



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 Eighth Meeting of the
Detroit River International Crossing
Community Consultation Group**
(and second joint meeting with the U.S. Local Advisory Council)

Meeting Date/Location:

March 22nd, 2006/Ciociaro Club — Windsor, Ontario

Co-Facilitators:

Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi
Mohammed Alghurabi, MDOT

Meeting Purpose

This eighth meeting of the Canadian Community Consultation Group (CCG) — and second combined meeting with the American Local Advisory Council (LAC) — was focused on previewing the practical crossing/plaza alternatives on both sides of the border that will be taken forward for more in-depth analysis. This content and related information was shown in advance of the public meetings being held at the end of March in both Canada and the U.S.

In keeping with the spirit of a bi-national initiative, the meeting provided CCG/LAC members with the chance to share information and perspective — to hear from one another and get a better sense of the issues, challenges and opportunities on both sides of the Detroit River.

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Invite member input on key questions with a view to helping further shape and refine the content to be presented at the upcoming public meetings;
- Provide an update on EPA Air Quality PM_{2.5} rules for the U.S. study and an overview of the Canadian Air Quality work plan;
- Notify members of the upcoming CCG, LAC and public meetings schedule;
- Allow for public/CCG/LAC member comments and questions about issues of their choosing; and
- Provide an overview of next steps in the project.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Introduction and Agenda Review

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting co-facilitator, called the group to order and welcomed all participants, observers, and project team members. He also extended a special welcome to the new members of the CCG who have just recently joined the group (and provided some background regarding their appointment). Co-facilitator Mohammed Alghurabi, from the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), also welcomed the group as a whole and offered some introductory remarks emphasizing the importance of the contributions of CCG/LAC members.
- Project team members and CCG/LAC members introduced themselves and noted their group affiliation.
- Glenn Pothier described the meeting conduct procedures and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

Review of February 8/06 CCG Meeting Notes and February 22/06 LAC Meeting Notes

- Glenn Pothier asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions from the Feb. 8/06 CCG meeting summary. One participant asked that a sub-bullet describing one part of the content of L. Kozachuk's presentation be revised to read '*in Sandwich*' (in place of '*closer to Sandwich*') — see page four of the Feb. 8/06 meeting summary. This request was agreed to. No other errors/omissions were identified and there were no concerns expressed about the meeting summary notes format or general substance.
- Mohammed Alghurabi noted one piece of unfinished business existed and asked Joe Corradino to elaborate on it, i.e., the distance between plazas and Southwestern High School. Joe Corradino noted that with Plaza Options 3, 4, and 5, the center-to-center distance was about 3, 800 feet with the edge-to-edge distance being approximately 2,000 feet. For Plaza Option 2, again the distances were approximately 1, 700 feet center-to-center, and 0 feet, edge-to-edge. He noted that, in terms of air quality and noise impacts, that those distances do not "tell the story." The key issue is the location of vehicle activities (like toll booths with idling vehicles) and their distances from sensitive land uses.

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/LAC meeting as an observer. He then asked if any comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. A single member of the public offered the following comments and questions:

Comment/Question: A statement made regarding the lack of health impact study as part of the Birder crossing project. The speaker noted there would always be gaps in knowledge to cause an excuse for not doing such a study, but thousands of studies had pointed out the effects of air toxics on health. Several example reports were cited. Further, there had been emphasis by the DRIC U.S. Study Team on the EPA-induced mobile source air toxic reductions resulting from increased regulation, but there had not been discussion about fleet turnover. As Detroit is a non-attainment area, the speaker asked what the strategy was for reaching attainment.

Response: The U.S. program of analysis is based on the February 3, 2006 Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidance followed by the March 10, 2006 U.S. EPA Final Rules on PM_{2.5} hotspot analysis. This guidance and rule indicate there would be no quantitative analysis at the project level at this time. EPA continues to work on a model expected to quantify particulate matter; it is to be finalized in 2007. Meanwhile, the U.S. analysis will use agency rules and travel data including the truck fleet mix from SEMCOG.

SEMCOG is responsible for the attainment program that includes point and non-point (mobile) sources of pollution.

