting of owners and operators of current border crossings, and private sector proponents of new or expanded crossings.
- **Community Consultation Group (CCG):** The study team solicited membership from the public, representing a wide variety of backgrounds and interests to join the CCG. Everyone who asked to be involved was included in the group. Participants volunteered their time to meet with the team on a regular basis, learn about the project, and share their ideas and interests.
- **First Nations Consultation:** Consultation with First Nations began in January 2005, where several First Nations groups were initially consulted.

The consultation groups were established early in 2005 and the team has met with each of them several times as detailed in the following sections. As the study evolved, the team consulted with various other interests groups and stakeholders, including community groups, business owners and individual property owners. After the selection of the ACA (see **Chapter 6**), a School Advisory Group was formed to provide more direct consultation with local school councils. In addition to the above the team maintained extensive coordination and consultation with the U.S. study team and relevant stakeholders. DRIC study Working Group and Steering Committee meetings were held at regular intervals throughout the four-year period. Study team representatives reciprocated attendance at most public meetings held on the opposite side of the border.

The study team also consulted with the general public throughout the course of the study. The main forum for public consultation has been Public Information Open Houses (PIOHs) and follow up workshops, bus and boat tours, as well as several context sensitive solutions workshops and an initial public outreach meeting. Each meeting was extensively advertised and well attended, in some cases, by more than 1,000 citizens. The PIOHs provided attendees with the opportunity to review and discuss display boards and handout materials, as well as video animations of proposals and other relevant information. PIOHs and workshops were staffed by several technical representatives of the study team as appropriate. These included technical and environmental specialists (air, noise, natural heritage,

etc.), and the lead consultant, MTO (project management, environmental, and property specialists). At each public event, comments were solicited for consideration and response. Throughout the study, the study team also met with various community groups, as appropriate, in order to further understand and respond to specific issues and concerns.

To further general public knowledge about the project, the study team established a project website, which has been maintained throughout the course of the study (www.partnershipborderstudy.com). This website has provided up-to-date information on the study progress as well as draft reports as they have become available. A second project website (www.weparkway.ca) was added in the spring of 2008 to highlight the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative for the access road portion of the study. The public has been further informed about the study through the local media. Study progress has been widely covered by the local newspaper, radio stations, and television stations.

As noted above, the Detroit River International Crossing study has included extensive consultation with a wide variety of stakeholders. These consultation activities are depicted graphically as **Exhibit 3.1**. **Table 3.1** summarizes the consultation activities in chronological order. **Table 3.2** provides a listing of the consultation activities sorted by stakeholder. These tables highlight the fact that more than 300 meetings have been held throughout the study. Consultation has occurred during every phase of the project with stakeholders, including:

- Municipalities
- Federal and Provincial Agencies
- Community Groups
- First Nations
- Business Owners
- Proponents of New River Crossing Initiatives
- The General Public
- Emergency Services
- Utility Companies

The consultation has been undertaken using many forums, including Public Information Open Houses (PIOHs), workshops, meetings and correspondence.

The information received through these consultation activities has been considered in the development, analysis and evaluation of alternatives. In some cases, the comments and/or desires of interested stakeholders were not supported by the study team's analysis and evaluation, in which case they are not reflected in the final outcomes. However, in many cases the comments reinforced the analysis/evaluation and/or caused the team to adjust its thinking regarding the balance of impacts and benefits of the undertaking. In this way, the consultation has influenced the outcome of the project in many significant ways. Several of these are summarized as follows:

- **The Schwartz Report:** Released by the City of Windsor in January 2005, this report outlined a vision for a new border crossing and plaza in the Brighton Beach area, and a controlled access facility connecting to Highway 401. The report discounted alternatives, such as use of E.C. Row Expressway, and the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (DRTP) corridor through the central parts of

Windsor. The report considered access road alternatives primarily in the Highway 3/Huron Church Road corridor, the corridor which was ultimately selected by the DRIC study team as the preferred route for the access road.

- Rating Tool: Seven evaluation factors were developed in consultation with the public during the P/NF study and from the Initial Public Outreach (IPO) meeting. Public input relative to the weighting of the factors was obtained through a rating tool distributed at the first round of PIOHs in June 2005. Rating tools were also available through the local Project Office and on the project website. Interested members of the public were asked to provide the study team with their opinion as to how highly (on a scale of 0 to 100) the study team should consider each of the factors in deciding on what alternatives to carry forward for additional study. These responses enhanced the study team's appreciation of community concerns and values.

- Consultation with the Municipal Advisory Group: Among many useful contributions, the Municipal Advisory Group outlined a vision of the role and function of the future service road. This had considerable influence on the development of the alignments of the service road, as well as the ramp locations.

The Municipal Advisory Group also outlined a vision for the Highway 3 interchange, which would help focus traffic away from the existing intersection of Howard Avenue and Highway 3 and more towards Highway 401, leading to and from the eastern parts of Windsor. These discussions had a direct bearing on the development of alternatives and the final selection of an interchange design in the Highway 3-Highway 401 area.

The Municipal Advisory Group also requested that the study team consider the use of roundabouts at one or more strategic locations in the corridor. This led directly to consideration of roundabouts and selection of a roundabout at the Highway 3-Highway 401 interchange ramps.

The Municipal Advisory Group also discussed the advisability of partial interchange ramps to and from Malden Road. These had been included as part of the original concepts, but were subsequently determined not necessary. This change facilitated moving the alignment of the access road closer to E.C. Row and ultimately integrating it into the E.C. Row corridor so as to minimize impacts to the natural area and nearby communities.

- Consultations with the City of Windsor, Municipal Advisory Group, Community Consultation Group, the public and many stakeholders within the community influenced the decision to set aside the at-grade alternatives and to further develop below-grade alternatives. These stakeholders also had a direct influence on the team's decision to develop a new alternative called The Parkway, a green transportation corridor which included a below-grade freeway, an end-to-end recreational trail system, and numerous tunnel sections.
- Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Workshops: To follow up on PIOHs, the team convened CSS workshops in 2006 and 2007. Study team members participating in the meeting included PMA Landscape Architects. The study team worked with citizens to identify themes for buffers and landscaping. There was strong community interest in naturalized areas and ecological restoration, which influenced the development of The Parkway alternative and mitigation treatments for the preferred alternative.
- Discussions with the Sandwich Towne Community: Several discussions took place with representatives of the Sandwich Towne community, highlighting the historical importance of

Sandwich Towne. The historic nature and sensitivities of this community were considered throughout the analysis of alternatives for the plaza and bridge crossing. Ultimately, a location removed from the main part of Sandwich Towne was selected as the preferred alternative.

- Spring Garden Community Meetings: Meetings held with the Spring Garden community in 2008 indicated dissatisfaction with The Windsor-Essex Parkway alignment as it had been recommended in May 2008. This input prompted the team to develop a refined alignment, which integrates The Windsor-Essex Parkway into the E.C. Row Expressway corridor. This refinement has met with a level of acceptance by the community and the City of Windsor.
- Consultation with Oliver Estates Community: The August 2007 Parkway alternative originally envisioned a tunnel section at Howard Avenue. Subsequent discussion with the community indicated that the tunnel would have more benefit if it was shifted farther west. As a direct result of this consultation, the tunnel design was revised at this particular location.
- Consultation with Residents in the areas of Kendleton Court, Sansotta Court, and other specific areas: These discussions have resulted in the team considering a wider buffer area and additional right-of-way.
- Consultation with Residents on Huron Church Line: Consultation with residents on Huron Church Line near the Highway 3 intersection has resulted in refinements to the alignment proposed for Huron Church Line and development of a short cul-de-sac to provide access to these residents.
- Consultation with Emergency Service Departments: Consultation with Windsor and LaSalle Fire Services has led directly to development of the interchange design at Todd Lane / Cabana Road West.

The following sections summarize key public and stakeholder consultations, which are illustrated in Exhibit 3.1.

EXHIBIT 3.1 – STUDY STAKEHOLDERS



TABLE 3.1 – CONSULTATION MEETINGS BY DATE

#	MEETING	DATE
1	Meeting with Town of LaSalle	22-Feb-05
2	Meeting with City of Windsor	24-Feb-05
3	Meeting with County of Essex	24-Feb-05
6	CBSA Meeting	17-Mar-05
7	Windsor City Council	21-Mar-05
8	LaSalle Town Council	22-Mar-05
9	PSAG Meeting	23-Mar-05
5	COOP Meetings (individual by organization)	22 & 23-Mar-05
10	MAG Meeting	29-Mar-05
11	CANAAG Meeting	31-Mar-05
12	CBSA Meeting	31-Mar-05
22	Initial Public Outreach Meeting	5 & 6-Apr-05
13	COOP Meetings (DRTP)	8-Apr-05
14	Binational Border Agencies Meeting	21-Apr-05
15	COOP Meetings (AMB)	28-Apr-05
16	First Nations (Oneida)	4-May-05
17	Community Consultation Group Meeting #1	11-May-05
19	U.S. Border Agencies Meeting	12-May-05
20	CBSA Meeting	18-May-05
21	MNR Meeting	18-May-05
22	WWCTWC	26-May-05
23	PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	2-Jun-05
24	Community Consultation Group Meeting #2	9-Jun-05
27	NBEST Meeting	14-Jun-05
28	Essex County Council	20-Jun-05
29	Windsor City Council	20-Jun-05
32	MAG Meeting	21-Jun-05
33	CANAAG Meeting	22-Jun-05
34	PSAG Meeting	23-Jun-05
35	First Nations (WIFN)	27-Jun-05
31	U.S. Public Meeting	27-Jun-05
36	COOP Meeting	28-Jun-05
30	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 1	21, 27 & 28-Jun-05
38	BASF Corporation Meeting	12-Jul-05
39	Community Consultation Group Meeting #3	13-Jul-05
40	MAG Meeting	14-Jul-05

#	MEETING	DATE
41	PIOH 1 Workshop	14 & 20-Jul-05
42	MAG Meeting (Windsor Peer Review Team)	29-Jul-05
43	MAG Meeting (Tecumseh)	17-Aug-05
44	MAG Meeting (Windsor)	23-Aug-05
45	U.S. Scoping Meeting	31-Aug-05
46	Community Consultation Group Meeting #4 - Joint with LAC	28-Sep-05
47	CBSA Meeting	19-Oct-05
48	Community Consultation Group Meeting #5	25-Oct-05
49	U.S. LAC Meeting	26-Oct-05
50	PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	17-Nov-05
53	Essex County Council	28-Nov-05
54	Windsor City Council	28-Nov-05
55	U.S. LAC Meeting	28-Nov-05
57	MAG Meeting	29-Nov-05
58	Sandwich Development Task Force Meeting	30-Nov-05
59	CANAAG Meeting	1-Dec-05
56	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 2	29 & 30-Nov-05 and 01-Dec-05
60	Windsor Port Authority Meeting	2-Dec-05
61	COOP Meeting	6-Dec-05
62	PSAG Meeting	7-Dec-05
63	U.S. Public Meeting	8-Dec-05
64	Greater Essex County School Board Meeting	14-Dec-05
66	Essex Aggregates Meeting	15-Dec-05
67	Essex Terminal Railway Meeting	15-Dec-05
68	Lou Romano Water Reclamation Plant Meeting	15-Dec-05
69	Van De Hogen Meeting	15-Dec-05
70	Windsor Salt Meeting	15-Dec-05
65	Sandwich Community Heritage Group Meeting	15-Dec-05
71	Brighton Beach Power Meeting	16-Dec-05
72	Hydro One Meeting	16-Dec-05
73	U.S. Border Agencies Meeting	19-Dec-05
74	U.S. Workshop Meeting	21-Dec-05
75	U.S. Workshop Meeting	4-Jan-06
76	Sandwich Community Task Force Meeting	10-Jan-06
78	CBSA Meeting (+ tour)	11-Jan-06
77	Community Consultation Group Meeting #6	11-Jan-06
79	Huron Church Business Owners Meeting	12-Jan-06

