



G. L. Pothier Enterprises Inc.
2197 Galloway Drive
Oakville, Ontario, Canada L6H 5M1

tel: (905) 844-5174
fax: (905) 844-7368
em: glenn@gfpi.com

Meeting notes from:

**The Fifth Meeting of the
Detroit River International Crossing
*Community Consultation Group***

Meeting Date/Location:

October 25th, 2005/Holiday Inn Select Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

The key focus of this fifth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was to provide members with an update on and an opportunity to discuss selected issues including:

- Factor weightings
- Status of the ongoing evaluation process
- The announcement re: the narrowing of alternatives
- Site-specific issues and questions
- Other topics of interest to CCG members

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Get member input on the notification procedures for and the proposed content of the Nov./Dec. Public Information Open Houses
- Provide an overview of the process for evaluating the short-list alternatives (this item was deferred to the next CCG meeting given time limitations)
- Notify members of the upcoming CCG meeting and public workshops schedule
- Allow for public/CCG member comments and questions about issues of their choosing

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Introduction and Agenda Review

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order, welcomed all participants, introduced project team members and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier reminded the group that in the interest of openness, transparency and accountability, any member of the public can attend a CCG meeting as an observer. He then asked if any members of the public were in attendance and, if so, whether any comments/questions were forthcoming at this time:

Question: What are the implications of the Governor of Michigan's announcement re: the narrowing of alternatives?

Answer: [Discussion of this issue was deferred to later in the meeting given that the topic was already identified as a discrete agenda item.]

Question: What is the possibility of widening E.C. Row Expressway to accommodate international traffic on route to the new crossing?

Answer: Local traffic volumes on E.C. Row Expressway will continue to grow and the Expressway will, at some point, require widening. Additional international traffic would require widening of the Expressway outside of the existing right-of-way.

September 28th Joint CCG/LAC Meeting Notes

- No errors were noted and there were no concerns about the meeting summary notes format or substance.

Update on/Discussion of Factor Weightings

- Glenn Pothier noted that issues had been raised, in advance of the meeting, about the factor weightings — how they have been used and reported thus far, the segmentation of weightings by group, and attribution to the CCG.
- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) reviewed the results of the weighting exercise (for both Canada and the U.S.) and explained the different roles/value of the ‘reasoned argument’ and ‘arithmetic methods’ of analysis. He also provided a rationale for showing separate weightings for the general public, the CCG and the project team. These remarks were followed by CCG member comments and discussion:

Comment: The CCG weighting scenario is based on the average of the weights provided by individual CCG members and, therefore, is not based on a consensus among the CCG members. An individual member may disagree with the aggregate CCG weighting scores. Given this, I object to presenting the CCG weighting scenario to the public — doing so creates an incorrect perception that the CCG is a decision-making body. The CCG weightings should not be shown on their own, but rather be incorporated into to the public weighting scenario.

Comment: There is value and utility in presenting a CCG weighting scenario in addition to those of the general public and project team given that the CCG may be closer to and more knowledgeable about the project issues — having been engaged in regular project meetings.

Question: How were the weightings for the general public, the CCG and the project team calculated?

Answer: The Public and CCG weighting results are based on averaging the individual weighting scores from the members of each group. The project team collectively used a consensus approach to develop their weighting scenario.

- Len Kozachuk noted that all of the weighting results serve as input to the project team. However, though they help inform recommendations, final decisions about alternatives to be carried forward are made by the Partnership.
- In response to questions raised about the mandate and scope of the CCG, Glenn Pothier reiterated the agreed upon role for the CCG in the DRIC study (as documented in previous meeting minutes and accompanying presentation slides). In the interest of advancing the discussion, he asked the CCG members to provide direction regarding the reporting of CCG weighting scenario results and outlined three potential options:
 - Present discrete weighting results for each of the general public, the CCG and the project team;
 - Present discrete weighting results for each of the general public, the CCG and the project team — but include clear notation stating that the CCG weightings are based on the average for members as a whole and should not be construed as reflecting an individual member’s view; or
 - Do not present discrete CCG weighting results, but rather incorporate them into the results for the public as a whole.

By way of majority vote, members selected the second option noted above and further requested that the number of respondents comprising the averaged CCG weightings be indicated.

- One CCG member (Mr. Ed Arditti) asked that his opposition to the majority decision of the group be formally noted for the record.

Status of the Ongoing Evaluation Process

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) briefed CCG members on the status of the ongoing evaluation noting that:
 - Data collection is essentially complete
 - Travel demand model runs are complete and initial analysis done (and that traffic is being assigned to the travel demand model for the illustrative alternatives)
 - Assessments of the illustrative alternatives are being reviewed at the project team and Border Partnership Study levels
 - Documentation is underway

Announcement Re: Narrowing of Alternatives

- Dave Wake (Windsor Projects Coordinator, MTO) identified which crossing/plaza/route options had been eliminated from further study and provided context regarding the Governor of Michigan’s announcement about the narrowing of alternatives. He noted that the environmental and technical assessment work,

including Travel Demand analysis, completed prior to the announcement clearly indicated that the South/Downriver and East/Belle Isle alternatives do not meet the needs of the DRIC Study — and that both Canadian and American members of the Border Partnership supported removing them from further study. This was followed by a number of participant comments/questions:

Comment: The level of evaluation — in this first higher-level analysis phase — should be the same for all illustrative alternatives.

