



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

Meeting Date/Location:

February 8th, 2006/Ciociaro Club — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

This seventh meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on providing members with a progress update re: the development of practical alternatives for plaza sites, crossing locations and route designs — and inviting member input on key questions with a view to helping further shape the alternatives.

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of next steps in the project
- Notify members of the upcoming CCG and public meetings 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 elected officials, 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 comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. None were raised.

Review of January 11/06 CCG Meeting Notes

- Glenn Pothier noted that the project team had identified an error in the Jan. 11 Meeting Notes (the document erroneously referred to 28,000 trucks/year in 2035; it should read 28,000 trucks/day in 2035).
- Glenn Pothier then asked for other feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. None were noted and there were no concerns about the meeting summary notes format or substance. Given that some participants had not had a chance to review the Jan. 11 Meeting Notes in advance of the session, they were invited to send any comments concerning errors/omissions to either the facilitator or a project team member.

Progress Update on the Development of Practical Alternatives

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) began a Project Team presentation by making the following points:
 - The Team is developing alternatives within the Area of Continued Analysis (i.e. the Area identified in late November/early December);

- The process is unique in that public input is being sought and considered in an iterative manner as the freeway concepts and plaza/crossing alternatives are developed;
 - A set of practical alternatives will be presented in two Public Information Open Houses at the end of March — these alternatives will serve as the basis for ongoing study, with results from the analysis of them (leading to the selection of a preferred alternative) presented toward the end of 2006;
 - Public input from the January and early February workshops centred on: noise and air quality issues, accessibility/mobility issues, property issues, and concerns about where service roads, interchanges and flyovers would be located;
 - The Project Team will be looking at options for service roads, interchanges and flyovers and will examine how traffic staging may be conducted — trade-offs will be required;
 - Each alternative has its own unique challenges (for example, structures will be required for tunnel ventilation, different approaches may require drainage/utility relocations, and so forth) with implications for construction staging and timelines;
 - There have been suggestions to separate local and international traffic; and
 - The Project Team has been asking and continues to ask the public about what needs to be considered when developing different alternatives — the meeting tonight will focus on some key related questions [these are described below in this summary].
- Tim Sorochinsky (Project Engineer, URS Canada) continued the presentation by providing a progress update outlining various route design concepts within different geographic areas (EC Row Expressway/Todd Lane/Cabana; Todd Lane/Cabana/Cousineau; and Cousineau/Howard/Highway 401). More specifically, he described various interchange and service road options, including a series of slides depicting depressed, at grade and tunneled highway sections.
 - Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) continued the presentation, making the following key points:
 - The Project Team is developing more refined alternatives for plazas and the crossing;
 - Like their Canadian counterparts, the U.S. Project Team is sharing potential crossing and plaza locations with the public on the American side of the River;
 - The handout distributed to all participants shows seven factors (and related performance measures) that will be considered as part of the ongoing evaluation/analysis — key overarching factors include: air quality, community/neighbourhood characteristics, consistency with existing and planned land use, cultural impacts, the natural environment, regional mobility and cost;
 - The EA process requires the Project Team to examine environmental impacts; these are characterized by the seven major factors;

- A key issue relates to how the plaza/crossing facility can complement the community and the degree to which it should reflect a theme (e.g. gateway to Windsor);
 - Input from the last CCG meeting (and from the public workshops) suggested that the plaza should be located away from Sandwich Towne and south of Prospect Avenue — the Project Team has used this information and examined plaza locations north of Broadway, on lands used by Ontario Power Generation (OPG) and Windsor Salt, and the area between Matchette Road and Malden Road (again, there is a need to site a plaza 80-100 ac in size);
 - Another potential plaza location is in the Brighton Beach area — the property is located between the Black Oak and Nemark plant (given that the bridge structure will still be 130 feet in the air at the edge of the shoreline and that approximately 1 KM is required to get back down to grade, it is not possible to take advantage of the land right at the shoreline; moreover, there is a need to cross over Ojibway Parkway and the ETR rail line, therefore, losing the ability to take advantage of the entire Brighton Beach area);
 - In siting its plaza facility, the U.S. Team is looking to minimize impacts to the communities of Delray and Historic Fort Wayne — both Project Teams are studying opportunities for coming across the river either north or south of Fort Wayne (on the U.S. side);
 - The Team is aware of the sinkhole and brine well issues, and are examining the potential for an angled or skewed bridge — we are still fine-tuning the design aspects and are looking at all reasonable alternatives;
 - Another option involves siting the Plaza as close to the river as possible: for this plaza, we are looking at a crossing north of Fort Wayne (closer to Sandwich) — there are a number of structural elements that need to be considered including concerns about proximity to the Sterling Marine Fuels facility, proximity to brine wells, and issues relating to connecting roads and lands under the structure; and
 - A technically and environmentally preferred alternative will be selected in the spring of 2007. The analysis for the practical alternatives that have been evaluated will be presented in November/December 2006.
- Following the various presentations as described above, CCG members offered a number of questions/comments:

Question: How much land is needed for the plaza — it has been quoted as 100ac today, but previously as being as low as 80ac and as high as 120 ac?

Answer: We need 80-100 ac to meet the needs of the Canadian Border Services Agency. The 100 ac size would allow for some room to grow to meet future needs.

Question: If the U.S. is looking at a more northern crossing site and the Canadian team is looking more south, how can you meet and have a structure that is practical? When are the two communities going to come together to share views?

Answer: Project Teams on both sides of the border are working closely together and exploring a range of options. We will be holding a joint meeting with the U.S. Local Advisory Committee and the CCG on March 22 (tentative date), and are holding a number of meetings prior to that to explore local community issues. We want to ensure that Project Teams on both sides of the River understand each other's issues.

Question: Has the Project Team dismissed the Ambassador Gateway concept? What about the 'no action alternative'?

Answer: Both teams have reviewed the twin Ambassador alternatives and determined its should not be carried forward. The 'no action alternative' will be carried forward in the study to document whether the benefits of the project outweighs the impacts.

Question: If the U.S. team says they do not want to build a bridge, what can the Canadian team do?

Answer: The Partnership is comprised of representatives from Federal and State governments on the U.S. as well as Federal and Provincial governments in Canada. All four partners on each side of the border are committed to proceeding with a new crossing.

Question: Is it possible to get a copy of the three maps of the plaza sites?

Answer: We will make the slides available and they will be part of the meeting notes.

Question: What are the challenges in designing a diagonal bridge?

Answer: A diagonal bridge is typically a longer, more expensive, and more complex structure to construct. You could have a bridge that went straight across the river with an 's-curve' in the landing area or have a bridge further north, connected to a plaza further south. The U.S. and Canadian teams are looking at all alternatives. We are both conducting analysis to see what is the most feasible and sensible bridge options.

Question: What is the potential for a diagonal bridge at Chappel and Prospect? And can the Project Team produce maps that include street names and/or landmarks?

Answer: A diagonal or skewed alignment for the crossing is being considered. The location of the crossing alternatives have not been finalized yet. Street names/landmarks can be placed on the maps — however, please note that the arrows identifying crossing opportunities on the potential plaza maps do not define the precise location for a new crossing. We have not characterized the potential new crossing by street, but rather by the property in the area of the crossing opportunity.

Question: When planning a plaza, can you do it in isolation from the surrounding area and roadways like EC Row Expressway and Ojibway Parkway? What will the plaza actually look like — do you have to mound up land, will it destroy Ojibway Park natural heritage areas?

Answer: Our plaza experts are looking at these issues and the range of possible impacts — and we continue to gather public input in this area. We are going to have artist conceptions of what the plaza will look like at the Open Houses. It's possible that a more compact plaza may not initially use the full plaza footprint. We will also be looking at a variety of options for going over/under EC Row Expressway and Ojibway Parkway.

Question: If you were to pick the tunnel option will you conduct computer analysis that models the use of electrostatic scrubbers for cleaning the air and compare this cost to the health costs that the city already incurs?

Answer: We will incorporate the leading air cleaning/filtering technologies into the analysis model. We won't limit our analysis to electrostatic scrubbers. We will compare a tunnel to an open grade solution/depressed roadway.