#	MEETING	DATE
80	Windsor Ward 1&2 Councillors' Meeting	18-Jan-06
81	U.S. Workshop Meeting	18-Jan-06
82	MAG Meeting	19-Jan-06
83	First Nations (WIFN)	20-Jan-06
84	PIOH2 Workshop (Plazas)	25-Jan-06
85	Windsor City Council Meeting	26-Jan-06
86	PIOH 2 Workshop (Routes)	26-Jan-06
87	Public Question & Answer Session	1-Feb-06
89	MAG Meeting	7-Feb-06
88	PIOH 2 Workshop (Routes Revised)	7-Feb-06
91	Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	8-Feb-06
90	Community Consultation Group Meeting #7	8-Feb-06
92	PIOH 2 Workshop (Plazas and Crossing)	9-Feb-06
93	Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce Meeting	15-Feb-06
94	Protect Windsor Meeting	15-Feb-06
95	Coco Corporation Meeting	16-Feb-06
96	Royal Canadian Legion Br. #594 Meeting	16-Feb-06
97	Public Meeting (Talbot Road/Huron Church)	21-Feb-06
98	First Nations (WIFN)	28-Feb-06
99	Port Authority & Sterling Fuels Meeting	1-Mar-06
100	Community Consultation Group Meeting #8 - Joint with LAC	22-Mar-06
102	CBSA Meeting	23-Mar-06
103	Briefing of Mayors & Warden	27-Mar-06
104	PSAG Meeting	28-Mar-06
107	CANAAG Meeting	29-Mar-06
106	MAG Meeting (Windsor Peer Review Team)	29-Mar-06
105	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 3	28 & 30-Mar-06
108	Presentation to WIFN Council	3-Apr-06
196	Presentation to Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee	3-Apr-06
109	Tour of Sandwich with Detroit City Council	5-Apr-06
110	PSAG Meeting	6-Apr-06
111	Oakwood Parent Council	10-Apr-06
112	MAG Meeting	11-Apr-06
113	PIOH 3 Workshop	11-Apr-06
114	RCMP/EMO/OPP/CBSA/Mun. Emergency Services Meeting	12-Apr-06
115	PIOH 3 Workshop	12-Apr-06
116	Talbot Road Residents	18-Apr-06

#	MEETING	DATE
117	MAG Meeting	26-Apr-06
118	School Board Meeting	26-Apr-06
119	Community Consultation Group Meeting #9	27-Apr-06
121	Armanda Street Residents	10-May-06
120	MDOT Tour for JIBA	10-May-06
122	MAG Meeting	24-May-06
123	Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce Meeting	29-May-06
124	School Council Meeting	30-May-06
125	U.S. CSS Bus Tour	8-Jun-06
126	Sandwich Towne Community Task Force Tour of Delray	14-Jun-06
127	St. Clair College Meeting	21-Jun-06
128	Heritage Park Alliance Church Meeting	21-Jun-06
129	PIOH 3 Workshops	23-Jun-06
130	PIOH 3 Workshops	24-Jun-06
132	Community Consultation Group Meeting #10	26-Jun-06
131	Canadian CSS Bus Tour	26-Jun-06
139	Presentation to Windsor-Essex County District School Board of Trustees	8-Jul-06
133	Meeting with RCMP/NRCAN	10-Jul-06
134	Meeting with LaSalle Councillors (not formal council meeting)	11-Jul-06
135	Huron Church Business Owners Association Meeting	26-Jul-06
136	Meeting with City of Windsor Representatives	26-Jul-06
137	Meeting with Vidican Engineering	27-Jul-06
138	Meeting with Ministry of Tourism	3-Aug-06
140	Presentation to DaimlerChrysler	15-Aug-06
141	U.S. CSS Workshops	24-Aug-06
142	Drilling Information Session with STCTF	31-Aug-06
143	MAG Meeting	5-Sep-06
144	Community Consultation Group Meeting #11	6-Sep-06
146	Meeting with Valente Real Estate	7-Sep-06
147	Bi-National Coast Guard Meeting	13-Sep-06
148	Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	19-Sep-06
149	Canadian CSS Workshops	2 & 3-Oct-06
150	Social Impact Assessment Workshop	21-Oct-06
151	Community Consultation Group Meeting #12	26-Oct-06
152	CSS Workshop (Detroit)	3-Nov-06
153	CBSA Meeting	7-Nov-06
154	First Nations (WIFN)	9-Nov-06

#	MEETING	DATE
155	Presentation to Bellewood School	14-Nov-06
156	CSS Workshop (Windsor)	15-Nov-06
157	Presentation to Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee	23-Nov-06
158	MAG Meeting	29-Nov-06
159	Community Consultation Group Meeting #13 – Joint w/U.S. LAC	29-Nov-06
160	Meeting with Councillor Halberstadt	4-Dec-06
164	Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	5-Dec-06
161	Meeting with Dainty Foods	5-Dec-06
162	Meeting with Citizens Protecting Ojibway Wilderness	5-Dec-06
166	CANAAG Meeting	6-Dec-06
165	Mayor Briefing (PIOH 4)	6-Dec-06
167	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 4	06 & 07-Dec-06
168	PSAG Meeting	8-Dec-06
169	Meeting with City of Windsor Staff	13-Dec-06
170	Teleconference with Coast Guard	8-Jan-07
171	PIOH 4 Workshop	9-Jan-07
172	Windsor Port Authority Meeting	10-Jan-07
173	PIOH 4 Workshop	10-Jan-07
174	Meeting with Windsor Port Authority & Sterling Fuels	19-Jan-07
175	CBSA Meeting	23-Jan-07
176	Sandwich Towne Community Meeting	25-Jan-07
177	Social Impact Assessment Workshop	26-Jan-07
178	Social Impact Assessment Workshop	27-Jan-07
179	Meeting with Essex Region Conservation Authority	30-Jan-07
180	Meeting with Southwest Sales	30-Jan-07
181	Meeting with Royal Canadian Legion Br. 594	31-Jan-07
182	Meeting with LaSalle Utilities	31-Jan-07
183	Meeting with DFO	15-Feb-07
185	Community Consultation Group Meeting #14	21-Feb-07
184	Tour of ACA with Mike Weis, University of Windsor	21-Feb-07
186	First Nations (WIFN)	23-Feb-07
187	Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	27-Feb-07
188	Recreational Boaters Meeting	28-Feb-07
189	Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	1-Mar-07
190	Assumption Town Hall Meeting	3-Mar-07
191	Meeting with Ontario Ministry of the Environment (Noise)	6-Mar-07
192	Meeting with RCMP/NRCAN	9-Mar-07

#	MEETING	DATE
193	Meeting with Sterling Fuels	9-Mar-07
194	Heritage Park Alliance Church Meeting	16-Mar-07
195	Natural Science Agencies' Meeting	27-Mar-07
197	Meeting with Canadian Great Lakes Pilots Association	4-Apr-07
198	Presentation to U.S. Coast Guard Working Group	10-Apr-07
199	Meeting with Canadian Shipowners Association	10-May-07
200	PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	10-May-07
202	Meeting with Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets	15-May-07
201	Meeting with Town of LaSalle re: HPAC	15-May-07
203	Meeting with City of Windsor	18-May-07
204	Meeting with City of Windsor	24-May-07
205	Meeting with Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets	28-May-07
207	Presentation to Heritage Park Alliance Church	30-May-07
206	Meeting with Town of Tecumseh	30-May-07
208	Meeting with Town of LaSalle and County of Essex	31-May-07
209	Meeting with City of Windsor	4-Jun-07
210	Presentation to County of Essex Council	6-Jun-07
211	Meeting with City of Windsor	8-Jun-07
213	Detroit River Canadian Cleanup	26-Jun-07
214	Elected Officials Briefing	14-Aug-07
215	Media Briefing	14-Aug-07
217	PSAG Meeting	15-Aug-07
216	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 5	14 & 15-Aug-07
219	Community Consultation Group Meeting #15	21-Aug-07
220	PIOH 5 Workshop Session	22-Aug-07
218	MAG Meeting	23-Aug-07
221	PIOH 5 Workshop Session	23-Aug-07
222	Presentation to International Joint Commission (IJC)	27-Aug-07
223	Presentation to Tecumseh Council	28-Aug-07
224	Presentation to LaSalle Council	12-Sep-07
225	CANAAG Meeting	13-Sep-07
226	Meeting with ERCA & MNR	19-Sep-07
227	Meeting with Representatives of Affected Municipalities	20-Sep-07
228	Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	4-Oct-07
229	Meeting with City of Windsor	26-Oct-07
230	Meeting with DFO	2-Nov-07
231	Meeting with City of Windsor	14-Nov-07
232	Meeting with Windsor Crossing	19-Nov-07

#	MEETING	DATE
233	Presentation to CSCE	21-Nov-07
234	Meeting with Trillium Court	28-Nov-07
235	MAG Meeting	11-Dec-07
236	First Nations (WIFN)	13-Dec-07
238	First Nations (WIFN)	11-Jan-08
239	Meeting with Ministry of the Environment (MOE)	29-Jan-08
240	First Nations (WIFN) Council Meeting	4-Feb-08
241	Meeting with Oliver Estates	19-Feb-08
242	First Nations (WIFN) PIOH	26-Feb-08
243	Community Consultation Group Meeting #16 - invited to LAC	27-Feb-08
244	PSAG Meeting	19-Mar-08
245	Meeting with DFO	26-Mar-08
246	PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	2-Apr-08
247	MNR/ERCA Meeting	21-Apr-08
248	Essex County Medical Society	6-May-08
249	Meeting with Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets	9-May-08
250	CBSA Meeting	14-May-08
251	MAG Meeting	15-May-08
252	Community Consultation Group Meeting #17	21-May-08
253	Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	22-May-08
254	Windsor City Council	26-May-08
256	Presentation to Tecumseh Council	27-May-08
258	Presentation to Essex Council	4-Jun-08
259	Presentation to LaSalle Council	10-Jun-08
260	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 6	18 & 19-Jun-08
262	Meeting with Nemark	24-Jun-08
263	CANAAG Meeting	25-Jun-08
264	First Nations (WIFN) Meeting	25-Jun-08
261	PIOH6 Workshops	24 & 25-Jun-08
265	Hydro One Meeting	11-Jul-08
267	Meeting with Spring Garden/Bethlehem Residents	15-Jul-08
266	Meeting with City of Windsor	15-Jul-08
268	CANAAG Agency Meeting	16-Jul-08
269	Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	16-Jul-08
271	Community Consultation Group Meeting #18	16-Jul-08
272	CANAAG Meeting	22-Jul-08
273	Meeting with Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee	23-Jul-08

#	MEETING	DATE
275	CANAAG Agency Meeting	24-Jul-08
274	Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Workshops	23 & 24-Jul-08
276	Meeting with Mr. Lalonde & Neighbours	29-Jul-08
277	West Windsor Power Meeting	30-Jul-08
278	Brighton Beach Power Meeting	30-Jul-08
279	WECEC Bus Tour	6-Aug-08
280	Meeting with Southwest Sales	6-Aug-08
281	Presentation at NATPO Conference	11-Aug-08
282	First Nations (WIFN) Council Meeting	12-Aug-08
283	Meeting with PB/City of Windsor	19-Aug-08
284	Bell Utility Relocation Meeting	20-Aug-08
285	Meeting with Huron Church Line Residents	28-Aug-08
286	Union Gas Utilities Meeting	29-Aug-08
288	MNR Meeting	3-Sep-08
289	Meeting with Dainty Foods	3-Sep-08
287	Tecumseh Utilities Meeting	3-Sep-08
290	Trillium Court Meeting	9-Sep-08
291	Meeting with Essex Power Lines	18-Sep-08
292	Meeting with Cogeco Cable	18-Sep-08
293	MNR Meeting	22-Sep-08
294	DFO Meeting & Tour	23-Sep-08
295	Southwestern Sales Meeting	25-Sep-08
296	River Park Board Meeting	30-Sep-08
298	WECEC Meeting	2-Oct-08
297	Meeting with ERCA	2-Oct-08
299	Meeting with LaSalle Planning Department	3-Oct-08
300	Presentation to CAW Retirees	9-Oct-08
301	Meeting with Montessori School	15-Oct-08
302	Meeting with Spring Garden Residents	15-Oct-08
303	Presentation to LaSalle Business Association	5-Nov-08
305	Meeting with Kendleton Court Residents	6-Nov-08
307	Meeting with Sansotta Residents	7-Nov-08
308	Meeting with Trillium Court Residents	10-Nov-08
309	Meeting with CANAAG	12-Nov-08
310	Public Information Open House (PIOH) 7	24 & 25-Nov-08
311	Hydro One Meeting	05-Dec-08
312	Meeting with LaSalle Utilities	09-Dec-08

TABLE 3.2 – CONSULTATION MEETINGS BY CATEGORY

MEETING	DATE
Advisory Group 1	
WECEC Bus Tour	6-Aug-08
WECEC Meeting	2-Oct-08
MAG Meeting	29-Mar-05
MAG Meeting	21-Jun-05
MAG Meeting	14-Jul-05
MAG Meeting	29-Nov-05
MAG Meeting	19-Jan-06
MAG Meeting	7-Feb-06
MAG Meeting	11-Apr-06
MAG Meeting	26-Apr-06
MAG Meeting	24-May-06
MAG Meeting	5-Sep-06
MAG Meeting	29-Nov-06
MAG Meeting	23-Aug-07
MAG Meeting	11-Dec-07
MAG Meeting	15-May-08
Advisory Group 2	
CANAAG Meeting	31-Mar-05
CANAAG Meeting	22-Jun-05
CANAAG Meeting	1-Dec-05
CANAAG Meeting	29-Mar-06
CANAAG Meeting	6-Dec-06
CANAAG Meeting	13-Sep-07
CANAAG Meeting	25-Jun-08
CANAAG Agency Meeting	16-Jul-08
CANAAG Meeting	22-Jul-08
CANAAG Agency Meeting	24-Jul-08
CANAAG Meeting	12-Nov-08
Advisory Group 3	
PSAG Meeting	23-Mar-05
PSAG Meeting	23-Jun-05
PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	17-Nov-05
PSAG Meeting	7-Dec-05
PSAG Meeting	28-Mar-06