Response: Equally complete evaluations and related documentation will be provided for all of the initial illustrative alternatives.

Question: Can you please explain why the East and South alternatives do not attract sufficient traffic to meet the needs of the study?

Answer: Fifty percent of international traffic is local (that is, the destination is Detroit/Windsor). The East and South alternatives would not attract a significant portion of this traffic and, therefore, would be underutilized. The traffic using the existing River crossings would continue to grow and would reach capacity within the study time horizon.

Question: Can someone confirm that no final decision has been made on the remaining central alternatives and that there will be an opportunity to review reports on the South and East alternatives?

Answer: No final decision has been made with respect to the Central alternatives. The team's analysis of all of the alternatives will be available for review.

Comment: I'm concerned that the Governor of Michigan made the announcement about the narrowing of alternatives with only the interests of South and East area residents in mind — that it was more of a political than a technical decision.

Response: The announcement was based on the technical work of the project teams and has the support of the Partnership.

Question: Has the Travel Demand Model considered the recent closings of manufacturing plants?

Answer: The Travel Demand Model has considered a variety of circumstances including low and high growth scenarios.

Question: Are plans to expand the inspection plazas by the Ambassador Bridge under consideration for the DRIC Study?

Answer: The generation and subsequent evaluation of plaza sites was based on input from the border agencies. The plaza alternatives being evaluated were not based on the plans of the Ambassador Bridge.

Question: Did both the American and Canadian project teams notify their respective government officials at the same time about the decision to eliminate the South and East alternatives? Is the U.S. side of the Partnership controlling the decisions that are being made?

Answer: Prior to the announcement, the Partnership met and agreed that the South and East alternatives should not be carried forward for further consideration. The Partnership did not provide advice to the Ontario Government prior to the announcement. The Ministry of Transportation, Michigan Department of Transportation, Transport Canada and the Federal Highway Administration are still working together as equal partners. The Partnership will continue to meet with the respective governments on an ongoing basis.

Question: Can the Partnership provide an assurance that politicians on both sides of the border will be notified at precisely the same time about future Partnership decisions?

Answer: Given the challenges of scheduling and access, no such assurance can be given.

Question: Can you confirm that neither URS Canada nor the Corradino Group have worked for the Ambassador Bridge company?

Answer: URS has not worked for the Ambassador Bridge Company. The Corradino Group has worked for MDOT on the Gateway project, but not for the Ambassador Bridge Company.

Question: Will more alternatives be eliminated from further study before the Public Information Open Houses and were tunnels considered as options?

Answer: Yes, more alternatives will be eliminated — they will be shown at the upcoming Open Houses. Tunnels were considered as part of the assessment process.

Site-Specific Issues

- Murray Thompson addressed a number of site-specific issues and questions raised prior to the CCG meeting:
 - *Was the environmental area considered in locating crossing X9?* Yes. Mitigation requirements would need to be considered in the next stages.

- *Can curves be added to the international crossing?* The crossing will need to be tangent (straight) between the main span piers. With consideration to design standards, curves can be introduced on the back spans, located at each end of the main span. The back spans are approximately one-third the length of the main span.
 - *Can buffers be incorporated into the plaza design?* The 80 to 100 hectare footprint specified by the Canada Border Services Agency can accommodate natural buffer areas.
 - *What are the impacts of plaza CT1 on the Sandwich community?* Direct and proximity impacts were assessed for plazas. For the CT1 plaza, there would be over 200 displacements.
- Mr. Thompson's overview was followed by some participant questions and comments:

Question: The maps displayed at the June 2005 Public Information Open Houses indicated a different and smaller plaza footprint for CT1 than in the mapping provided at the boat tour.

Response: The mapping shown in June 2005 was indicative of the Project Team's thoughts on the CT1 plaza alternative at that time. Based on consultation with CBSA and input from plaza specialists, it was determined that a larger footprint was required.

Comment: The project team needs to consider a number of things about the Sandwich community: there are many heritage homes located in the area; there are two schools located in the area; a crossing would have an unsettling impact on Sandwich, especially seniors, many of whom cannot easily move to other locations; historically and presently, Sandwich serves as a starting community for new immigrants; Sandwich is home to a student community.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: What is the maximum grade that will be used in the approaches to the new crossing — if it's only 3%, won't the bridge carry too far inland?

Answer: The grade will be up to a maximum of five percent, which is within acceptable design guidelines.