- There were no other public comments/questions offered at this point in the agenda.

Information on Crossings and Plazas to be presented at Public Meetings

- This portion of the meeting agenda provided the Canadian and U.S. project teams with the opportunity to preview plaza and crossing-related material to be presented at upcoming public meetings (Public Information Open Houses in Windsor on Mar. 28th and 30th; a Public Meeting in Detroit on Mar. 29th). Glenn Pothier noted that Canadian connecting routes — a series of options to travel the 8 KM or so from the 401 to the potential plaza sites — were not being covered in the joint CCG/LAC meeting given time constraints and that such information would be of relatively less interest to the American participants [connecting routes are less of an issue in the U.S. given that their proposed plaza sites are adjacent to the Interstate.] However, Glenn also noted that the connecting route information would be included in the Canadian Public Information Open Houses.
- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) led off the slide presentations by describing the project schedule and providing an overview of the alternatives evaluation process (and emphasizing that both the Canadian and U.S. teams have been following the same process). He then went on to make the following key points:
 - The consultation process has been extensive and ongoing — there have been multiple meetings with elected officials, the public and a variety of other stakeholders. The project team will continue to have meetings with various groups in order to gather their input.
 - Several workshops and meetings were held to gather input from groups about the plaza/crossing designs. In addition, the project team has met several times with the RCMP and the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) to determine what their needs and criteria are for a new inspection plaza and crossing.
 - The project team is looking at a number of criteria and challenges. A key consideration is to provide the necessary navigational clearances over the Detroit River. The project team is also currently studying the brine wells and sink hole issues. In addition, air quality and noise are other issues that are being closely examined.
 - In terms of a new crossing, generally, the longer the crossing the more costly it is to construct. The grades on the new crossing are an issue in relation to vehicle performance on steeper grades (particularly for trucks) as well as adverse climatic conditions (e.g. ice, snow, fog). A maximum grade of 5% is assumed for the new crossing.

- In developing new plaza and crossing locations, public input was sought and community objectives were taken into account. Many from the public emphasized the importance of: staying out of the Black Oak area; preserving the many historic features of Sandwich Town and keeping a plaza and crossing south of Prospect Avenue.
- In consideration of all input, three potential plaza and crossing locations have been identified as those to be taken forward for more in-depth analysis. Plaza A is located adjacent to E.C. Row Expressway in one of the few areas of developing residential uses. Plaza B is in the Brighton Beach Area where there is a mix of vacant land and industrial uses. The Project Team has developed plaza alternatives that are north of Broadway Avenue and away from Black Oak/Ojibway natural areas. Plaza C is on a site on the Detroit River shoreline. Much of the land needed for this site is currently owned by Ontario Power Generation (OPG) and includes a transformer station.
- Crossing A in the X10 Corridor is a long skewed crossing located in the Brighton Beach area in Windsor and the area west of Fort Wayne in Detroit; Crossing B in the X10 Corridor is located in the area south of Prospect Avenue to the area west of Fort Wayne in Detroit. Crossing C in the X11 Corridor is located in the area of Sterling Fuels/K Scrap Resources in Sandwich to the area east of Fort Wayne.
- The different crossings connect with one or more plaza sites on the Canadian side. Crossing A in the X10 Corridor can connect with Plaza A only, due to the location of the crossing and the clearance requirements at the river's edge. Crossing B in the X10 Corridor is on the south side of Prospect Avenue and connects with Plazas A or B. Crossing C connects to Plaza A, B or C on the Canadian Side.
- There are geotechnical issues on the Canadian side related to salt mining activities that could affect the plaza and crossing locations. The project team has a work plan to investigate bedrock conditions in the area in more detail.
- The Area of Continued Analysis (ACA) includes an extension of Highway 401 from its present terminus at Highway 3 to the area of the plazas. The Project Team is examining tunnel, depressed, and at grade route alternatives. There are a number of challenges — particularly, those relating to potential community impacts — associated with each alternative.
- In the next phase of the study, the project team will be conducting additional analysis for each of the plaza and crossing locations, and for the route alternatives.

