



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 Sixth Meeting of the  
Detroit River International Crossing  
*Community Consultation Group***

---

Meeting Date/Location:

January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006/Hilton Hotel — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

## **Meeting Purpose**

The key focus of this sixth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was to invite member input on preliminary practical crossing/plaza locations and the implications of such — and to identify key opportunities and constraints in the area of continued analysis (ACA).

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of how the team arrived at the ACA and a summary of the evaluation of illustrative alternatives
- Provide an overview of the process for identifying and evaluating practical alternatives in the ACA
- Share defined parameters/requirements for the crossing, plaza and connecting route alternatives
- Notify members of the upcoming CCG meeting and public workshops schedule
- Explore the future role and composition of the CCG
- 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.

### ***Review of October 25<sup>th</sup> CCG Meeting Notes***

- Glenn Pothier determined whether all members in attendance had received a copy of the October 25<sup>th</sup> meeting notes before asking for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions.
- No errors were noted and there were no concerns about the meeting summary notes format or substance.

### ***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 comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. None were raised.

## *Summary of Evaluation of Illustrative Alternatives*

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) reviewed the process concerning how the Project Team went from a larger list of illustrative alternatives to determining a more circumscribed area of continued analysis (ACA). In so doing, he described: key criteria used to evaluate the alternatives, the evaluation methods (arithmetic and reasoned argument), coordination between the Canadian and American teams, and related public outreach and consultation activities. He also described the relative strengths and weaknesses of various groupings of the initial illustrative alternatives — including their community/environmental impacts, the likelihood of meeting traffic needs, implications for security, and so forth. It was noted that no option is without impacts. Mr. Kozachuk then provided an overview of the geographic boundaries of the ACA on both the Canadian and U.S. sides of the River.
- Mr. Kozachuk emphasized that the project team is looking at the ACA as a ‘clean slate’ — that is, initial illustrative alternatives within the ACA have been set aside with the intention of developing new ones. He invited community participation in this exercise. He also noted that no decisions had been made about where plazas and routes would be located, and that the Canadian and American teams would be presenting practical alternatives in the next few months.
- Both during and following Mr. Kozachuk’s remarks, CCG members offered a number of questions/comments:

*Question:* Will the Project Team be considering diesel particulate matter given that it’s a carcinogen — and why does the Project Team keep refusing the request to test/monitor these levels in a different way? Why have written requests to Premier McGuinty and Prime Minister Martin for the placement of air quality monitors near schools along the route to the Ambassador Bridge been refused?

*Answer:* The Project Team will be measuring particulates, including the study of what future levels might be. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment is the government agency responsible for the installation and operation of the air quality monitors. Specific concerns about the monitors should be directed to them. Responses to your requests by the Premier and Prime Minister are beyond the control of the Project Team.

*Question:* Why was a four-lane truck only route never considered given that the City of Windsor proposed separating cars and trucks? Why hasn’t the DRTP proposal of tunneling between 2-4 lanes been considered — and what traffic number estimates were used for the analysis?

*Answer:* International truck traffic is projected to increase to approximately 28,000 trucks/year in 2035. There will also be an increase in international auto traffic, but not as great a percentage increase as that projected for

trucks. Traffic projections primarily considered information from industries, economic trend data and so forth. The other questions require more detailed and lengthy responses that time does not permit in this venue — answers to the questions might be most readily attained by consulting the documentation supporting the evaluation of the illustrative alternatives.

*Comment:* You need to look closely at the Belzer Report [produced for the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership].

*Response:* [Comment noted. The Project Team is familiar with the Report.]

*Question:* Is there a minimum distance that a highway must be from a residential area?

*Answer:* There is no minimum distance.

*Question:* Has your analysis ‘projected-out’ to the year 2035 and taken into account the growth of the cities, including things outside of I-75 and not shown on some Project maps such as the Metropolitan airport — have you considered growth in the context of that airport?

*Answer:* The Project Team incorporated projected growth in the Windsor and Detroit regions, including the Detroit Metropolitan airport. It should be noted that international traffic represents a relatively small percentage of the total daily traffic on the U.S. freeway network in southeastern Michigan.

*Question:* Has the Project Team looked at the impacts of alternative routes and the implications for the Ojibway area?

*Answer:* Yes, the Project Team assessed the impacts of the illustrative route alternatives including potential impacts to the Ojibway area based on a variety of factors.

*Question:* Can impacts to Ojibway be mitigated, particularly if there is still 50 percent of the international truck traffic running down the Huron Church/Talbot Road corridor?