MEETING	DATE
PSAG Meeting	6-Apr-06
PSAG Meeting	8-Dec-06
PSAG Meeting	15-Aug-07
PSAG Meeting	19-Mar-08
PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	2-Apr-08
Advisory Group 4	
COOP Meetings (individual by organization)	22 & 23-Mar-05
COOP Meeting	6-Dec-05
Advisory Group 5	
Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	8-Feb-06
RCMP/EMO/OPP/CBSA/Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	12-Apr-06
Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	27-Feb-07
Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	4-Oct-07
Municipal Emergency Services Meeting	16-Jul-08
Advisory Group 6	
School Board Meeting	26-Apr-06
Greater Essex County School Board Meeting	14-Dec-05
School Council Meeting	30-May-06
Presentation to Windsor-Essex County District School Board of Trustees	8-Jul-06
Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	19-Sep-06
Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	5-Dec-06
Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	1-Mar-07
Schools Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	22-May-08
Advisory Group 7	
CBSA Meeting	17-Mar-05
CBSA Meeting	31-Mar-05
CBSA Meeting	18-May-05
CBSA Meeting	19-Oct-05
CBSA Meeting (+ tour)	11-Jan-06
CBSA Meeting	23-Mar-06
CBSA Meeting	7-Nov-06
CBSA Meeting	23-Jan-07
CBSA Meeting	14-May-08
Advisory Group 8	

MEETING	DATE
RCMP/NRCAN Meeting	10-Jul-06
RCMP/NRCAN Meeting	9-Mar-07
Advisory Group 9	
Ministry of Tourism Meeting	3-Aug-06
Advisory Group 10	
MNR Meeting	18-May-05
MTO Meeting (Noise)	6-Mar-07
Presentation to International Joint Commission (IJC)	27-Aug-07
DFO Meeting	26-Mar-08
MNR/ERCA Meeting	21-Apr-08
MNR Meeting	3-Sep-08
MNR Meeting	22-Sep-08
DFO Meeting & Tour	23-Sep-08
ERCA Meeting	2-Oct-08
Essex Region Conservation Authority Meeting	30-Jan-07
DFO Meeting	15-Feb-07
Natural Science Agencies' Meeting	27-Mar-07
Detroit River Canadian Cleanup	26-Jun-07
ERCA & MNR Meeting	19-Sep-07
DFO Meeting	2-Nov-07
MOE Meeting	29-Jan-08
Advisory Group 11	
Bi-National Coast Guard Meeting	13-Sep-06
Teleconference with Coast Guard	8-Jan-07
Canadian Great Lakes Pilots Association Meeting	4-Apr-07
Presentation to U.S. Coast Guard Working Group	10-Apr-07
Canadian Shipowners Association Meeting	10-May-07
Business Owner	
PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	2-Jun-05
Windsor Port Authority Meeting	2-Dec-05
Essex Aggregates Meeting	15-Dec-05
Essex Terminal Railway Meeting	15-Dec-05
Lou Romano Water Reclamation Plant Meeting	15-Dec-05
Van De Hogen Meeting	15-Dec-05

MEETING	DATE
Windsor Salt Meeting	15-Dec-05
Brighton Beach Power Meeting	16-Dec-05
Hydro One Meeting	16-Dec-05
Coco Corporation Meeting	16-Feb-06
Royal Canadian Legion Br. #594 Meeting	16-Feb-06
Port Authority & Sterling Fuels Meeting	1-Mar-06
St. Clair College Meeting	21-Jun-06
Heritage Park Alliance Church Meeting	21-Jun-06
Huron Church Business Owners Association Meeting	26-Jul-06
Vidican Engineering Meeting	27-Jul-06
Presentation to DaimlerChrysler	15-Aug-06
Valente Real Estate Meeting	7-Sep-06
Dainty Foods Meeting	5-Dec-06
Windsor Port Authority Meeting	10-Jan-07
Windsor Port Authority & Sterling Fuels Meeting	19-Jan-07
Southwest Sales Meeting	30-Jan-07
Royal Canadian Legion Br. 594 Meeting	31-Jan-07
Sterling Fuels Meeting	9-Mar-07
Heritage Park Alliance Church Meeting	16-Mar-07
PSAG Meeting (CAPC)	10-May-07
Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets Meeting	15-May-07
Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets Meeting	28-May-07
Presentation to Heritage Park Alliance Church	30-May-07
Trillium Court Meeting	28-Nov-07
Windsor Crossing Premium Outlets Meeting	9-May-08
Nemak Meeting	24-Jun-08
West Windsor Power Meeting	30-Jul-08
Brighton Beach Power Meeting	30-Jul-08
Southwest Sales Meeting	6-Aug-08
Dainty Foods Meeting	3-Sep-08
Trillium Court Meeting	9-Sep-08
Southwestern Sales Meeting	25-Sep-08
Montessori School Meeting	15-Oct-08
Hydro One Meeting	05-Dec-08

CCG	
Community Consultation Group Meeting #1	11-May-05
Community Consultation Group Meeting #2	9-Jun-05
Community Consultation Group Meeting #3	13-Jul-05
Community Consultation Group Meeting #4 – Joint with LAC	28-Sep-05
Community Consultation Group Meeting #5	25-Oct-05
Community Consultation Group Meeting #6	11-Jan-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #7	8-Feb-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #8 – Joint with LAC	22-Mar-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #9	27-Apr-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #10	26-Jun-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #11	6-Sep-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #12	26-Oct-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #13 – Joint with LAC	29-Nov-06
Community Consultation Group Meeting #14	21-Feb-07
Community Consultation Group Meeting #15	21-Aug-07
Community Consultation Group Meeting #16 – invited to LAC	27-Feb-08
Community Consultation Group Meeting #17	21-May-08
Community Consultation Group Meeting #18	16-Jul-08
Community Meetings	
Sandwich Community Heritage Group Meeting	15-Dec-05
Sandwich Community Task Force Meeting	10-Jan-06
Huron Church Business Owners Meeting	12-Jan-06
Sandwich Towne Community Task Force Tour of Delray	14-Jun-06
Sandwich Towne Community Meeting	25-Jan-07
Assumption Town Hall Meeting	3-Mar-07
Meeting with Oliver Estates	19-Feb-08
Meeting with Spring Garden/Bethlehem Residents	15-Jul-08
Meeting with Mr. Lalonde & Neighbours	29-Jul-08
Oakwood Parent's Council	10-Apr-06
Talbot Road Residents	18-Apr-06
Armanda Street Residents	10-May-06

Presentation to Bellewood School	14-Nov-06
Meeting with Huron Church Line Residents	28-Aug-08
River Park Board Meeting	30-Sep-08
Meeting with Spring Garden Residents	15-Oct-08
Meeting with Kendleton Court Residents	6-Nov-08
Meeting with Sansotta Residents	7-Nov-08
Meeting with Trillium Court Residents	10-Nov-08
Council	
Windsor City Council	21-Mar-05
LaSalle Town Council	22-Mar-05
Essex County Council	20-Jun-05
Windsor City Council	20-Jun-05
Essex County Council	28-Nov-05
Windsor City Council	28-Nov-05
Windsor Ward 1&2 Councillors' Meeting	18-Jan-06
Windsor City Councillor Meeting	26-Jan-06
Briefing of Mayors & Warden	27-Mar-06
Meeting with LaSalle Councillors (not formal council meeting)	11-Jul-06
Meeting with Councillor Halberstadt	4-Dec-06
Mayor Briefing (PIOH 4)	6-Dec-06
Presentation to County of Essex Council	6-Jun-07
Elected Officials Briefing	14-Aug-07
Presentation to Tecumseh Council	28-Aug-07
Presentation to LaSalle Council	12-Sep-07
Windsor City Council	26-May-08
Presentation to Tecumseh Council	27-May-08
Presentation to Essex Council	4-Jun-08
Presentation to LaSalle Council	10-Jun-08
First Nations	
First Nations (Oneida)	4-May-05
First Nations (WIFN)	27-Jun-05
First Nations (WIFN)	20-Jan-06
First Nations (WIFN)	28-Feb-06
Presentation to WIFN Council	3-Apr-06
First Nations (WIFN)	9-Nov-06
First Nations (WIFN)	23-Feb-07

First Nations (WIFN)	13-Dec-07
First Nations (WIFN)	11-Jan-08
First Nations (WIFN) Council Meeting	4-Feb-08
First Nations (WIFN) PIOH	26-Feb-08
First Nations (WIFN) Meeting	25-Jun-08
First Nations (WIFN) Council Meeting	12-Aug-08
Interest Group	
WWCTWC	26-May-05
MAG	
Meeting with Representatives of Affected Municipalities	20-Sep-07
Media	
Media Briefing	14-Aug-07
Municipality	
Town of LaSalle Meeting	22-Feb-05
City of Windsor Meeting	24-Feb-05
County of Essex Meeting	24-Feb-05
MAG Meeting (Windsor Peer Review Team)	29-Jul-05
MAG Meeting (Tecumseh)	17-Aug-05
MAG Meeting (Windsor)	23-Aug-05
MAG Meeting (Windsor Peer Review Team)	29-Mar-06
Presentation to Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee	3-Apr-06
City of Windsor Representatives Meeting	26-Jul-06
City of Windsor Staff Meeting	13-Dec-06
LaSalle Utilities Meeting	31-Jan-07
Town of LaSalle re: HPAC Meeting	15-May-07
City of Windsor Meeting	18-May-07
City of Windsor Meeting	24-May-07
Town of Tecumseh Meeting	30-May-07
Town of LaSalle and County of Essex Meeting	31-May-07
City of Windsor Meeting	4-Jun-07
City of Windsor Meeting	8-Jun-07
City of Windsor Meeting	26-Oct-07
City of Windsor Meeting	14-Nov-07
City of Windsor Meeting	15-Jul-08
PB/City of Windsor Meeting	19-Aug-08

LaSalle Planning Department Meeting	3-Oct-08
LaSalle Utilities Meeting	09-Dec-08
Other Interest Groups	
Citizens Protecting Ojibway Wilderness Meeting	5-Dec-06
Other Study Area/Interest Group	
Binational Border Agencies Meeting	21-Apr-05
U.S. Border Agencies Meeting	12-May-05
NBEST Meeting	14-Jun-05
U.S. Border Agencies Meeting	19-Dec-05
U.S. Workshop Meeting	21-Dec-05
U.S. Workshop Meeting	4-Jan-06
Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce Meeting	15-Feb-06
Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce Meeting	29-May-06
Windsor Crossing Meeting	19-Nov-07
Presentation to CSCE	21-Nov-07
Essex County Medical Society	6-May-08
Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee Meeting	23-Jul-08
Presentation at NATPO Conference	11-Aug-08
Presentation to CAW Retirees	9-Oct-08
Presentation to LaSalle Business Association	5-Nov-08
BASF Corporation Meeting	12-Jul-05
Other/Interest Group	
Tour of ACA with Mike Weis, University of Windsor	21-Feb-07
Recreational Boaters Meeting	28-Feb-07
PIOHs, Workshops, Public & Community Meetings	
Initial Public Outreach Meeting	5 & 6-Apr-05
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 1	21, 27 & 28-Jun-05
PIOH 1 Workshop	14 & 20-Jul-05
Sandwich Development Task Force Meeting	30-Nov-05

Public Information Open House (PIOH) 2	29 & 30-Nov-05 and 01-Dec-05
PIOH 2 Workshop (Plazas)	25-Jan-06
PIOH 2 Workshop (Routes)	26-Jan-06
Public Question & Answer Session	1-Feb-06
PIOH 2 Workshop (Routes Revised)	7-Feb-06
PIOH 2 Workshop (Plazas and Crossing)	9-Feb-06
Public Meeting (Talbot Road/Huron Church)	21-Feb-06
Protect Windsor Meeting	15-Feb-06
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 3	28 & 30-Mar-06
PIOH 3 Workshop	11-Apr-06
PIOH 3 Workshop	12-Apr-06
PIOH 3 Workshops	23-Jun-06
PIOH 3 Workshops	24-Jun-06
Canadian CSS Bus Tour	26-Jun-06
Drilling Information Session with STCTF	31-Aug-06
Canadian CSS Workshops	2 & 3-Oct-06
Social Impact Assessment Workshop	21-Oct-06
CSS Workshop (Windsor)	15-Nov-06
Presentation to Windsor Essex County Environmental Committee	23-Nov-06
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 4	06 & 07-Dec-06
PIOH 4 Workshop	9-Jan-07
PIOH 4 Workshop	10-Jan-07
Social Impact Assessment Workshop	26-Jan-07
Social Impact Assessment Workshop	27-Jan-07
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 5	14 & 15-Aug-07
PIOH 5 Workshop Session	22-Aug-07
PIOH 5 Workshop Session	23-Aug-07
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 6	18 & 19-Jun-08
PIOH 6 Workshops	24 & 25-Jun-08

Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Workshops	23 & 24-Jul-08
Public Information Open House (PIOH) 7	24 & 25-Nov-08
Proponent	
COOP Meetings (DRTP)	8-Apr-05
COOP Meetings (AMB)	28-Apr-05
COOP Meeting	28-Jun-05
U.S. Group	
U.S. Scoping Meeting	31-Aug-05
U.S. LAC Meeting	26-Oct-05
U.S. LAC Meeting	28-Nov-05
U.S. Public Meeting	8-Dec-05
U.S. Workshop Meeting	18-Jan-06
Tour of Sandwich with Detroit City Council	5-Apr-06
MDOT Tour for JIBA	10-May-06
U.S. CSS Bus Tour	8-Jun-06
U.S. CSS Workshops	24-Aug-06
CSS Workshop (Detroit)	3-Nov-06
U.S. Public Meeting	27-Jun-05
Utility	
Hydro One Meeting	11-Jul-08
Bell Utility Relocation Meeting	20-Aug-08
Union Gas Utilities Meeting	29-Aug-08
Tecumseh Utilities Meeting	3-Sep-08
Meeting with Essex Power Lines	18-Sep-08
Meeting with Cogeco Cable	18-Sep-08

3.2 Public Information Open Houses, Workshops and Meetings

Public consultation began at the start of the study in January 2005 with a Notice of Study Commencement published in local newspapers. Over the study period, an Initial Public Outreach Meeting (IPO), seven Public Information Open Houses (PIOHs) and associated workshops have been held in which the study material has been presented to the public for their input and information. Workshops following the PIOHs were used to address specific issues and/or develop context sensitive solutions. The workshops were generally conducted with the aid of a facilitator. The public provided the study team with input into the materials presented. The study team has used this input in modifying the design of the alternatives and in analyzing the data at each step of the study process.

The IPO, PIOH, and workshop sessions are summarized in **Table 3.3**. Summary reports were prepared following each PIOH. These summaries are supporting documents and are available on the study website www.partnershipborderstudy.com.

TABLE 3.3 – INITIAL PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETING, PUBLIC INFORMATION OPEN HOUSES AND WORKSHOPS

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
Initial Public Outreach (IPO) Meeting April 5 & 6, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Government Notice published in the following papers: LaSalle Silhouette, Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart Meeting dates and locations presented to local councils and Advisory Group meetings in advance of the IPO meetings Notices mailed directly to study team's contact lists (over 400 addresses) Details posted on project website 	Total number of sign-ins: 179 (91 at Windsor session, 88 at LaSalle session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of the study team & the study Study, evaluation & EA planning processes Key milestones Proposed evaluation criteria Short-term improvements How to stay involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the presentation boards Study team contact sheet Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate citizenship and use of the border for commuting Rate importance of specific principles while generating or developing new/expanded crossing alternative and connections to existing highways (on scale of 1-5) Input to evaluation criteria Mark areas of interest on aerial photo maps 	Total number of comment sheets received: 129 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 124 received in person at IPO 5 received by mail/fax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve environmentally significant areas (concerned about impacts to Ojibway area) Consider air quality Health and quality of life of residents Consider tunnel option Consider other modes of transportation Keep trucks off local roads 	Team became aware of community issues re: air quality, significant natural areas and desire to consider tunnels. The interest of the community confirmed the need to develop a wide range of Illustrative Alternatives.
Public Information Open House 1 (PIOH 1) June 21, 22 & 28, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Government Notice published in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart, LaSalle Silhouette Meeting dates and locations presented to local councils and Advisory Group meetings in advance of PIOH 1 Media Briefing Session and drop-in session for Windsor Councillors held prior to PIOH 1 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact list (over 340 addresses) and advisory group contact lists (over 250 addresses) Details posted on project website 	Total number of sign-ins: 477 (255 at Windsor session, 155 at LaSalle session, 97 at Amherstburg session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of IPO Travel demand information Development of Illustrative Alternatives Alternative inspection plaza sites and conceptual layout Crossing types Generation of connecting routes Evaluation criteria and proposed evaluation method What's next and how to stay involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the presentation boards Study team contact sheet Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH1 Workshop sessions Rating Tool Form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree/disagree with Purpose and Need for study Any additional plazas, crossings or route alternatives to consider Mark areas of interest on aerial photo maps Please comment on Factor Weights Using Rating Tool form 	Total number of comment sheets received: 181 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 169 received in person at PIOH 12 received by mail/fax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve environmentally significant areas (concerned about impacts to Ojibway area) Consider air quality Health and quality of life of residents Opposed to Schwartz plan Consider tunnel option Consider other modes of transportation Consider routes outside (south) of study area 	Team awareness of air quality, natural concerns continued to develop. Many differing viewpoints, re: the Illustrative Alternatives confirmed the need for a thorough and systematic analysis of Illustrative Alternatives.

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
PIOH1 Workshops July 14 & 20, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH1 Provided registration forms at PIOH 1 for sign-ups Followed up with phone call to those who signed up at PIOH to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of Public Information Open House 1 Discussion of Purpose and Problem Statement, including Travel Demand Discussion of Assessment of Other Alternatives (i.e., rail; diversion to Blue Water Bridge) Review / Discussion of Illustrative Alternatives (Crossings, Plazas and Routes) Discussion of Evaluation Factors and Methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Large scale maps (as shown at PIOH 1) were shown to facilitate discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions centred on agenda items, and time was allotted to general questions during in an open forum setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the time requirements and costs involved in this study Questions re: travel demand, use of other modes Who makes the decisions and who will own the new crossing Connections to existing infrastructure Consultation, public input and next steps 	
SUMMARY	At the conclusion of the first round of public consultation the team further appreciated the wide range of (and sometimes competing) interests and preferences for alternative border solutions. This reinforced the team's commitment to proceed based on thorough and systematic analyses.							
Public Information Open House 2 (PIOH 2) November 29 & 30 and December 1, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Government Notice published in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart, LaSalle Silhouette Meeting dates and locations presented to local councils and Advisory Group meetings in advance of PIOH 2 Media briefing and drop-in session for Windsor Councillors held prior to PIOH 2 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact list (over 350 addresses) and advisory group contact lists (over 260 addresses) Details posted on project website Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 433 (106 at Windsor session, 146 at LaSalle session, 181 at Sandwich Towne session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of PIOH 1 Evaluation process & methods Evaluation of Illustrative Alternatives Results of analysis of alternatives Summary of Arithmetic Evaluation Results End-to-end evaluation Area of Continued Analysis What's next and how to stay involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the key presentation boards Study team contact sheet Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH 2 Workshop sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with results of Reasoned Argument analysis and Arithmetic Evaluation? Are there additional plaza, crossing or route alternatives within or outside ACA to consider as practical alternatives? Mark areas of interest on aerial photo maps 	Total number of comment sheets received: 108 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 99 received in person at PIOH 9 received by mail/fax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect natural areas such as Ojibway, Spring Garden ANSI, Black Oak Woods Protect established recreational trails & fields Do not use Schwartz route Keep away from existing schools Use existing transportation corridors Tunnel the route Concern about decrease in property values 	Team determined that a tunnelled alternative should be developed and analysed as a Practical Alternative. Awareness of historical importance of Sandwich Towne was heightened leading to future meetings with key representatives from the community

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
PIOH 2 Workshops January 25 & 26 and February 7 & 9, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH 2 Provided registration forms at PIOH 2 for sign-ups Followed up with letters to those who signed up at PIOH to confirm attendance at January or February workshops 	Total number of participants: 183 (121 in January, 62 in February)	<p>January Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Update / What's Next Brief Presentation by study team Workshop Exercises Study team Responses to Issues Raised During Workshop Exercises <p>February Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Format was question & answer on routes and plazas 	<p>January Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Orthophoto of ACA Plaza visualizations Comment sheet <p>February Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Proposed Evaluation Factors and Performance Measures table General and specific comment sheets 	<p>January Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/ questions about the project <p>February Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the priority areas for tunnelling or for a depressed roadway? Are there other locations where interchanges should be considered? Where should different highway crossings (vehicular/pedestrian) be located? What should the Study team incorporate in the design of the roadway to improve its look and aesthetics and have it blend more seamlessly into the community? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of question cards received: 38 (18 in January, 20 in February) Total number of comment sheets received: 17 	<p>January Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received suggestions for suitable/unsuitable plaza locations Questions regarding alternatives Avoid natural areas <p>February Workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for suitable/unsuitable areas for plazas and tunnelling/ depressed roadway, highway interchange and crossing locations Suggestions for impacts/ opportunities to assess in evaluation of Practical Alternatives Suggestions for design components and plantings along the roadway 	Team gained better appreciation for local conditions which assisted in development of Practical Alternatives
Public Question & Answer Session February 1, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided registration forms at PIOH 2 for sign-up Followed up with letters to those who indicated interest at PIOH to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Status Common Questions & Answers Group Questions Key Dates / What's Next 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question card (for use during the meeting) Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/ questions about the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of question cards received: 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with air quality Who makes the decisions and who will own the new crossing Effects of project on properties and owners Coordination with U.S. Next steps and how to stay informed & involved 	Team continued to gain appreciation for high level of community interest and concern especially regarding air quality and tunnelling
Public Meeting February 21, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hand delivery of meeting notice to properties within and surrounding the Area of Continued Analysis (approximately 3,600 addresses) Participants asked to email or call to register 	Total number of participants: 339	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project update & current status Input to develop practical alternatives for new crossing, inspection plaza and connecting route Question & Answer session 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Evaluation Factors and Performance Measures Question card (for use during the meeting) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions centred on development of practical alternatives; time was allotted to general questions during in an open forum setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of question cards received: 52 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions about air quality, protection of environmentally sensitive areas, vehicle emissions Concern with amount of property required Tunnel the access route Suggestions for other alternatives 	Team continued to gain appreciation for high level of community interest and concern especially regarding air quality and tunnelling

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
SUMMARY	The second round of consultation was instrumental in raising the team's awareness of community concerns in the ACA, particularly as they related to air quality and protection of the natural environment. This awareness led directly to inclusion of below-grade alternatives and a full 6km tunnel as Practical Alternatives that would be subject to full analysis and evaluation.							
Public Information Open House 3 (PIOH3) March 28 & 30, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Government Notice published in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart Meeting dates and locations presented at Advisory Group meetings in advance of PIOH 3 Technical briefing session held for Mayors & Wardens prior to PIOH 3 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public and Advisory Group contact lists (over 1,400 addresses) as well as to property owners as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 7,500 addresses) Details posted on project website Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 812 (472 at Oldcastle session, 340 at Sandwich Towne session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of PIOH 2 & consultation to date Evaluation process & methods End-to-end evaluation Crossing, plaza & route alternatives Canadian side analysis results Sample river crossing visualization Inspection plaza alternatives Access route alternatives and access road conceptual visualizations Tunnelling Evaluation factors & performance measures What's next and how to stay involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the presentation boards study team contact sheet Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH 3 Workshop sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there other plaza and crossing options/modifications to be considered? Comments on access road alternatives What are the most important considerations in evaluation of plaza, crossing and access road alternatives Mark areas of interest on aerial photo maps 	Total number of comment sheets received: 232 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 215 received in person at PIOH 17 received by mail/fax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tunnel instead of a bridge Put crossing outside Windsor Concerned with neighbourhood access, air quality, noise pollution Depress the roadway Consider/minimize impacts during and after construction Consider emergency access 	Team proceeded with full analysis of 5 Practical Alternatives for the Access Road, including a 6km cut and cover tunnel, 3 plaza locations, and 3 bridge crossing locations in the ACA.
PIOH 3 Workshops April 11 & 12, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH 3 Provided registration forms at PIOH 3 for sign-ups 	Total number of participants: 91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Input from PIOH 3 Sessions How We Got Here / Area of Continued Analysis / O-D Tunnelling April 11th session focused on review/refinements to access road alternatives; April 12th session focused on review/refinements to plaza & crossing alternatives Air Quality and Noise/Vibration Impact Assessment Introduction to the Ministry of Transportation Property Acquisition Process CBSA gave a presentation at April 12th session on roles, functions and responsibilities of CBSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/questions about the project Workshop format was general question & answers session on access roads (April 11) and plazas & crossings (April 12) 	Total number of comment sheets received: 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about property value/impact to property Size of plaza footprint Concern with access to tunnelled portions of route Impacts to residents during construction Concerns with air quality and community connections Suggestions for alternate locations for access road, plaza and crossing 	Team increased its awareness of community values and began to gain a better sense of how "greening" could be effective as mitigation