Question: What is the right-of-way that's required for the different alternatives?

Answer: There is a 55m right-of-way on Talbot Road. The right-of-way may increase to between 80-100m. It may widen further when you put in interchanges and service roads.

Question: If you work to keep the route at grade (6 lanes) with two service roads, what is the right-of-way requirement?

Answer: The size of the right-of-way will depend on the needs of the design — we may need to take more than 80m to do a widening and for construction staging. It's too early to precisely define the size of the required right-of-way.

Working Discussion Re: Potential Practical Alternatives

- Glenn Pothier asked CCG members to form four smaller working groups in preparation for tackling a series of route- and plaza-related questions (and to identify a ‘speaker’ who could report back on the highlights of their group’s discussion).
- Work on each question was preceded by brief introductory remarks by Len Kozachuk with a view to providing important context to help inform the small group discussions. A Project Team member led each of the discussions.
- At the conclusion of the exercise, a spokesperson from each group reported (in plenary) on their discussion highlights.
- The breakout group questions are listed below with a summary of the collective responses to them. Please note that there was not necessarily consensus within or between the smaller discussion groups.

(Route-Related Questions)

Question 1: What are the priority areas for tunneling or a depressed roadway?

- **For tunneling:**
 - Entire route from 401 and E.C. Row
 - Need more information regarding tunnel feasibility along the entire route
 - Tunnel all of it or none of it (don't pick and choose which residential areas are worthy of a tunnel)
 - Tunnel in areas in close proximity to schools
 - Give tunnels priority over a depressed roadway
 - Residential area: Howard to Cousineau
 - Howard to St. Clair College area, due to sports fields and schools (Mount Carmel, Holy Name) and day care centres
- **For depressed roadway:**
 - High sensitivity areas
 - Consider faith groups (for example) and movement to places of worship
 - Avoid creating a ‘rollercoaster’ (i.e. at grade-depressed-at grade-depressed and so forth) along the route
 - Entire route is possible/feasible — can provide an air filter from traffic
 - Need more information re: the benefits of a depressed road
 - Depressed highway preferred over at-grade solution

Question 2: The Project Team has identified possible highway interchange locations (that is, access points to/from new highway) at Howard Avenue, Cousineau Road, Todd Lane/Cabana Road and EC Row Expressway. Are there other locations where interchanges should be considered?

- Howard — yes
- Howard and Todd Lane/Cabana Road, E.C. Row
- Howard Ave/Highway 3
- Cabana — yes and no
- School in close vicinity to Cabana is a concern
- If vehicles are separated (international vs. local traffic) then less of a problem
- Allow access into E.C. Row
- No change to Huron Church/E.C. Row interchange (separate local/truck traffic west of Huron Church)
- Eliminate interchange at Cousineau (could be redundant)
- At least two interchanges between Cousineau and Cabana/Todd Lane
- St. Clair College instead of Cousineau — connect to Cousineau with service road
- St. Clair College (instead of at Todd/Cabana and Cousineau/Sandwich Pkwy)
- Note access requirements for Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall
- Single point urban interchange
- Roundabouts could be an option

Question 3: Where should different highway crossings (vehicular/pedestrian flyovers) be located?

- **Pedestrian:**
 - Turkey Creek
 - Midway between Howard and Cousineau
 - Turkey Creek, currently a bike path/trail — maintain access to cross to the parks on west side of Huron Church Road (i.e. Spring Garden, etc.)
 - Need more data to determine need
- **Vehicular:**
 - Flyover at Todd/Cabana if no interchange
 - Include bike lane, sidewalks
 - Todd Lane/Cabana Road
 - LaBelle/Spring Garden
 - Grand Marais
 - Cousineau Road
- **Both Pedestrian and Vehicular:**
 - La Belle/Spring Garden
 - Grand Marais/Lambton
 - Cabana (if no interchange)
 - Check with city of Windsor Official Plan for future bike lanes or plans
 - Pulford
 - St. Clair College (if no interchange)
 - Cousineau (if no interchange)
 - Grand Marais — maintain access to cross to the parks on west side of Huron Church Road (i.e. Spring Garden, etc.)