*Answer:* The Project Team will be assessing the potential impacts to the Ojibway area as part of the assessment of practical alternatives in the coming months. This work will also include the identification of possible mitigation measures.

*Question:* What is the environmental and air quality impact of placing the plaza in the locations designated CC3/CC2 (in the illustrative alternatives), that are near Ojibway — particularly given that Ojibway accounts for half of the natural area

left in Windsor and that it delivers multiple benefits (removes pollution, purifies water, etc.)?

*Answer:* The CC2, CC3, CC7, X10 and X11 concepts are all erased now that the area of continued analysis has been identified. The Project Team is open to reshaping options within the ACA. These options and their impacts will be the focus of the Project Team's study for the next six months or so.

*Question:* How will you mitigate impacts and protect people living along the Huron Church and Talbot Road corridor — there are more people living there than along the DRTP corridor — will you consider tunneling?

*Answer:* Mitigation measures are yet to be determined, but will be addressed in the next phase of the study. Yes, we will consider tunneling.

*Comment:* Trees should be planted around the plaza wherever it's located.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Comment:* If a tunnel is built, scrubbers and filters must be used — otherwise, Windsor will continue to have poor air quality and high asthma/cancer rates.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* Will the Canadian team be conducting workshops like those in the U.S.?

*Answer:* We will be conducting open public workshops in early February that will be focused on the planning of plazas and routes.

### ***Overview of the Process for Identifying and Evaluating Alternatives in the Area of Continued Analysis***

- Audrey Steele (Lead Environmental Planner, LGL) described the process for evaluating practical alternatives within the ACA. More specifically, she outlined the key project components and activities that will be part of the evaluation process, including issues concerning: acoustics and vibration, air quality, waste and waste management, archaeology, built heritage, economic impacts, social impacts, and natural heritage. Ms. Steele noted that the project team had already looked at the initial illustrative alternatives to a certain level of detail and that activities during 2006 would be focused on a more in-depth exploration of the practical alternatives in the ACA, leading to the identification of the technically preferred one.

- Following Ms. Steele’s remarks, CCG members offered a number of questions/comments:

*Question:* Has the project team been consulting directly with truckers to get their input on routes — and if not, why not? You should be doing this if you haven’t already done so.

*Answer:* The Project Team has been consulting directly with the trucking associations who speak on behalf of the collective interests of truckers. The Project Team will consider speaking directly with truckers in the future during this next more detailed phase of investigation.

*Question:* In terms of the process, how can you be conducting fieldwork and going through the analysis exercise if you’ve ‘tossed out’ the original illustrative alternatives and are starting over again — and if you haven’t identified the potential crossing location(s)?

*Answer:* The fieldwork will begin in earnest in March after the practical alternatives have been identified (these will include crossing, plaza and route locations). Though some work has already begun — given that the area of continued analysis has been identified — the practical alternatives will drive future fieldwork. We’re starting with a clean slate only from the perspective that the Team is open to considering crossing, plaza and route locations anywhere within the area of continued analysis.

*Question:* Will particulates, including PM10 be studied?

*Answer:* Yes.

- Len Kozachuk then provided an overview of how the alternatives in the ACA will be identified and the related opportunities for input during the process. He emphasized that dialogue with the community is an important part of the work plan.

### ***Defining the Parameters for Crossing, Plaza and Connecting Route Alternatives***

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) briefed CCG members on some of the important facts to keep in mind when considering what’s possible for the crossings, plazas and routes. More specifically, he noted some key differences in the characteristics and requirements of suspension and cable-stayed bridges, and provided a conceptual overview of a plaza (including features, land requirements, potential layouts and the need to accommodate primary and secondary inspection areas). Mr. Thompson also provided an overview of land uses that exist along the waterfront (on both sides of the River — noting potential

plaza locations on the American side), including heritage features, significant industrial operations, brine wells (and the potential for sink holes), and natural features. He also noted that the first of the upcoming workshops would be focused on plazas/crossings, and the second on connecting routes through the Huron Church/Talbot Road area.

- Both during and following Mr. Thompson's remarks, CCG members offered a number of questions/comments:

*Question:* What's the maximum length for a suspension bridge?

*Answer:* They can be quite long. It's important to remember that in addition to the bridge span we also have to consider the length of the road in the landing area down to the plaza.

*Question:* What about the Manning Road option for pre-processing?

*Answer:* Pre-processing needs to be closer to the border. Given security issues, border agencies do not want long roadways that are difficult to monitor.

*Question:* Does the entrance to the plaza have to be in a certain place?