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
CSS Public Workshops June 23 & 24, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertised in local area newspapers Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact lists (over 1,500 addresses) as well as to property owners & tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 8,600 addresses) Participants asked to email or call to register Followed up with phone calls to those who indicated an interest to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 189 (116 on June 23, 73 on Jun 24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of examples of design elements to address concerns re: aesthetics and community impacts Open discussion to generate ideas for design elements for practical alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Workshop booklets and worksheets Comment sheet Large scale maps were shown to facilitate discussions and allow comments on specific areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other options/modifications to the plaza and crossings should be considered? Concerns or comments about access road alternatives What are most important considerations in the evaluation of access road and plaza & crossing alternatives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of comment sheets received: 11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for alternate locations for access route; request to tunnel whole route Protect wildlife and green areas; plantings should be easy to maintain Concern with impacts of exhaust/diesel fumes Questions about property acquisition, project timeline, and staying involved & informed 	
CSS Public Workshops October 2 & 3, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertised in local area newspapers Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact lists (over 1,700 addresses) as well as to property owners & tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 7,700 addresses) Participants asked to email or call to register Followed up with phone calls to those who indicated an interest to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 169	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aesthetic themes for the access road (Carolinian, Rose City, Motor City) Landscaping elements for the access road corridor and plaza buffer areas Themes for focus areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop booklets and worksheets 	Worksheet questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on aesthetic themes for access roads What other themes or landscaping elements should be considered for the access road corridor and plaza buffer areas General comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for features to incorporate into designs Concerns about costs related to maintenance, soil quality, safety issues Mitigate existing sensitive areas (acquire property) Include Canadian themes for plaza options Consider safety of pedestrians in landscaped spaces 	Team increased its awareness of community values and began to gain a better sense of how "greening" could be effective as mitigation
CSS Public Workshops November 2 & 15, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertised in local area newspapers Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact lists (over 1,800 addresses) as well as to property owners & tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 8,300 addresses) Participants asked to email or call to register Followed up with phone calls to those who indicated an interest to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 168	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual design visions for new international bridge (suspension, cable-stayed) and themes (history, friendship) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop booklets and worksheets Computer simulation stations produced postcards for participants in response to answers re: design preferences Visual artist stations produced sketches for participants in response to answers re: design preferences 	Worksheet questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was workshop setup efficient and effective for displaying material and gathering ideas Are there other tools that could have enhanced the experience for visitors Was the technology provided intuitive/easy to use Would you like to see similar technology presented at future meetings Add any sketches to illustrate your ideas regarding the look & fit of the new crossing General comments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments supported the historical vision for the suspension bridge option and the friendship vision for the cable-stayed bridge option Preference for natural sustainable vegetation for access road More intensive plantings in pedestrian-oriented spaces Incorporate art and natural textures in surfaces 	

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
Public Information Open House 4 (PIOH 4) December 6 & 7, 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ontario Government Notice published in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart Meeting dates and locations presented at Advisory Group meetings in advance of PIOH 4 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public and Advisory Group contact lists (over 2,000 addresses) as well as to property owners and tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 7,700 addresses) and Canada Post mail walks (over 12,300 addresses) Details posted on project website Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 510 (334 at Windsor session, 176 at Oldcastle session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of PIOH 3 & consultation to date Practical Alternatives Crossing & plaza alternatives Governance U.S. plaza alternatives Evaluation Factors Tunnelling Context Sensitive Solutions Evaluation process & methods Property acquisition Crossing visualizations What's next and how to stay involved Video simulations of access road alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the presentation boards CD of alternatives Study team contact sheet Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH 4 Workshop sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on preliminary analysis of the seven evaluation factors Suggestions for refinements/improvements to crossing, plaza or access road alternatives 	Total number of comment sheets received: 46 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 36 received in person at PIOH 7 received by mail/fax 3 received by e-mail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't sacrifice homes Relocate wildlife Keep community linkages intact Plazas too close to natural areas Don't make cost a consideration Reduce impacts to natural areas Tunnel the route 	Continued community concerns, expressed at PIOHs plus other consultation meetings resulted in the team developing a 6 th Practical Alternatives for the Access Road, labelled as The Parkway
PIOH 4 Workshops January 9 & 10, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH 4 Provided registration forms at PIOH 4 for sign-ups Followed up with phone call to those who signed up at PIOH to confirm attendance 	Total number of participants: 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breakout sessions on Plazas & Crossings and Access Roads Summary and Next Steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/ questions about the project Workshop format was general question & answers session on access roads and plazas & crossings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of comment sheets received: 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with location of air quality monitoring stations, accuracy of AQ results, and impacts to cultural heritage features DRIC can have positive effect on tourism/ economic development Costs of tunnelling Concern with noise impacts; what are possible mitigation measures Next steps and how to stay informed & involved 	
SUMMARY	All of the consultation to date and reactions received at public venues led the team to the conclusion that an additional green alternative for the access road should be developed and considered.							

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
Public Information Open House 5 (PIOH 5) August 14 & 15, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flyer was placed in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Leamington Post, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart Full-page advertisement published in Windsor Star Meeting dates and locations presented at Advisory Group meetings and media events held in advance of PIOH 5 Media briefing session held in advance of PIOH 5 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public and Advisory Group contact lists (over 2,100 addresses) as well as to property owners and tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 8,000 addresses) and Canada Post mail walks (over 12,300 addresses) Details posted on project website Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 1,672 (919 at Windsor session, 753 at Tecumseh session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of PIOH 4 & consultation to date CEAA & OEAA processes & coordination Governance Property acquisition Evaluation process & methods Summary of analysis of access road, plaza and crossing alternatives The Parkway alternative Connecting communities Context Sensitive Solutions Bridge types U.S. study progress What's next and how to stay involved Video simulations of access road alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the presentation boards Fact sheets CD of alternatives Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH 5 Workshop sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of practical alternatives does not support further analysis of the end-to-end at-grade solution – do you agree/disagree? Assessment of practical alternatives found limited benefits to end-to-end cut and cover tunnel do not justify associated additional costs & risks – do you agree/disagree? Suggestions to improve/refine The Parkway alternative. Provide comments on practical alternatives, including The Parkway, by marking areas on aerial photo maps Comments on preliminary analysis of seven evaluation factors 	Total number of comment sheets received: 207 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 184 received in person at PIOH 23 received by mail, fax, e-mail or via the project website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the gateway to Canada, Windsor deserves the best solution Concern about air quality; improve air quality Tunnel the route Concerned with traffic flow during construction Consider wildlife linkages Protect community connections Support for The Parkway Make the short tunnels longer Protect the natural areas Cost should not be a factor 	The team committed to further develop The Parkway alternative and to conduct a full evaluation of The Parkway. Refinements to The Parkway based on the PIOHs and subsequent community meetings included a new tunnel near Spring Garden and a shift of the Howard tunnel to a location opposite Oliver Estates. The overall length of tunnelling was increased from 1.5km to 1.86km
PIOH 5 Workshops August 22 & 23, 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH 5 Provided registration forms at PIOH 5 for sign-ups Advertised on project website and provided sign-up form 	Total number of participants: 200+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of update on study process and progress Issues/concerns about analysis presented at PIOH 5 Comments on analysis to date Comments/ideas on new Parkway alternative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment sheet requesting comments/opinions on general topics of discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of comments received: 235 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for alternate locations for route, plaza and crossing Estimated timeframes for construction Concern about impacts to properties and residents, community connections Who makes the decisions; coordination with U.S. Questions about Air Quality modelling, scrubbers, tunnel ventilation, impacts Consider end-to-end tunnel 	

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
SUMMARY	This round of consultation focused attention on the newly developed Parkway Alternative. These meetings and subsequent consultations resulted in refinements to The Parkway and development of The Windsor-Essex Parkway, which eventually became the preferred alternative.							
Public Information Open House 6 (PIOH 6) June 18 & 19, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An advertisement was placed in the following papers: Windsor Star, Amherstburg Echo, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Essex Voice, Leamington Post & Shopper, Essex Free Press, LaSalle Post, Le Rempart Meeting dates and locations presented at Advisory Group meetings and media events held in advance of PIOH 6 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public and Advisory Group contact lists (over 4,400 addresses) as well as to property owners and tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 8,000 addresses) and Canada Post mail walks (over 12,300 addresses) Details posted on project website Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 1,000 (658 at Windsor session, 342 at LaSalle session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study schedule and key milestones Review of PIOH 5 & consultation to date CEAA & OEAA processes & coordination Governance Evaluation process & methods & study process Summary of analysis of Illustrative and Practical Alternatives Connecting communities Refinements to The Parkway alternative based on consultation The Windsor-Essex Parkway The Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) Summary of analysis of access road, plaza and crossing alternatives Bridge type study and bridge types Evaluation factors U.S. study progress Context sensitive solutions What's next and how to stay involved Video simulations of access road alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Copy of the display boards Fact sheets CD containing fact sheets, bridge types, images, display boards and TEPA Comment sheet Sign-up sheets for PIOH 6 Workshop sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on evaluation process and choice of TEPA What mitigation methods should be explored as the TEPA proceeds into the next phase of study/ design? Do the tunnel locations provide adequate community connections & access to greenspace? Comments on analysis of seven evaluation factors 	Total number of comment sheets received: 196 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 189 received in person at PIOH 7 received by mail, fax, e-mail or via the project website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEPA is excellent choice; good, acceptable solution Concern re: maintenance of green areas Concern about air quality; improve air quality Support for GreenLink Concern about noise Protect wildlife Tunnel the route; add more tunnels Get started on construction Add more greenspace areas Route is close to properties Thank you for protecting sensitive natural areas Do whatever it takes, no matter the cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team decided to have follow-up meetings with the Spring Garden community; led to TEPA refinement The team reconsidered buffer areas near Chappus Street, Sansotta Court, Trillium Court, Kendleton Court, and Todd Lane The team revised tunnel design at Hearthwood and Cousineau

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
PIOH6 Workshops June 24 & 25, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announced workshop dates at PIOH6 Provided registration forms at PIOH6 for sign-ups Advertised on project website 	Total number of participants: 110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design of Windsor-Essex Parkway Design features of preferred plaza and crossing alternative Mitigation measures to reduce impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/ questions about the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of comment sheets received: 25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparison of Windsor-Essex Parkway to GreenLink solution Concern about impacts to properties and residents, community connections Concerns with air quality and noise; what is possible for mitigation Protect human health Amount of tunnelling is good; consider more tunnels Support for amount of parkland and green areas 	
Public Workshops July 23 & 24, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertised in local area newspapers Notices mailed directly to study team's general public contact lists (over 2,700 addresses) as well as to property owners & tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 4,400 addresses) Participants asked to email or call to register 	Total number of participants: 86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of the TEPA design for the crossing, plaza and access road Exploration of how to best fit new transportation facilities and access road into the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment sheet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment sheet requesting comments on/ questions about material presented at workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of comment sheets received: 13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on at-grade vs. below-grade roadway Specific comments on plaza and bridge Concerns about air quality and human health Suggestion to tunnel more of the route Support for TEPA Support for The Windsor-Essex Parkway design Preference for using natural features over man-made construction features 	
SUMMARY	<p>This round of consultation focused awareness on direct impacts to adjacent properties. As a result of these concerns and comments, additional community meetings and reviews by the team were held. These in turn resulted in refinements to the preferred alternative including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting The Parkway alignment further away from Spring Garden and adjusting ramp geometry to reduce community impacts and impacts to the very significant natural environmental features in the area; Increasing the buffer areas at Chappus Street, Sansotta Court and Kendleton Court; and Introducing a cul-de-sac design near the terminus of Huron Church Line to better buffer local residents. 							