- LaBelle/Bethlehem — maintain access to cross to the parks on west side of Huron Church Road (i.e. Spring Garden, etc.)
- Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall (may run into a crossing for Cousineau)
- Todd Lane/Cabana
- When using "hook" surface service roads, allow access for pedestrians and traffic to follow these directions for crossing
- Huron Church Line
- At all intersections with traffic lights (currently in place)
- Montgomery

Question 4: What should the Project Team incorporate in the design of the roadway to improve its look and aesthetics and have it blend more seamlessly into the community?

- **Plantings:**
 - Grass berms (vegetated) if at or above grade
 - Lots of trees and bushes
 - Use native plants/trees (same number of trees to offset the particulate matter emitted from diesel emissions)
 - Trees — evergreen, native species, tulip, ginkgo
 - Create parkettes (trees and benches)
 - Green space — the more the better; make it as naturalized as possible
 - Consider maintenance issues: Who is responsible? Who pays (the costs)?
- **Design Features:**
 - Visually pleasant flyover (like at Assumption High school)
 - Not plain
 - Bike paths on service roads
 - Decorative noise walls if above grade
 - Pedestrian sidewalks on service roads
 - Benches
 - Pleasant lighting — directed onto roadway, not homes
 - Split re: artistic and non-artistic (i.e. use totem poles/do not use totem poles; use inukshuks as path marking/do not use inukshuks)
 - Keep things functional
 - Depress throughout (with the exception of when near schools/populated areas — then tunnel)
 - Tunnel from Howard to E.C. Row
 - At a minimum, use a depressed roadway or tunnel in residential areas
 - Build a tunnel with electrostatic precipitators, filters, scrubber's and catalytic converters or other updated technology
 - Separate 4 lanes for trucks in a tunnel
 - 6 lanes of cars on top
 - Natural sound barrier (earth berm, trees)
 - See Phoenix Arizona (re: barrier wall aesthetics)
 - Should not be a cement wall (noise barriers)

- Use architecturally-designed unique structures
- Design as a ‘Gateway’
- Use field stone/stamped concrete retaining walls
- Improve signage
- Note: when evaluating the impact of trucks traveling through the city (Talbot/Huron Church) air monitors should and must be placed on the roofs of Oakwood and Our Lady of Mount Carmel Schools and these air monitors should be hooked up directly to Environment Canada's website where they can be read by the public daily.

(Plaza-Related Questions)

Question 5: Are there other plaza alternatives that should be considered, and if so, what are they?

- U.S. and Canada should get together to choose locations which are complementary (across from one another)
- Secure route to Plaza locations at Highway 401/3 (international only)
- Option south and east of E.C. Row preferred — select larger property to maintain flexibility and meet future needs
- Keep plaza and crossing away from Sandwich Town triangle
- Brighton Beach lands and those south of Broadway/west of Black Oak Prairie

Question 6: In addition to the factors that the Project Team will be looking at in assessing the Practical Alternatives for plazas, are there other impacts or opportunities the team should be assessing in the evaluation?

- Public image
- Value for the dollar (not to be confused with the cheapest option)
- Overall aesthetics, trees, berms
- Aesthetics of plaza and fit with surroundings
- Re-evaluate air quality 5 years after construction
- Air quality is number one
- Ensure air quality analysis identifies carcinogens
- Evaluate the affect of increased pollution on the compromised tree stand
- Potential for pedestrian and bike usage of new crossing structure
- Potential for ‘community redevelopment’
- Look for mitigation opportunities (e.g. Brighton Beach can be redeveloped if not used for a plaza)
- Re: heritage — all ‘listed’ sites should be considered, not just ‘designated’ sites
- Consider mitigation costs

Question 7: What should the Project Team incorporate in the design of the plaza and crossing to improve its look and aesthetics and have it blend more seamlessly into the community?