Comment: As the project moves forward, there is a need for much more precise and explicit alignments for the potential crossings/plazas/routes.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: The project team should consider a joint CCG/LAC bus tour into those communities where the crossing/plaza/route might be placed — to aid in understanding of the constraints and opportunities.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Process for Evaluating the Short-List Alternatives and the Ongoing Role of the CCG

- Due to time constraints and at the suggestion of the meeting facilitator, participants agreed to defer this item to the next CCG meeting

Upcoming Public Information Open House (PIOH) Sessions

- Len Kozachuk noted the dates and locations of the upcoming PIOH sessions, and explained that the public would be notified through mailings to those on the project contact list and ads placed in local newspapers. The facilitator then prompted the group for additional reasonably practical ideas for ‘getting the word out’ about the upcoming PIOH’s (and for other general notification-related advice). Participants offered the following suggestions:
 - Ensure that the notices are clear and that they explain that decisions have been made concerning which alternatives are to be carried forward for further analysis
 - The notices need to better ‘connect’ with the community — the standard government approach does little to achieve this
 - The notices should be posted on the City of Windsor and other community websites
 - The project team should consider interviews with radio and TV stations, including the cable station COGECO — be proactive with media relations
 - Consider placing ads on billboards
 - Consider signage on the Ambassador Bridge
 - Speak with the City of Windsor about how best to reach people
 - CCG members should speak to those in their communities to help spread the word
 - There needs to be messaging that the Partnership is working together equally and the solution is still to be determined
- Mr. Kozachuk then described the proposed format for the upcoming PIOHs and the major themes/topics that would be addressed on the display boards and handout materials. Participants were asked to respond to the proposed topics and to identify others in which they might be interested (or to provide their value-added suggestions about the Open Houses generally). Suggestions included:
 - The need for more detailed maps and definitive representations of the alternatives (with more clear depictions of which streets/features might be affected)

- Showing the ‘pros and cons’ of each of the alternatives
 - Having the project team members dress more casually (no suits and ties) with a view to appearing more approachable
 - Having information about governance and what ‘reverse inspection’ really means
 - Ensuring that handouts include oblique photography of the areas affected by the carried forward alternatives
 - Give people time to reflect on all of the information and to offer thoughts after the sessions
- Participants then asked a number of questions:

Question: Will the shortlist only include potential crossings?

Answer: The shortlist of alternatives will cover crossing, plaza and route alternatives.

Question: How detailed will the mapping information be at the Open Houses?

Answer: Specific engineering designs will not be available for the Open Houses. This level of detail will be available in the next stage of the process.

Overview of Upcoming Meetings

- Len Kozachuk noted that the next CCG meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 11/06 and that two post-PIOH workshops are tentatively scheduled for January 10 & 12/06.
- The venues for the next CCG meeting and workshops are yet to be determined.

Open Forum

- Glenn Pothier asked whether CCG members or the consulting team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No items were identified.
- Glenn then asked for any additional comments or questions that CCG members/the public would like to raise:

Comment: A new border crossing must be publicly-owned.

Comment: Community groups should undertake to notify the public of the Open Houses

Comment: There were too few weighting forms submitted on the Canadian side to make the analysis of them valid

Comment: The elimination of the East and South alternatives (all in predominantly affluent neighbourhoods) raises potential environmental justice issues

Comment: There is concern that the public is not truly being included in the project decisions

Comment: The Ambassador Bridge should have to wait until the Bi-National process is complete before continuing to pursue their own study and permits

- All of the above were acknowledged and noted.

Closing Remarks

- Glenn Pothier and Dave Wake thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:35 to 9:20).

Attendance (names listed in order as recorded on the participant sign-in sheet)

CCG Members and Public Observers:

Robert Benson
Moe Haas — Citizens in Support of DRTP
Mike Duchene — Citizens in Support of DRTP
Dan Karom — Citizen
Ed Arditti — Ojibway Now!
Denise Ausman — Citizen
Kevin O'Neil
Dennis Boismier — Windsor resident
Bob Mokar
Ray Bezaire — West Windsor concerned citizen
Patrick Holland — Ambassador Bridge
David Munro — Little River Enhancement Group
Dominic Troiani
Josie Iannetta
Alan McKinnon — CPOW
Tedd Szalay
David Baker — CPOW
Patrick Loubriel — Delray Community Council
Mary Loubriel — Delray Community Council
John M. Nagy — Delray Community Council
Mark Drysdale — City of Riverview
Ed Oleksiuk — Ojibway Now!
Alice DiCaro — Ojibway Now!
Clara Deck
Mary Ann Cuderman — WWCTWC
Terrence Kennedy — WWCTWC
Wayne Lessard — WWCTWC
Dale Coffin — University of Windsor
Elizabeth Havelock — CPOW
Bill Marshall

Partnership:

Dave Wake — MTO
Roger Ward — MTO
Joel Foster — MTO
Janice Coffin — MTO
Kevin DeVoss — MTO
Mohammed Alghurabi — MDOT
Sean O'Dell — Transport Canada

Consultant Team:

Audrey Steele — LGL Limited
Len Kozachuk — URS
Murray Thompson — URS
Colin Wong — URS
Irene Hauzar — URS