PUBLIC EVENT	Advertising	Attendance	Topics/Material Presented/ Displayed	Handout Material	Comment Sheet Questions	Comments Received	Overview of Comments	Outcomes
Public Information Open House 7 (PIOH 7) November 24 & 25, 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An advertisement was placed in the following papers: Windsor Star, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Essex Voice, Leamington Post & Shopper, Essex Free Press, Le Rempart (French), Amherstburg Echo, LaSalle Post, LaSalle Silhouette Meeting dates and locations presented at Advisory Group meetings and media events held in advance of PIOH 7 Notices mailed directly to study team's general public and Advisory Group contact lists (over 3,200 addresses) as well as to property owners and tenants as identified and supplied by municipalities (over 14,300 addresses) and Canada Post mail walks (over 12,300 addresses) Details posted on project websites Public Service Announcements placed on local community electronic billboards & websites 	Total number of sign-ins: 1,478 (963 at Windsor session, 515 at LaSalle session)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benefits of The Windsor-Essex Parkway CEAA Process & Coordination of CEAA & Ontario EA Processes Governance Purpose and Chronology of study Illustrative and Practical Alternatives Studied Evaluation Process, Methods and Evaluation Factors TEPA Refinements Roundabouts The Recommended Plan Impacts, mitigation and future work related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Quality Human Health Risk Assessment Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Characteristics Cultural Resources Noise & Vibration Natural Environment Landscape Plan Property Acquisition Draft Provincial EA Report Review Next Steps U.S. Study Progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Sheet Fact sheets End-to-End Recommended Plan CD containing fact sheets, Recommended Plan, display boards, Draft EA Report Copy of the display boards (available upon request) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on refinements made to TEPA since PIOH 6 Comments on proposed mitigation strategies of the Recommended Plan Suggestions to carry forward to design and construction phase 	Total number of comment sheets received: 429 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 398 received in person at PIOH 31 received by mail, fax, e-mail or via the project website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get started on construction Support for GreenLink Increase tunnelling Support for the Recommended Plan; excellent work The study team is taking public input into account Concerns about noise, air quality and health Support for noise berms/barriers Support for roundabout Concern with roundabout Add more greenspace/buffering/mitigation Concern that study team is not listening to public Concern for property value Concern about impacts during construction Use local workforce Add more multi-use trail bridges/connections/access Requests for ongoing consultation Requests for property purchase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team refined the alignment of the Howard Avenue Diversion to avoid direct impact to an institution on Howard Avenue The team revisited the configuration of noise mitigation adjacent to Shadetree Court. to provide an improved concept.
SUMMARY	<p>This round of consultation focused upon presenting and receiving public feedback on the Recommended Plan for the new border transportation system linking Highway 401 in Ontario to a new international bridge. This Recommended Plan consisted of refinements made to the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA) since the last round of PIOH's (PIOH 6) and the proposed impact mitigation strategies developed by the study team. The feedback obtained has been utilized to make final refinements to the Recommended Plan for inclusion in this Environmental Assessment Report. These refinements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor realignment of the Howard Avenue Diversion to avoid direct impact to an institution on Howard Avenue; and Improvement of proposed noise mitigation in the vicinity of Shadetree Court. 							

3.3 Community Groups

In addition to the public events (PIOHs and workshops), the study team met with individual community groups when requested or in response to specific issues and concerns. Meetings with communities have included:

- Sandwich Community;
- Spring Garden / Bethlehem / Armanda Street Community;
- Oliver Estates;
- Huron Church Line Residents;
- Kendleton Court Residents;
- Sansotta Residents;
- Trillium Court Residents; and,
- Talbot Road Residents.

Consultation with each of these groups helped the study team to better understand issues and concerns identified by the communities, and allowed the team to provide clarifications and / or detailed information about the project. The information gained by the study team through these consultations has been included and considered in the analysis and evaluation of alternatives and mitigation for the preferred alternative, and has resulted in decisions including:

- A preferred bridge crossing and plaza location well removed from the historic area of Sandwich Towne;
- An additional tunnel section near Spring Garden / Bethlehem;
- A refined Parkway alignment to integrate the freeway portion of The Windsor-Essex Parkway and E.C. Row Expressway as a core-collector system in the Spring Garden area;
- A relocated tunnel section in the vicinity of Oliver Estates;
- A cul-de-sac design and relocation of existing Huron Church Line to reduce local traffic and provide a better buffer from freeway portion of The Windsor-Essex Parkway;
- Development of a Parkway alternative so as to provide a buffer area along Highway 3 / Talbot Road and Huron Church Road; and,
- Provision of additional buffer zones near Kendleton Court and Sansotta Court.

Consultation was also a key component of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) carried out for this study. For the assessment of practical plaza, crossing and access road alternatives, data collection for the SIA involved household questionnaires, social feature questionnaires, focus group sessions, input received as part of the public consultation efforts, stakeholder interviews, site visits, and review of various published secondary sources (e.g., Census Canada, City of Windsor). For the assessment of the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative, data collection for the SIA included use of the social household questionnaire data, public consultation activities and comment forms, context

sensitive solution workshops, and the review of information provided by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) property agents.

3.4 Community Consultation Group (CCG)

The Community Consultation Group (CCG) was formed at the commencement of this study in the spring of 2005. The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) in coordination with Transport Canada (TC) invited interested individuals from the City of Windsor, Town of LaSalle, and Essex County to participate in the study as part of the Community Consultation Group. Members of the public with a variety of backgrounds and interests joined the CCG and volunteered their time to meet and share ideas and concerns. In total, 73 citizens have enrolled as CCG members.

The primary role of the CCG was to operate as a forum for open dialogue and information exchange between the study team and the public. CCG members were asked for their advice and input, and to participate in joint exploration of key issues, concerns, challenges, and opportunities. CCG meetings were held at key milestones of the study to review and comment on project materials and analysis.

In total, 18 CCG meetings have been held at key milestones of the study. Meetings have been well attended, with an average attendance of 29. While some members have come and gone, a core group of approximately 20 has remained engaged over the life of the study. The majority of the meetings held with the CCG were presentation-style meetings that included question and answer sessions. The study team presented new data and information to the CCG, and then sought input and feedback from the CCG members regarding the materials presented. At each CCG meeting, members of the public were invited to attend as observers only. They were encouraged to ask questions at specific points in the meeting.

The CCG has provided the study team with an excellent barometer of community concerns and issues. Members have contributed to the study team's awareness of the need for a new border crossing and connection to the freeway network and have articulated concerns regarding air quality, the natural environment, specific community concerns, and tunnelling. The group's accomplishments are reflected in many of the study decisions and outcomes, including decisions to stay out of the most sensitive natural areas, avoid impacts on the historic area of Sandwich Towne and fully analyze a tunnelling alternative. Of particular note is that the study team modified the analysis to include a full year of air quality monitoring along the Highway 3/ Huron Church Road corridor. This was done as a direct result of consultation with the CCG.

3.5 Municipalities

The following subsections summarize the consultation that took place with the Municipal Advisory Group (MAG) and with individual municipalities.

3.5.1 Municipal Advisory Group (MAG)

The MAG, convened at the study outset, has included senior staff officials from the municipalities and county as well as school board representatives. Specifically, the MAG consisted of the following:

- City of Windsor;
- Town of LaSalle;
- Town of Tecumseh;
- Town of Lakeshore;
- Town of Amherstburg;
- Town of Essex; and,
- County of Essex.

Throughout the duration of the study, the following school boards were also invited to join the MAG:

- Greater Essex County District School Board;
- Windsor-Essex Catholic District School Board;
- Conseil Scolaire de District des Ecoles Catholiques du Sud-Quest; and,
- Conseil Scolaire de District Centre-Sud-Quest.

As with the CCG, the MAG has served as an excellent barometer of articulating municipal and community concerns. A series of 14 meetings with MAG have occurred since the study began. The MAG has also contributed significantly to the development and refinement of project alternatives. The MAG has made many positive contributions, however in particular, MAG members highlighted the importance of retaining a roadway that would meet the local and regional functions of the existing Highway 3/Huron Church Road corridor. This was influential in the development of practical alternatives which provided for a service road to separate local / regional traffic from international traffic.

As well, MAG members articulated a vision for the future Highway 3/Highway 401 interchange that would provide full traffic movements as well as divert longer distance traffic away from Howard Avenue in the City of Windsor. This led directly to abandonment of some early alternative interchange layouts and the development of new alternatives (one of which has been selected) at this location that would provide full traffic movements, and divert traffic away from Howard Avenue. The selection of the preferred interchange alternative was a collaborative effort of the MAG team and the study team.

The Municipal Advisory Group also requested that the study team consider the use of roundabouts at one or more strategic locations in the corridor. This led directly to the consideration of roundabouts and selection of a roundabout for the Highway 3/Highway 401 interchange ramps.

In addition to meetings with the MAG, the team has also attended two meetings of the Windsor and Essex County Environmental Committee, a committee that advises both City Council and County Council. Bus tours for members were also arranged. These meetings provided an opportunity for continuing dialogue, particularly relative to The Parkway alternative, discussion of air quality, and the review of issues associated with the plaza alternatives.

Consultations with staff from individual municipalities have also occurred throughout the study. These included introductory meetings early in 2005 and meetings to gain better mutual appreciation of the study and of the concerns of municipalities. Each of these meetings has been beneficial. In general these meetings augmented discussions held at MAG meetings and helped the study team develop the

Practical Alternatives, as they related to the configurations of the service road, interchanges and access/egress ramps. The discussions with the City of Windsor and its consultants leading up to and following the development of The Parkway alternative are of particular note and are summarized in **Section 3.5.2** below.

3.5.2 City of Windsor

The Schwartz Report was released by the City in January 2005. This report outlined a vision for a new border crossing and plaza in the Brighton Beach area, and a controlled access facility connecting to Highway 401. The report discounted alternatives such as use of E.C. Row Expressway, and the DRTP Corridor through the central parts of Windsor. The report considered access road alternatives in the Highway 3/Huron Church Road corridor, the corridor that was ultimately selected by the study team as the preferred route for the access road.

In the summer of 2005, the City of Windsor formed the Windsor Peer Review Team (WPRT). The WPRT reviewed and provided detailed comments on the illustrative alternatives that had been announced by the study team in June 2005.

In March 2006, the city provided comments and questions to the study team, including questions about the selection of the access road corridor.

In April 2007, city council passed a resolution supporting the inclusion of tunnelling in the access road corridor, and emphasizing the need to mitigate impacts on local residents.

Informal consultations continued into the spring and summer of 2007 with growing interest around a concept which would be a combination of the tunneled and below-grade alternatives. At meetings with the City of Windsor, the vision of a more “green”, parkway-like, alternative emerged. The concept, would include a green corridor with tunneled sections, a grade separated recreational trail system, and extensive urban design of the green areas.

The DRIC study team built upon this vision to develop a Parkway Alternative, which was released for public comment in August 2007. The alternative included 10 tunnelled sections (total length 1.5km, a grade separated recreational trail network, and extensive areas of future parkland.

In response to the Parkway, the City of Windsor released a concept for the access road which it called GreenLinkWindsor in October 2007. The GreenLinkWindsor proposal was similar to the August 2007 Parkway in many respects. Both the GreenLinkWindsor proposal and The Parkway alternative, included:

- A six-lane, below-grade freeway with separate service roads for local traffic;
- Tunnelled sections in key locations to link communities;
- Hundreds of acres of green space, with new spaces for community features;
- Walking and biking trails which allow pedestrians and cyclists to travel from E.C. Row Expressway to Howard Avenue without ever crossing paths with a vehicle;
- Air quality and noise improvements by eliminating stop-and-go truck traffic and getting trucks off local streets;
- The same general layout of roadways and interchanges;

- Nearly identical property requirements, with buffer areas between the roadway and the adjacent community; and,
- An opportunity to create a signature gateway welcoming travellers to Canada, Ontario, and Windsor and Essex County.

However, there were also some significant differences. The most significant of these was the fact that GreenLinkWindsor proposed approximately 3.8 km of tunnelled section as opposed to the 1.5 km proposed in the August 2007 Parkway. GreenLinkWindsor featured individual tunnels greater than 240 m in length (two tunnels were greater than 1 km in length). Specifically, GreenLinkWindsor proposed longer tunnelled sections than The Parkway in the areas of Spring Garden/Bethlehem/Grand Marais, Todd Lane/Cabana Road and Cousineau Road/Sandwich West Parkway/Hearthwood Place.

In addition, GreenLinkWindsor included a tunnel section under the Grand Marais Drain. The Parkway alternative was developed to pass over the Grand Marais Drain to avoid construction in difficult ground conditions and the associated problems related to schedule impacts, constructability risks, and the increased costs associated with a tunnelled crossing in this area.

The study team reviewed publicly available information on the GreenLinkWindsor proposal and, in the fall of 2007, met with the City and its consultants on a few occasions. These meetings provided the opportunity for the study team to gain improved understanding of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal and for city representatives to gain improved understanding of The Parkway alternative. Subsequently, in March 2008, the City provided more analysis of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal to the study team.

The study team carefully reviewed and assessed all of the information available about the GreenLinkWindsor proposal, and considered the extent to which it would be appropriate to modify the August 2007 Parkway alternative.

A preliminary review of the air quality implications of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal in comparison to the Parkway alternative was completed by SENES Consultants Limited. SENES is responsible for all of the air quality work undertaken for this study, and is a subconsultant to URS Canada Inc. The review by SENES focused on the potential impacts of the three long tunnel sections proposed as part of the GreenLink alternative.