U.S. Presentation

- Mohammed Alghurabi said that there was a handout which showed the slides to be used in the U.S. presentation. The slides mirrored the graphics on display in the room. The idea was to give the LAC a preview of the presentation that would

be given to the public on March 29th in the United States at two meetings. The public meetings were being publicized through flyers distributed door-to-door in the Delray neighborhood, Public Access TV, and major local newspapers.

- Joe Corradino (Project Manager, The Corradino Group) began his PowerPoint presentation by indicating that the purpose of the March 29th meetings is to update the general public on the work conducted since November 2005. He noted that there had been many workshops with many community members in between November and now, but not with the general public, in particular those living in the Delray area.
- Joe Corradino said that the project's development in the United States was focused on the crossing, plaza and connections to I-75, with little need to work on a route between the plaza and the freeway. He used a series of oblique aerial photos to show important points on the U.S. side to lay the groundwork for plaza development. He noted vision statements have been prepared in coordination with the local community for conditions with and without a bridge. Both emphasized improved relations with governmental agencies and support for the community. The vision statement with the bridge called for a return to the host community of some of the economic wealth that is expected to be generated by the new crossing.
- Master planning is the current focus of ongoing work. The master planning effort will transition to context sensitive solutions (CSS) blending community development issues with transportation infrastructure (plaza, bridge, interchange). That work will start in April. At the same time, an extensive effort will begin to analyze the social-cultural effects in a broader area than Delray, which has 5,000 persons. That broader area incorporates approximately 150,000 people. Among other activities and analysis will be interviews with 100+ persons/groups to determine what makes the community work and how it might be affected/improved by the project.
- Mr. Corradino next explained the plaza analysis zone of approximately 310 acres. That zone was identified in conjunction with the community and will later be reduced to approximately 150 acres. At this point, it is understood that the plaza would be ultimately designed and owned by the federal government. Meanwhile, the consultant team will do site planning of the plaza at a level sufficient to analyze impacts and prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- Mr. Corradino then explained Plaza Options 3 and 4, which have a linear layout, are associated with Crossing X10. The difference is that Option 3 goes more directly to the freeway providing ramps into and out of the plaza in this area of Livernois and Dragoon Avenues, whereas Option 4 splits the ramp access with inbound access from the Springwells area and outbound access in the Livernois/Dragoon area. In either case, the likelihood is that the Livernois/Dragoon interchange with I-75 will be closed.

- Mr. Corradino then showed slides illustrating what a plaza may look like from an oblique aerial view in terms of its magnitude and the amount of green space associated with it.
- Mr. Corradino next turned to Crossing X11, which is east of Fort Wayne, and showed Options 1 and 2. These plazas are more compact, with Option 1 having a circular traffic pattern and Option 2 having a “down-and-back” type layout with inbound traffic moving first to the west and back to the east. There is an Option 1-A that would shift the alignment of I-75 south to reduce impacts that could occur north of I-75. A new Option 5 associated with Crossing X-11 was introduced. It has a linear layout with entry to the plaza from the west (inbound to the United States) at the Springwells area and exit to the freeway to the east of the Livernois/Dragoon area.
- Mr. Corradino concluded that none of the options were in final form and that the elements of the options could be mixed and matched to come to a final plaza preliminary configuration. Further, a preliminary evaluation of impacts had been done and was distributed as a handout. The data on Options 1 through 5 would be updated and refined as time goes on.
- Regarding “next steps” in the United States, Joe Corradino noted that the context sensitive solution effort would begin in April and would blend engineering/environmental considerations and the master planning effort into design and access elements of the bridge/plaza/interchange, for example, whether ramps to I-75 should go under or over Fort Street, and the kinds of walls and buffers that might be used around the plaza. He went on to discuss other upcoming meetings and the overall schedule. He said the current plan is to develop the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) by December with a public hearing in January 2007.
- Glenn Pothier and Mohammed Alghurabi then invited CCG/LAC members to ask questions and/or share comments and observations about the presented material — including ideas for refining/strengthening the display materials planned for use in the upcoming public meetings:

Question: Can the LAC get a copy of the CCG materials?