*Answer:* There is some flexibility regarding the plaza entrance location. However, it must work well for circulation and efficiency. It's generally linear in design.

*Question:* If the new bridge runs directly across (i.e. at a 90 degree angle to) the Detroit River, how long would it be from the start point to the end point?

*Answer:* It depends on precisely what part of the River the bridge crosses. Remember that a bridge consists of both a main span — which has to be a certain height — and the landing portion which can vary in length depending on whether it's linear, curved or s-shaped. The crossing will require a minimum of one kilometre from the main span to the end of the bridge in the landing area.

*Question:* Why are CCG members being asked to provide input into potential plaza locations — isn't it the project team's job to identify them?

*Answer:* Based, in part, on input from the community, the Project Team will identify potential plaza locations and bring them forward as the practical alternatives. At this point, the Team is interested in getting the important perspective of CCG members and others. No one expects CCG members to be experts in plaza siting and design. The Team believes that

community input can help identify where a plaza might be best placed and, as importantly, where it should not.

*Comment:* The law governing the EA process requires public input. Our participation is an important part of the process and we should provide ideas.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* Will the proposed size of the plaza be sufficient for the next 20-30 years or will further expansion in the nearer term be required?

*Answer:* Based on discussions with the border agencies, the proposed size is what is currently being required. Though it should be sufficient, plaza requirements can change from year-to-year.

### ***CCG Input on Preliminary Practical Crossing, Plaza and Connecting Route Alternatives***

- Glenn Pothier introduced this smaller group workshop component of the meeting. He described the objectives of the exercise: identifying options for where a plaza might be located; areas to avoid when siting the plaza; and key area features/characteristics to consider.
- CCG members broke out into four groups — each gathered around an aerial photo of the ACA. Simply described, CCG members were asked to: use green dots to depict areas where they would most prefer to see a plaza; and red dots to identify areas where they would not want to see a plaza (or to identify features/characteristics to protect/avoid). Project Team personnel facilitated the small group exercise and documented key comments.
- A representative of each table then reported back to the group as a whole. Areas identified as potential plaza sites include: the Brighton Beach Industrial Area, the area south of EC Row/east of Ojibway Pkwy, the area south of Chappus/EC Row, and vacant land between Malden and Ojibway. Areas identified as those where a plaza should **not** be placed include: Malden Park, the known sinkhole location, the Ojibway/Black Oak area, the residential area west of Sandwich St. and south of the hill, the LaFarge Lands (Chippawa St.), the Lou Romano Plant, and buffer areas for the Ojibway and Black Oak locations.
- [Please note that the marked-up maps from each table at the workshop will be placed on the Project web site ([www.partnershipborderstudy.com](http://www.partnershipborderstudy.com)) in the near future.]

### *Future Role/Composition of the CCG*

- Glenn Pothier led the discussion about the ongoing role and future composition of the CCG. He began by affirming that the dialogue within the group has been and will continue to be an important part of the process. He noted (and the group agreed) that the CCG can continue to make a meaningful contribution by:
  - Sharing information and perspective;
  - ‘Work shopping’ selected issues; and
  - Offering advice and insight to help shape communication, refine project processes and so forth.
- Mr. Pothier noted that the number of members attending CCG meetings has decreased, particularly since the elimination of selected illustrative alternatives and the identification of the ACA. He also noted that there has been increased interest in the project among those living in the ACA — namely, from the Sandwich and Talbot Road/Huron Church areas. Mr. Pothier said that the Project Team would like to respond to this growing interest by allowing some people from within these areas to join the current core of CCG members (no existing members would be asked to leave the group). After a brief ensuing discussion, there was agreement that the CCG could expand to accommodate new members from within the ACA.
- The discussion of the future role/composition of the CCG was followed by a number of questions/comments on a variety of topics:

*Question:* Why have a CCG meeting — why not invite the whole community to every meeting?

*Answer:* The purpose and function of the CCG was established early on with the concurrence of its members. It will continue to function as a distinct group. Keep in mind that CCG meetings are open to any member of the public who wants to attend as an observer — and that the public are given opportunities to share their views at two separate points in the CCG meeting. In addition, the Project Team has conducted and will continue to conduct open houses and public workshops that are open to anyone.

*Question:* What if the workshop exercise shows that many people want to place the plaza in a natural area — will this input dictate decisions?

*Answer:* No. From the beginning the CCG has never been construed as a decision-making body. It provides input and advice. The Project Team will assess the CCG input in the context of its own analysis and with input that is received from others.