Based on SENES' detailed work conducted previously for the *Practical Alternatives Evaluation Working Paper*, SENES determined that, on a Windsor airshed basis, the air quality is generally not impacted by any of the alternatives, including a full 6 km tunnel. The GreenLinkWindsor proposal could be considered an "intermediate" alternative between The Parkway and the full 6km tunnel that was assessed previously. The assessment concluded that the greatest impacts from roadways were typically limited to within the first 50-100 m of the roadway corridor when comparing one alternative to another, and in SENES' professional opinion, GreenLinkWindsor was sufficiently similar to the other alternatives that this conclusion would not change. As the six kilometer tunnel alternative did not have substantial air quality benefits, neither would the shorter tunnels that were proposed in the GreenLinkWindsor proposal. Therefore, GreenLinkWindsor was not expected to impact Windsor air quality in any manner that is significantly different from the practical alternatives that were analyzed in detail.

Localized differences are detectable between the GreenLinkWindsor proposal and the practical alternatives. For GreenLinkWindsor, there are three local air quality impacts to consider with the tunnels:

- The impact on the community adjacent to the tunnel;
- The impact on receptors near the tunnel portals; and,
- The impact on the air quality on the tunnel covered area (green space).

An analysis of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal submitted by the City's consultant indicated that predicted concentrations of PM_{2.5} in the Todd Lane / Cabana Road area would be essentially identical ($\pm 0.2 \text{ ug/m}^3$) compared to the DRIC forecasts. The study team concluded that the ability to reliably predict concentrations to less than 1 ug/m^3 was questionable, particularly given the inherent uncertainty in many of the model parameters.

Based on the above, the study team concluded that the longer tunnels proposed in the GreenLinkWindsor proposal offered no significant overall air quality benefits over The Parkway or the other practical alternatives.

With respect to any potential noise reductions associated with the longer tunnel sections proposed in the GreenLinkWindsor proposal, the study team again turned to its analysis of Alternative 3, the 6 km (3.7 mi) tunnel, as compared to the below-grade alternatives. That analysis showed that future noise levels for a below-grade freeway could be limited to acceptable levels, and in some cases reduced, from a future 'Do Nothing' scenario particularly when standard noise mitigation measures (berms and/or barriers) were applied. The MTO acknowledged that these mitigation measures would be included with The Parkway and other below-grade alternatives.

The study team also considered the extent to which the longer GreenLinkWindsor tunnels would enhance community connectivity. It is acknowledged that longer tunnel sections potentially provide more space for active recreation on the tunnel roof; however, the team concluded that the 120 – 240m (395-790 ft) lengths provided by the Parkway alternative would provide adequate opportunities for community connections in pedestrian-friendly environment.

The GreenLinkWindsor proposal had the same general footprint and property requirements as that of The Parkway, and therefore, the overall impacts to the natural environment were considered relatively equal. The only difference between the two options from a natural perspective was the potential for restoration and enhancement opportunities on the additional greenspace that could be provided on top of the longer GreenLinkWindsor tunnel sections. However, given the overall anticipated impacts to the natural environment from both alternatives, this additional benefit was considered relatively minor.

Last but not least, the study team assessed the GreenLinkWindsor proposal from the cost and constructability viewpoint. Some of the estimates presented by the City were not comparable to the estimates prepared for the practical alternatives and The Parkway (i.e., length of roadway included, freeway cross-section and inclusion of allowance for inflation). The study team developed a cost estimate for GreenLinkWindsor proposal, on the same basis as the estimates that had been developed for the practical alternatives and The Parkway alternative. Using this approach, the study team estimated the cost of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal at \$2.3 to \$2.5 billion – about \$700 to \$900 million more than the estimate of \$1.6 billion (CDN – 2011 dollars) that was developed for The Windsor-Essex Parkway alternative in the spring of 2008.

The study team was also concerned that the longer tunnels in the GreenLinkWindsor proposal would require the introduction of mechanical ventilation in tunnels, and would cause increased risk associated with movement of hazardous goods through longer tunnels. The GreenLinkWindsor proposal to tunnel under Turkey Creek added increased risks to construction cost and schedule.

Based on the assessment above, the study team concluded that the benefits of the longer tunnels identified in the GreenLink proposal did not justify the expenditure of an additional \$750 million.

The study team had solicited comments on its Parkway alternative at the August 2007 PIOH's in order to identify how The Parkway could be improved. The study team reviewed and assessed the city's material on that basis, along with suggestions of other stakeholders, including other municipalities, ministries agencies and the public. As noted above, the study team concluded that the increased cost of the GreenLinkWindsor proposal (\$700 to \$900 million) did not result in enough additional benefit in terms of air quality, noise reduction, and community connectivity to warrant its adoption. However, in response to the GreenLinkWindsor proposal and in response to other suggestions received after the August 2007 PIOHs, the study team made a number of refinements to the August 2007 Parkway. These refinements were adopted in order to reduce the negative effects of the Parkway, and to the extent practicable, to improve the transportation benefits and community benefits of the Parkway.

A new tunnel section was added near Spring Garden Road, and the tunnel at Howard Avenue was relocated and lengthened. There were also other minor changes in tunnel lengths and portal locations. In total these changes increased the amount of tunnelled section in The Parkway from 1.5km to 1.86km. Refinements were made to the recreational trail system, to reduce property impacts, and yet retain the principle that trail users are able to traverse the Parkway corridor without having to cross a lane of traffic. A new loop ramp was introduced at Todd Lane, in response to concerns expressed by emergency services regarding access to the freeway. The Howard Avenue/Highway 3 interchange was modified to include a connection to Howard Avenue and the possible future Laurier Parkway extension. Details of these refinements are discussed in **Chapter 8**.

The refined Parkway alternative was identified as The Windsor-Essex Parkway (refer to **Exhibit 8.14**). The Parkway alternative was analyzed in accordance with the seven major factors and evaluated against the practical alternatives, i.e., the at-grade and below-grade alternatives, as well as the cut-and-cover tunnel alternative.

3.6 First Nations

Consultation with First Nations began at the start of the study commencement in January 2005. The First Nations groups that were initially consulted include the following:

- Walpole Island First Nations;
- Oneida Nation of the Thames;
- Caldwell First Nation;
- Munsee Delaware Nation;
- Aamjiwnaang;
- Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point;
- Moravian of the Thames; and
- Chippewas of the Thames.

Early in the study, Walpole Island First Nation demonstrated a desire to actively participate in the study, and the study team has continued to consult directly with Walpole Island First Nation. In addition however, each First Nation group identified in the list above has been invited to comment on study materials at each key milestone of the study. All First Nations groups were notified of the Detroit River International Crossing study via a study commencement package and received follow-up phone calls / letters. In addition, mailing notices were also sent to each group prior to Public Information Open Houses and workshops.

To date, 11 meetings have been held with First Nations. A summary of each meeting is provided in Table 3.4. Issues identified at the meetings included:

- Possession of artifacts found;
- Piers in the river/disturbance of river bottom;
- Air and water quality;
- Species at Risk;
- Introduction of Foreign Species;
- Detroit River land claim;
- Legal duty to consult;
- Sharing of information with other First Nations;
- Funding for meaningful participation;
- Economic opportunities; and,
- Reflect historical presence in the naming of the bridge.

In response to these concerns, the Ontario government has provided funding for Walpole Island to retain a consultant to review and provide input to the study materials and findings. A community meeting was held with Walpole Island First Nations in February 2008 to present the study alternatives and gather the members input and comments about the study. The study team discussed the project with the Council in the summer of 2008. Input received from the Walpole Island First Nation members has related to environmental mitigation, archeological preservation and opportunities for meaningful employment. Walpole Island First Nations were also asked to provide their input and comment regarding the technical work completed at each milestone phase of the study. Input received from Walpole Island has been incorporated into the ongoing evaluation of the illustrative and practical alternatives. Recently, additional discussions with respect to mitigation have occurred.

TABLE 3.4 – SUMMARY OF FIRST NATIONS MEETINGS

Organization	Date	Area Of Discussion	Comments Received	Outcomes
Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians	4-May-05	An introduction to the DRIC project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion regarding concerns around natural heritage, archaeology, fundamental rights, species at risk and treaty access rights. The specific meaning the word “consultation” has to First Nations communities in regards to land claims and possible infringement on Native rights was noted. It was noted that First Nation communities have specific interests related to the Ojibway Prairie and Ojibway Park areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> URS would continue to work with First Nations communities throughout the EA process keeping them informed and engaged in the process. It was agreed that the Partnership would provide a list of possible First Nations contacts
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	27-Jun-05	Introduction to Detroit River International Crossing study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WIFN title claim for the Canadian portion of the Lake St. Clair, Detroit River, Lake Erie, and others were presented to the project team. Some areas of concern the WIFN may have relating to the DRIC project included possible alternations to the landscape, fisheries, water quality, species at risk issues and Ojibway lands. Material should be provided to WIFN for review In past projects, WIFN has provided “traditional knowledge” studies which give First Nations perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to continued consultation and ensure WIFN's continued participation URS to provide WIFN notes and project materials for review.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	20-Jan-06	Presentation and Evaluation of Illustrative Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted WIFN is speaking on behalf of the Three Fires Confederacy. Litigation is currently underway to establish title to the lands on the Canadian side of the Detroit River. The results of the Stage 1 Archaeology Review were presented, as well as the work plan for the cultural and heritage impact assessments in the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA) were discussed. WIFN will review the work plan and provide comments. It was noted that the development and assessment of practical alternatives must include a discussion of the economic and local opportunities associated with a new crossing, as well as the transportation of hazardous goods on the new crossing. It was noted by a WIFN representative that there should be a Duty to Consult policy in place between the province and First Nation Communities when they have an interest or are impacted by a project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of evaluation of illustrative alternatives and the rationale for ACA. WIFN is to develop a work plan which would the scheduling of quarterly meetings as well as a review of technical and environmental information. It was noted that WIFN has acquired experience and expertise through other projects which would prove beneficial during the Detroit River International Crossing study. URS to provide a listing of current documents available to WIFN. Follow up meeting was scheduled for February 28, 2006.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	28-Feb-06	Provide WIFN a project update as well as obtain comments on the project work plans which were provided at the last meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments were provided on the Stage 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report as well as the Generation and Assessment of Illustrative Alternatives Draft Report. Additional comments will be provided once review of other work plans has been completed. Areas of concern to the WIFN were discussed. These include the following: protection of the natural environment, protection of cultural resources, the introduction of foreign species, and the protection of other WIFN interests. Under the JAY Treaty the WIFN are dual citizens and therefore also have an interest in the U.S. project as well. As such, the Project Team will provide information as to the U.S. Project status. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination with U.S. partners necessary to ensure consistency. WIFN will continue to offer comments on documents and reports received from URS. Ongoing meetings between the WIFN and the Project Team will continue. No decision has been made in regards to funding for WIFN participation. With the WIFN's comments on study documentation, efforts between the Project Team and WIFN can be more easily coordinated.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	3-Apr-06	Current status of the DRIC Project was presented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of next steps as well as the overall timeframe for the project. A discussion of how the Fort Wayne site on the U.S. side would be impacted by the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued consultation will occur. WIFN can provide resumes for archaeological work in preparation for the Stage 2 Archaeological Studies. While a number of other First Nation communities have been contacted in regards to the project, these groups have not been as engaged as WIFN, but they will still continue to be provided information.

