

Facts at a Glance: The Detroit River International Crossing Study December 2006 Public Information Open Houses

For almost two years, teams of experts in both Canada and the United States have been working diligently on the Detroit River International Crossing study. From developing a coordinated study framework to narrowing the focus of the study to practical alternatives within the Area of Continued Analysis, we are making excellent progress.

Over the past eight months, the Canadian study team has been intently focused on collecting more detailed data and conducting specific technical studies of the Practical Alternatives announced in March 2006. We continue to work closely with the community to both meet the purpose of the study – to provide for the safe, efficient and secure movement of people and goods across the Canadian-U.S. border in the Windsor-Detroit corridor – and to achieve the local community's goals of:

- **improving quality of life**
- **taking trucks off city streets**
- **improving the movement of traffic across the border**

We're listening to you. In fact, over 125 public consultation sessions have been held since the beginning of the study, and we have met with more than 50 stakeholder groups including local homeowners and business owners since March 2006, as part of ongoing consultation.

All options being considered achieve the community's goals outlined above, and we are working to further refine the alternatives to ensure that when the final preferred alternative is identified in 2007, community and environmental impacts are minimized as much as possible. How we do that is by evaluating each of the alternatives based on the seven evaluation factors. Detailed fact sheets on the seven evaluation factors, and the technical findings, are contained in this package and can also be found on our website www.partnershipborderstudy.com.

These Open Houses are different from previous ones held in June and November 2005 and March 2006 because **no announcements or decisions have been made. No alternatives will be eliminated at this time**, and all options identified in the Area of Continued Analysis continue to be considered.

The purpose of these PIOHs is simply to inform you, the public, about the preliminary technical data and findings we have made since March 2006, and provide a summary of that data and preliminary analyses of the practical alternatives. No preferred alternative has been identified at this time, and all of the alternatives have certain advantages and disadvantages. The analysis is ongoing, and the results are subject to refinements and do not reflect mitigation measures, such as context sensitive solutions that the community is helping to develop. Some key highlights of the findings include:

Access Roads

Changes to Air Quality

- Total concentrations of nitrogen oxides are predicted to decrease due to improvements in fuels and engine technologies, even though traffic volumes will increase.
- Predicted concentrations of fine particulate are projected to be higher in the future due to increases in traffic volumes. Although tailpipe emissions are decreasing, there will be a greater contribution from road dust.
- Depressed roadway sections result in lower concentrations of fine particulate and nitrogen oxides in the vicinity of the right-of-way (ROW) compared to at-grade alternatives.
- Tunnel results in lower concentrations of fine particulate in the vicinity of the ROW compared to at-grade alternatives, however nitrogen oxide concentrations increase over a broader area compared to at-grade alternatives because of a greater dispersion from ventilation stacks.

Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Features

- Between 125 to 210 households and 25 to 45 businesses would potentially need to be acquired.
- Noise impacts of at-grade and depressed alternatives can be addressed through mitigation.
- Noise modelling of tunnel option is still in progress.

Consistency with Land Use

- All alternatives make use of existing Huron Church Road/Highway 3 corridor, which is the historical connection to the border crossing, and the proposed route is consistent with official plans.
- There are impacts to existing residential, commercial and zoned vacant lands with all alternatives.

Regional Mobility

- If no new crossing system is built, significant capacity problems are expected to begin by 2015 and by 2035 most intersections will operate over capacity.
- In the absence of a new crossing system, travel times will nearly double, and capacity problems will be widespread. Excess traffic demand will spill over onto other municipal streets.
- New six-lane roadway will meet future demands to 2035 and beyond, and the provision of local service roads will save substantial travel times for local traffic, when compared to “do nothing.”

Cost and Constructability

- All access road alternatives are constructible, and traffic flow can be reasonably maintained in the Huron Church Road/ Highway 3 corridor throughout the construction period.
- Access road construction is complicated by the high water table and relatively poor ground conditions, and those problems increase with the depth of construction.
- The cost of the three alternatives from Highway 401 to Malden Road (\$CDN 2011):
 - At-grade alternatives: \$620 million to \$920 million
 - Depressed alternatives: \$1.0 billion to \$1.4 billion
 - Tunnel alternatives: \$3.8 billion

Plazas and Crossings

- There is a combined total of 18 possible alternatives for plaza-crossing-plaza solutions between Canada and the U.S.

Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Features

- In Canada, Plaza A alternatives have the highest number of residential displacements (70).
- Crossing C alternatives have the highest business and industry impacts (13), including the only local marine fuelling station.
- Crossing C alternatives have the highest noise impacts before mitigation (180) due to proximity to Sandwich.

Protection of Cultural Features

- Between five to eight homes dating pre-1930 could be displaced, depending on the plaza and crossing alternative.
- All three crossing alternatives affect cultural landscapes.

Regional Mobility

- Confirmed all alternatives are practical in terms of location and layout, subject to the final results of geotechnical investigations. Plazas and crossings meet all transportation and mobility needs.

Cost and Constructability

- Geotechnical investigations are ongoing and will be completed by early 2007.
- Construction cost of the crossing is somewhat a function of the length of span.
- Shortest bank-to-bank is Crossing C (0.7 km), with longest bank-to-bank Crossing A (1.1 km).
- Shortest plaza-to-plaza is Crossing B to Plaza B1 (2.9 km), with longest plaza-to-plaza is Crossing C to Plaza A (5.4 km).

For more information on the Detroit River International Crossing study, including reports, maps and public meeting notices, please visit our website at www.partnershipborderstudy.com.