- Architectural design of structures/plaza (choose a theme; stay consistent with it)
- Aesthetically pleasing bridge (i.e. shape, profile, lighting, etc.)
- Waterfall, Casino, flashing lights
- Fit with surrounding area (style)
- Sculptured berms, landscaping, trees and benches
- ‘Green’ roofs on plaza buildings
- Use of alternative energy for plaza power supply (e.g. solar panels, wind mills)
- Landscaping: native trees, shrubs, native prairie grass
- Theme: beautiful, natural Canada
- Depress the plaza, use berms and so forth to hide it/make it blend into the area
- Make the plaza lands naturalized and hidden
- Incorporate a historical exhibit for public education (e.g. interpretation centre)
- Films showing construction process and consulting process
- Relate to industrial area
- Place air quality monitors in strategic locations — and have reporting procedures for sharing air monitoring data
- Trucks must shut-off engine at border crossing (while waiting)
- Keep road away from Spring Garden ANSI

Next Steps/Overview of Upcoming Meetings

- Len Kozachuk provided a brief overview of the project’s next steps:
 - The next public information open houses will be in late March — the subsequent set of open houses will be toward the end of 2006
 - Additional meetings (consultation/information sessions) are upcoming in the Spring/Summer 2006
 - The preferred alternative will be identified in the Spring of 2007
 - The next CCG meeting is a joint CCG/LAC meeting scheduled for March 22nd in Windsor
- Len Kozachuk also invited CCG members with ideas for future CCG discussion/information items to forward them to Jacquie Dalton or Glenn Pothier.

Open Forum/Public Comment

- 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:

Comment: There should be joint workshops on both sides of the River with people from the affected communities: Delray and Sandwich.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: At the end of March, are you going to know if you will build a tunnel or not?

Answer: No. By the end of March, we expect to have a number of alternatives. We may have combinations of alternatives including tunnels, depressed roadways and at grade approaches.

Question: Will the new Federal Government follow through on this study?

Answer: During the recent campaign, all three parties recognized the importance of border issues. Pending unexpected direction to the contrary, the Project is continuing as planned.

Comment: I hear a lot about tunneling — do you consider it a viable option? Doubts about a tunnel have been expressed given concerns relating to cost and political will. I've also heard that the nature of the soil is considered a challenge. Madrid has tunneled a lot of the city without disturbing buildings above. Madrid is an example of where it can be done.

Response: The Project Team is committed to looking at providing a facility to the river. We will be examining mitigation impacts and considering cost, impact on air quality and a range of other factors discussed earlier. We will put together a solution with the best balance of transportation benefits and impacts. We will look at the full range of options, including tunneling, and we will present all the data from our analysis.

Comment: As an observer of the proceedings, I just wanted to say that all of the participants should be proud of themselves. You are well intentioned and dedicated.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: Would the CCG members be comfortable with videotaping at future meetings?

Answer: [No objections were expressed.]

Closing Remarks

- Glenn Pothier and Dave Wake thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:40 to 9:55 p.m.).

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

CCG Members and Public Observers:

Kevin O'Brien — SLOOF
Ed Arditti — Ojibway Now!
Ed Oleksiuk — Ojibway Now!
Kevin O'Neil
Carmen Micallef
Pat Morneau
Paul Morneau
Liz Morneau
Ray Bezaire — West Windsor concerned citizen
Ron Caughlin
Cathy Blair — Oakwood Public School
Ingrid Rose — Oakwood Public School
Pierre Quenneville
Larry Stiers
Mary Stiers
Jeff O'Brien
Josie Iannetta
Clara Deck
Alan McKinnon — Citizens Protecting Ojibway Wilderness
Jim Martin
Karen Brady — University of Windsor
Dave Krysa — University of Windsor
Robert Benson
Bill Marshall
Mike Duchene — Citizens in Support of DRTP
Dominic Troiani
Terrence Kennedy — WWCTWC
Mary Ann Cuderman — WWCTWC
Nancy Pancheshan — Friends of Ojibway Prairie
Tedd Szalay
Anna Lynn Meloche — CPOW, Truck Watch
Shelley Harding-Smith
Tina Stagru

Partnership:

Dave Wake, Roger Ward, Kevin DeVos, Mark Norsworthy — MTO

Consultant Team:

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Tim Sorochinsky, Irene Hauzar, Sandra Hantziagelis — URS
Grant Kaufman — LGL Limited
David McLeod — Hemson Consulting
Amir Iravani, Gwen Brice — SENES Consulting