Organization	Date	Area Of Discussion	Comments Received	Outcomes
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	9-Nov-06	Project overview and potential mitigation measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was noted that the First Nations have not surrendered or signed any treaty regarding the title of lands under the Detroit River and the Great Lakes on the Canadian side of the border. WIFN reiterated that they are interested in working with the Project Team to ensure that there is a First Nation perspective in the decision making process. Areas identified in the ACA as having potential for archaeological finds were identified as the Lucier Site (E.C. Row/Huron Church Road) and the area of Highway 3/Highway 401 in Tecumseh. Investigations into these areas have discovered no substantive finds. Found artifacts will be temporally housed at ASI for assessment. Once completed the found materials will be returned to the public domain. WIFN will be kept informed as to future economic and employment opportunities for WIFN members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WIFN will be provided funding to ensure their meaningful participation in the DRIC project. WIFN will review and update their Work Plan and resubmit it to the Ministry of Transportation. A series of technical papers documenting the results of the alternatives analysis will be available within the next few months.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	23-Feb-07	Update on Air Quality monitoring as well as the results of the Public Consultation Events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizing the unresolved First Nations land claims to the bottom of the Detroit River, the Project Team is looking for any WIFN concerns regarding the installation of piers in the Detroit River. In-water investigations were carried out on the river bottom and no notable species or habitat was identified. WIFN will review the reports and provide further comments WIFN stated an interest in participating in archaeological field work being undertaken. It was noted that employment opportunities for WIFN members was an area of great concern to WIFN. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> URS will provide WIFN a copy of the Public Information Open House Summary Reports as well as corresponding displays. Additionally URS provided WIFN two copies of the Draft Preliminary Analysis Report (Dec 2006). Study Team will take part in presentations/workshops to the Walpole Island community if the WIFN feels it would be beneficial.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	13-Dec-07	Update WIFN on the Detroit River International Crossing study status and to discuss future consultation activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Archaeological Report (August 2007) was discussed. The International Boundary Waters Treaty Act has been consulted for this Study. There will be no piers proposed in the river and no work which would alter the water level in the Detroit River. Overview of the Parkway Alternative was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received were in regards to the Parkway Alternative and items affecting the WIFN specifically. The work plan will be refined based on the current DRIC schedule. Neegan Burnside will act as a liaison with the WIFN. Future meeting to be arranged to discuss the differences between the DRIC project and the Ambassador Bridge Project.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	11-Jan-08	Arrangements for a community meeting and the Neegan Burnside Scope of Work for their review of the DRIC project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the community meeting it was suggested that the following content to be presented: a presentation on the project, explanation of difference between the DRIC Project and the Ambassador Bridge Project, natural and archaeological information, The WIFN mentioned several treaties and land claims that the Project Team should be aware of. Interest was stated for a bus tour of the project site to be organized. Discussions regarding the work plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to differentiate the DRIC project from the Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project. The importance of the Ojibway Prairie was recognized by the study team and WIFN were reassured that any access road would traverse the area.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	25-Jun-08	Analysis of the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative (TEPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated technical reports are available which include the analysis of the Windsor-Essex Parkway. How the Parkway meets municipal tree cover objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team is working to document commitments to mitigation/compensation for EA approvals. Commitments may be presented as conceptual design/objectives for mitigation During the next council presentation an overview of DRIC will need to be provided as well as information on how the issues raised at the WIFN open house are being addressed.
Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN)	12-Aug-08	Presentation to the Walpole Island First Nation Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New bridge is expected to remain in public ownership. It may however be financed in part by the private sector via a P3 finance arrangement It was confirmed ITS facilities would be included to facilitate the streaming of trucks and lane designations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WIFN are reviewing the DRIC technical reports. Their comments will be available in 3 to 4 weeks.

3.7 Schools

The study team recognized the proximity of several schools to the Area of Continued Analysis. Therefore, in addition to inviting Board representatives to MAG meetings, the study team met with specific Boards on request. Also, at the request of representatives of Oakwood Public School Council, a Schools Advisory Group was established. Although only a few meetings have transpired, consultation with this group has heightened awareness of the proximity of the schools and related concerns. This has influenced, in part, the development of The Windsor-Essex Parkway and its 11 tunneled sections as the preferred alternative.

3.8 Business Owners

Over the course of the study there have been numerous consultations with individual business institutions. The study team's economic consultant carried out an overall economic assessment which is documented in the *Practical Alternatives Evaluation Working Paper – Economic Impact, April 2008*. In addition, members of the study team have held more than 35 meetings with individual businesses, institutions and associations. These meetings have provided a forum for useful dialogue so that both the project and its benefits and impacts are understood. Where appropriate, these meetings have resulted in detailed negotiations to proactively mitigate impact.

3.9 Crossing Owners, Operators and Proponents Group (COOP)

At the outset of the study, there were several private interests with specific proposals for new border crossings. These included:

- Canadian Transit Company/Detroit International Bridge Co., owners and operators of the Ambassador Bridge;
- Detroit & Canada Tunnel Corporation;
- The Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (DRTP) – a dedicated international truck route and tunnel river crossing;
- MichCan International Bridge Company – an international bridge proposal in the vicinity of Brighton Beach;
- Hennepin Point Crossing – a proposed international bridge crossing downstream near Amherstberg; and,
- Border Gateways.

The study team consulted with each of these groups individually and collectively to ensure that their proposals were understood and that they understood the Partnership's objectives and the Detroit River International Crossing study. Based on these meetings, the above-noted proposals were included in the development, analysis and evaluation of illustrative alternatives.

3.10 Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG)

The combined Canadian and U.S. study teams formulated a bi-national Private Sector Advisory Group and invited owners from many businesses (both in Canada and the U.S.) to participate. This has served as a useful method to provide timely information to a large number of businesses, and has resulted in further contact with several individual businesses, as documented below. These meetings have given the study team a better understanding of the economic importance of an efficient border crossing system.

American Chamber of Commerce in Canada	Association of International Automobile Manufacturers (Canada & U.S.)
Automotive Parts Manufacturer's Association	Bison Transport Inc., Border Gateways
BP Canada Energy Company	Brighton Beach Power
Canadian Association of Importers and Exporters Inc.	Canadian Auto Partnership Council, Canadian Chamber of Commerce
Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters	Canadian Shipowners Association
Canadian Trucking Alliance	Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association
Canadian/American Border Trade Alliance	Chamber of Maritime Commerce
City of St. Catharines	CN Rail / U.S. Government Affairs
Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters	Coco Group of Companies
DaimlerChrysler (Canada & Michigan)	Detroit Regional Chamber
Essex Terminal Railway Company / Morterm Limited	Fednav Limited
Ford of Canada, General Motors (Canada & U.S.)	Gorski Bulk Transport Inc.
Great Lakes Pilotage Authority	Honda Canada Inc.
Hydro One Networks Inc.	Industry Canada
International Business Consultants of Canada Inc.	Lake Carriers' Association
Lou Romano Water Reclamation Plant	Michigan Trucking Association
Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association	Norfolk Southern Railway
Ontario Chamber of Commerce	Ontario Trucking Association

SLH Transport Inc.	Sterling Marine Fuels
Sysco Food Services	The Canadian Salt Company Limited
Tourism Industry Association of Ontario	U.S. Great Lakes Pilotage Association
District 2	United States Consulate General
University of Windsor	Windsor & District Chamber of Commerce
Windsor Construction Association	Windsor-Essex County Development Commission
Southern Ontario Gateway Council	Corp. of Professional Great Lakes Pilots
Lakes Pilots Association, Inc.	Seaway Marine Transport
V.Ships Canada Inc.	

3.13 Environmental Agencies

3.13.1 Canadian Agency Advisory Group (CANAAG) / Individual Ministries and Agencies

The CANAAG was formed at the study outset to ensure that review and approval agencies would be brought into the process early and at timely study milestones. CANAAG consists of the following:

Canada Border Services Agency	Canada Political/ Economic Relations and Public Affairs
Canadian Coast Guard, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Canadian Transportation Agency
Environment Canada	Essex County OPP
Essex Region Conservation Authority	Fisheries & Oceans Canada
Foreign Affairs & International Trade Canada	Health Canada
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	International Joint Commission
Medical Officer of Health	National Energy Board
Natural Resources Canada	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food
Ontario Ministry of Culture	Ontario Ministry of Economic Development & Trade
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
Ontario Ministry of Northern Development & Mines	Ontario Ministry of the Environment
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation	Ontario Realty Corporation
Ontario Tourism Marketing Partnership Corporation	Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Transport Canada – Marine	Windsor Port Authority.

The objective has been to take the concerns and requirements of the agencies into account throughout the development analysis, evaluation and mitigation phases, and to ensure that they in-turn were kept abreast of study developments as they occurred, and had opportunities for input.

The consultation began in 2005 with initial meetings and the development of work plans for major environmental disciplines. The review and approval agencies reviewed and commented on draft work

3.11 Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA)

The study team met numerous times with CBSA throughout the study. CBSA has provided direct input regarding the plaza requirements in terms of size, proximity to the border, capacity, and components. The agency reviewed and commented on alternative layouts and continues to advise on the layout and requirements of the preferred plaza location. To ensure that the plaza alternatives were viable and would operate smoothly, the operations for each practical alternative were simulated under year 2035 traffic conditions using customized simulation software.

3.12 Emergency Services (EMS) / RCMP

The study team has consulted several times with EMS representatives (police, fire, and ambulance) as well as the RCMP. Meetings with EMS representatives have helped to shape the location of access opportunities for the practical alternatives and for the preferred alternative. In particular, EMS input has influenced the access ramp locations at the Todd Land/Cabana Road West interchange.

The team asked the RCMP to review the practical alternatives for the plazas and river crossing from a threat security viewpoint. This review was undertaken and concluded that each alternative was viable and could be made secure with no undue threat to safety and security.

plans and these were amended accordingly. These work plans served to guide the data collection and analysis for these environmental disciplines. To date, 11 meetings with the CANAAG have been held. These meetings have served to update members on study progress, distribute draft reports for review, and receive input.

In addition to the CANAAG meetings, more than 15 meetings have been held with individual ministries and approval agencies, including:

- Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA);
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO);
- Ministry of Environment (MOE);
- Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR);
- International Joint Commission (IJC);
- Transport Canada;
- Health Canada;
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing;
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency;
- Canadian Citizenship and Immigration Office;
- Ministry of Agriculture;
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- Trade Canada; and,
- Ministry of Economic Development Trade.

These meetings have been critical to and have helped shape the extensive environmental mitigation measure outlined in **Chapter 10** of this EA Report.

3.14 Individual Detroit River Authorities

The Detroit River authorities include the Transport Canada, the Windsor Port Authority, the U.S. Coast Guard, Canadian Shipowners Association, Canadian Great Lakes Pilots Association, and the International Joint Commission. The study team consulted with these agencies to determine whether it would be viable to have bridge piers in the Detroit River as part of the international crossing. The placement of even one pier in the river would lower the cost of the bridge by tens of millions of dollars. However, after consultation with these groups (and realizing that there would be environmental impacts from having a pier in the river) the Partnership decided that a full span of the river (no piers in the river) was the only viable option. Aside from the environmental concerns, one or more piers in the river would significantly detract from shipping and docking safety in the area.

3.15 Pre-Submission Review

As part of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (OEAA) requirements, a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) Report was prepared for this study that provided information on the technical findings and environmental effects identified throughout the study period. The Draft EA Report was made available for review and comment by the public, external agencies and all interested stakeholders for a 30-day period commencing on Wednesday, November 12, 2008 and ending on Friday, December 12, 2008.

Printed copies of the Draft EA Report were supplied to the following external agencies and stakeholders at the beginning of the review period:

- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
- Environment Canada
- Essex Region Conservation Authority
- First Nations (Walpole Island, Aamjiwnaang, Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point, Munsee Delaware Nation, Caldwell, Moravian of the Thames, Oneida Nation of the Thames)
- Fisheries & Oceans Canada
- Health Canada
- Michigan Department of Transportation
- Municipal Clerks (County of Essex, Town of Amherstburg, Town of Essex, Town of Lakeshore)
- Ontario Ministry of Culture – London & Toronto Offices
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment
- Ontario Ministry of Economic Development & Trade
- Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources – Southwest Zone, Ontario-Canada, Aylmer & Peterborough
- Ontario Parks
- Ontario Provincial Police Essex Detachment
- Transport Canada
- Windsor Port Authority

Printed copies of the Draft EA Report were also made available to the general public and any other interested stakeholders at the beginning of the review period at the following locations:

- MTO Windsor Border Initiatives Implementation Group – Windsor Office
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment – London Office
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Windsor Office
- Office of the Clerk – City of Windsor

- Office of the Clerk –Town of LaSalle
- Office of the Clerk – Town of Tecumseh
- Office of the Clerk – County of Essex
- Windsor Public Library – Central, Sandwich and Nikola Budimir branches
- LaSalle Public Library
- Tecumseh Public Library
- URS Canada Inc. – Markham Office

Additionally, the Draft EA Report was made available on the study website at www.partnershipborderstudy.com.

Notices of the Draft EA Report review period were distributed via Canada Post to over 29,100 addresses in the study area prior to the review period and published in several local newspapers including the Windsor Star, Harrow News, Kingsville Reporter, Essex Voice, Leamington Post & Shopper, Essex Free Press, Le Rempart, Amherstburg Echo, LaSalle Post, and LaSalle Silhouette at the beginning of the review period. Notification of the Draft EA Report review was also presented at the Public Information Open Houses (PIOH 7) held on November 24 and 25, 2008.

At the time of preparing this report, the study team has received comments from 22 sources including:

- The Canadian Transit Company (Ambassador Bridge)
- The City of Windsor
- Paciorka Leaseholds Limited
- Ontario Provincial Police - Essex Detachment
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment
- Hydro One
- Environment Canada
- Essex Region Conservation Authority
- County of Essex
- Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall
- Walpole Island First Nation (c/o Neegan Burnside)
- Ontario Ministry of Culture
- Town of Tecumseh
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
- Members of the public

The comments received are included in **Appendix D** of this report. All comments have been reviewed by the study team. The EA Report has been revised in several areas to provide more clarity and/or

information. In addition, written responses will be provided to those who provided comments during this review period.

3.16 Summary

Consultation has been an important component of the Detroit River International Crossing study since it began in 2005. Municipalities, agencies, businesses, communities, the public at large, and First Nations have been involved in the over 300 meetings and events convened by the study team. The consultation played an integral role in the development of the Recommended Plan.