*Question:* Is the U.S. team further ahead in the process — and how are we keeping aware of alternatives they may be considering?

*Answer:* The U.S. and Canadian teams are at the same point in the process. The activities of the teams are well coordinated and each group is in frequent contact with the other.

*Question:* Can members of the U.S. team attend CCG meetings and share their thoughts?

*Answer:* There is often a representative from the U.S. team in attendance at CCG meetings. There is a commitment to having this continue and a willingness to answer questions and/or share perspective from the American side of the River.

*Comment:* It would be nice to have maps that show more detailed features on the U.S. side. The Project Team should consider bus trips that show the study area from a ground-level perspective.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* How much of the 80-100 acre plaza is needed and how much of it actually gets used — is there room for a buffer between the operational part of the plaza and adjacent areas?

*Answer:* The full 80-100 acres are required. Though difficult to say with certainty, there could be room for a buffer approximately 10 acres or so in size.

*Question:* Can other natural areas be restored to help mitigate the impacts of the plaza?

*Answer:* Once the plaza footprint is defined, the Project Team will be studying and considering various mitigation measures.

*Question:* Does the CCG have to be a certain size for its input to be considered valid or representative?

*Answer:* All CCG input is valid in that it helps inform the overall project. As an advisory group consisting of a 'self-selected' membership, the CCG is not a representative body. There is no magic number that would make it so. Still, CCG and other public input are an important part of the process.

*Question:* Given the results of the Consult Study that suggested a truck metering station be sited outside of Windsor, are there any plans to do this?

*Answer:* The DRIC study is not directly addressing this issue. The ‘Let’s get Windsor/Essex Moving’ initiative has been giving it some consideration — however, there is considerable debate about the benefits of this approach.

*Question:* What if the City of Windsor approved having the metering facility outside of the City?

*Answer:* We are not currently looking at it — it is not part of the DRIC study.

### ***Overview of Upcoming Meetings***

- Len Kozachuk noted that the next CCG meeting is scheduled for February 8/06 and that two post-PIOH2 workshops are scheduled for January 25 & 26/06.

### ***Open Forum***

- Glenn Pothier asked whether CCG members or the Project 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:

*Question:* How/when can we get access to the summary of this meeting — will the results be posted on the project web site?

*Answer:* A summary of each CCG meeting is prepared and distributed to CCG members. After ensuring its accuracy, it is posted on the Project web site and is available to the public.

*Comment:* Consider expanding the CCG by asking for members among residents and businesses along EC Row.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Comment:* The Town of Tecumseh has resources to conduct an EA to widen Manning Road — if this is done, truckers will use Manning Road.

*Response:* [Comment 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  
Kevin O'Brien — SLOOF  
Alice DiCaro — Ojibway Now!  
Ed Arditti — Ojibway Now!  
Terrence Kennedy — WWCTWC  
Anna Lynn Meloche  
Mary Ann Cuderman — WWCTWC  
David Munro — Little River Enhancement Group  
Dominic Troiani  
Mike Duchene — Citizens in Support of DRTP  
Mary Loubriel — Delray Community Council  
John M. Nagy — Delray Community Council  
David Nagy — Delray Community Council  
Dena Nagy — Delray Community Council  
Caddie Nagy — Delray Community Council  
Sylvia Elizadle — Delray Community Council  
Tedd Szalay  
Ray Bezaire — West Windsor concerned citizen  
Moe Haas — Citizens in Support of DRTP  
Jeff O'Brien — Resident  
Ed Oleksiuk — Ojibway Now!  
Gary Parent — WDLC  
Nancy Pancheshan — Friends of Ojibway Prairie  
Ian Naisbitt — Little River Enhancement Group  
Tom Henderson — Public Advisory Council of the DRCC  
Alan McKinnon — Citizens Protecting Ojibway Wilderness  
Denise Ausman — Support of DRTP  
Dennis Boismier — Windsor resident  
Clara Deck  
Bill Marshall

***Partnership:***

Dave Wake — MTO  
Roger Ward — MTO  
Joel Foster — MTO  
Kevin DeVos — MTO  
Janice Coffin, Lesley Racicot, Jill Miller, Heather Grondin — MTO  
Mohammed Alghurabi — MDOT  
Sean O'Dell — Transport Canada

***Consultant Team:***

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Tim Sorochinsky, Irene Hauzar — URS  
Audrey Steele — LGL Limited  
David MacLeod, Russell Mathew — Hemson Consulting  
Mark Valizavic — Corradino Group  
Abby Salb, Gwen Brice — SENES Consulting