Answer: Yes, the materials were available at the entrance to the meeting hall and can be picked-up afterward. (The materials are also posted on the project website).

Question: The alternative B Plaza is too close to the river. The proposed length of the bridge is 735m. What is the length of the Ambassador Bridge?

Answer: The Ambassador Bridge is 555m.

Comment: It might be easier to understand the material if the nomenclature for the crossings is the same. The U.S. uses X10 and X11, and the Canadian team uses Crossings A, B, and C. Please provide a comparison table so that each group can understand which crossing is being referenced.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: Will the Canadian team be using the same criteria weightings as the study progresses to the next phase of evaluation?

Answer: Yes, the same weighting system will be used for the practical alternatives evaluation phase.

Comment: Include the weighting numbers when you present material to the public.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: As a longtime resident of Delray, I would like to compliment MDOT and the U.S. team for trying to find reasonable solutions. I began by being opposed to the project but now believe good can come from the process. It is important to save both Delray and Sandwich. Sandwich has the support of the city of Windsor. The same cannot be said of Delray insofar as the city of Detroit goes. The recent story in the *Windsor Star* painted Delray in a very poor light. The people in Delray deserve better. The newspaper focused on the negatives.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: I have attended most of the meetings in both the U.S. and Canada. We feel the same way in Sandwich as those residents in Delray — Sandwich is a community worth saving. We want a solution that will work for both communities. I have attended the MDOT question and answer sessions and I find them much more informative than the Canadian open houses with only display boards, but no presentation and follow-up Q&A. I find the question and answer sessions most beneficial. I would like to thank Joe and Len for their excellent presentations this evening.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: In terms of air quality and vibration, I know that the air quality analysis is not in the U.S. regulations, but in Canada, the Ambassador bridge plaza expansion would come within 30 feet of the backs of houses and air quality will be worse. How does this play out in terms of Canadian regulations? Something needs to be done.

Answer: Air quality is a top-ranked concern with the public. We have tried to site the plazas away from residential areas, whereas the Ambassador Bridge is right next door to many people. We will look at providing buffers around plazas. Air quality standards will be met. If there are negative impacts, then there will be mitigation. As far as vibration goes, although

there may be no standards, there are thresholds, and our studies will present those thresholds and take them into consideration.

Question: Where would the buffer be on the Canadian side of the plaza — have you taken into account the need for future growth?

Answer: The border agencies have said that the plaza needs to be a minimum of 80 to 100 acres. We are working with this footprint, which includes provisions for buffer. We spoke with CBSA about future needs and they feel comfortable with the size of the plaza and that it can accommodate growth in traffic. The U.S. is using about 150 acres as the plaza site to allow for future growth. The Canadian agencies are comfortable with 80 to 100 acres.

Question: Thank you for this joint meeting of the CCG/LAC — it's important to keep in mind that this project is about homes and people, not just roads and bridges. What is the difference between air quality regulations on the Canadian side and the U.S. side?

Answer: In the U.S., a recent publication of EPA rules has made it clear that there will not be a quantitative estimate of air quality at this time for this project. There will be a burden analysis, i.e. an estimate of the mass of the pollutant involved, but that burden will not be dispersed into concentrations at spot around the plaza area. In Canada, we will be conducting a quantitative analysis. We will be calculating emissions from vehicles to create dispersion models. We will be looking at sensitive receptors including homes and schools. The contaminants analyzed will include PM_{2.5}.

Comment: I believe there are standards in Ontario for vibration that should be examined once the facility is in place.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: It was stated earlier that the plaza in the U.S. would be designed and owned by the federal government. How does that square with private/public ownership? Further, a lawsuit in Wayne County that is now under appeal, has determined in a lower court that the Ambassador Bridge does not have to abide by local zoning laws. What effect might that have?

Answer: There are a number of models with respect to ownership. We do not yet know which model will be followed. It is true that it is the desire of the Department of Homeland Security to own the plaza that they occupy. It is also true that public oversight of the next crossing is a must. Beyond that, we do not know what the ownership and operating structure will be at this time. .

Comment: I appreciate the introductions at the beginning of the meeting by the LAC/CCG members. The Canadian DRIC team has consulted with members of the public, government, and areas affected. The City of Windsor seems to have a parallel process to the DRIC team. The city needs to start building relationships with the DRIC team. Neither community consensus nor a truly regional approach can be achieved if solutions are dictated without dialogue. On the U.S. side, the LAC appears to be made up of citizens and members that represent the community at large, but it also includes elected officials. I encourage elected officials to join in the CCG meetings. It would be great if the Windsor City Council got on board with the DRIC Study as it sometimes works at cross purposes. [Note: the following are excerpts from an unsolicited e-mail from the person making the above comment in aid of clarifying the point: *I did not mean to suggest that the CCG alter its composition from community at large representation to political representation...I understand the guidelines that were established when we formed the CCG. While the CCG promotes dialogue between the community and the DRIC team, and the municipal consultation group promotes dialogue between various municipal interests and the DRIC team, there is no forum for three-way dialogue among all three of these parties...Whether by design or default, the U.S. LAC has DRIC team members, politicians (or representatives thereof) and members of the community at large all in the same room at the same time, listening to each other...This has not happened on the Canadian side.*]

Response: [Mohammed Alghurabi clarified the nature of the LAC composition.] From the American point of view, the LAC is a mixture of elected officials and citizens. Some elected officials have chosen to represent themselves while others send a representative. This was followed by a comment from a Windsor Councillor who noted that City of Windsor councilors for Wards 1 and 2 have been very involved with the DRIC team and with the residents in their ridings; Windsor City Council is trying their best to work with the DRIC team; the media has played a role in portraying Windsor Council as being opposed to the DRIC project.

Question: How do you rationalize differences between the required plaza size on the U.S. side and the Canadian side?

Answer: The plaza sizes are dictated by the agencies that will operate them. The Canadian plaza size of 80-100 acres meets the needs of the Canadian Border Services Agency for 2035 traffic needs and beyond. They are satisfied with that plaza size and have considered future needs. The Project cannot justify taking more land for the plaza than the border agency considers necessary.

Comment: As a Canadian citizen sitting on the LAC, I would have to agree that the LAC is more heavily comprised of elected officials. A number of elected

officials were active on the LAC until their areas were removed from the study for the new crossing. I believe that representatives of Essex County, LaSalle and Windsor City Councils should be here. We shouldn't separate elected and non-elected officials.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: I don't understand why Alternative C on the Canadian side (which is associated with X11) has not been dropped given all the logistical and brine well issues. Why has it not been removed? Other crossings were removed. If the routes are so important on the Canadian side why not address them in this forum?

Answer: This stage of the Environmental Assessment process requires that we examine a set of practical alternatives. It is important that this process be thorough and rigorous. The individual crossings have both advantages and disadvantages. The purpose of this meeting is to brief the CCG and LAC on the alternatives developed in this phase of the project. We ask that you be patient as our analysis moves forward. The route discussion was not part of tonight's agenda because it is more or less a Canadian issue, and the meeting tonight is aimed at sharing information regarding the crossing and plazas on both sides of the border. We also have limitations in terms of the amount of time we have available. The routes will be shown and discussed at the upcoming Public Information Open Houses.

Comment: I'd like to see us do more of this joint Canadian/U.S. team work — that there be more combined full meetings of the CCG and LAC.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: DRIC is not a municipal initiative and the DRIC team is not employed by the City of Windsor. The City is having a meeting tomorrow night regarding this project — people should attend to hear the City's response to what has been done so far under the DRIC process.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: Last January the project team developed an alternative on the south side of Ojibway. Plaza alternatives A and B cause the same impact as a road would to the natural features of Ojibway and Black Oaks. Plaza alternative C goes right through Sandwich. You could have done better to lessen impacts to the community of Sandwich and to the natural areas — you are jeopardizing the Black Oaks. What will be the buffer zone for the plazas and for the Black Oak Forest? Why have you respected the north side, but not the south side?

Answer: We heard from the public at the workshops to place the plaza away from Sandwich and Ojibway. The project team has tried to do that

and find a reasonable balance to meet a number of social, environmental and technical objectives. In the upcoming weeks we welcome comments on the alternatives we have developed and how they can be further refined.

Question: Suddenly, there is a new Plaza Option 5 that includes a rail line that comes right past our houses in west Delray. No one talked to Delray in creating this option. I believe this is “sneaky.”

Answer: Option #5 is the result of additional analysis and contains components of several other options. It reverses the pattern of traffic flow of Option #4. We acknowledged in the presentation made earlier that you have not seen this before, but it does represent variations of options that have been presented earlier. Abandoning the rail line that now goes through Delray has been discussed previously a number of times. We are presenting this to the LAC before we go to the public meetings. This is the usual process for displaying/discussing new information.

Comment: Continue to do a joint presentation — up to now you have been operating as two separate organizations. Make your presentations joint sessions.

Response: Comment noted - Each project team will have a set of display boards covering the various plaza and crossing options at the upcoming public meetings. We are sharing this information with the public. The Canadian and U.S. projects teams have been and continue to work closely with one another.

Question: I thought we were going to cover PM_{2.5}?

Answer: There will be no quantitative analysis for PM_{2.5} in the U.S. This is based on the recently released March 10, 2006 EPA Final Rule.

[Glenn Pothier noted that the PM_{2.5} and air quality items listed on the agenda had been addressed earlier in the meeting in response to previous questions.]

Comment: The Schwartz Report did not go through an EA process — the citizens of Windsor need to understand the relationship of the Schwartz Report and this DRIC study. This is also true for the DRTP study. The public is confused about this.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: I am confused about the air quality and social impact assessment that is to occur for this study.

Response: In the Canadian work plan, we will be looking at PM_{2.5} instead of PM₁₀. The social impact assessment was explained earlier in the slide detailing what will be looked at in terms of social impacts.

- Mohammed Alghurabi noted for the record that he had received two reports from Mrs. Leonard of the Sierra Club. The first, a National Resource Defense Council report re: school buses, and the second, a University of Michigan study on the proximity of schools to freeways.

Other Business

- Glenn Pothier asked if there was any other business that either the Canadian/U.S. Project Teams and/or CCG/LAC members would like to add to the meeting agenda. No items were identified.

Public Comment (Second Round)

- Glenn Pothier asked if any comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. The following comments and questions were offered:

Question: How many local groups are located in Sandwich? I am looking for people in Sandwich to connect with those in Delray to establish contacts, talk about issues and help set common goals.

Answer: Mary Ann Cuderman is a representative of a key community group in Sandwich and you should speak with her.

Comment: As a representative of Delray, I have been engaged in this process for a year and I would like to encourage others to join in a positive, constructive spirit as we move forward. I have worked with MDOT and Joe Corradino and have come to trust them — they have been willing to listen to and work with us. The community, as well as the Detroit City Council, seems to have gotten on-board with the project. In particular, Ken Cockrell and Joanne Watson are to be commended for standing behind the community. Some Windsor City Council members have also shown an interest in Delray and I've been impressed with them. There have been lines on the map we don't necessarily like and we have worked through some options. We don't like taking homes, especially the new railroad link shown tonight. Nevertheless, I would encourage constructive engagement and I support Sandwich Towne in these same kinds of efforts. We need an ongoing dialogue.

Response: Thank you. MDOT will try and continue to try to resolve any issues.

Next Steps/Overview of Upcoming Meetings

- Representatives of the Canadian and U.S. project teams provided a brief overview of the project's next steps, including upcoming meetings and workshops. In particular, the following were emphasized:
 - The public meetings (March 28th and 30th in Canada; March 29th in the United States).
 - Post-public meeting workshops (dates to be confirmed).
 - The next LAC meeting will be April 26th and the next CCG meeting will be April 27th (tentatively scheduled for the Windsor Holiday Inn).

Closing Remarks

- Glenn Pothier and Mohammed Alghurabi thanked the group for their attendance, participation and ongoing commitment to the process.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:35 to 9:50 p.m.).

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

CCG Members and Public Observers:

Paul Morneau	Caroline Postma
Elizabeth Morneau	Pierre Quenneville
Leona Fracas	Jim Martin
June Thibert	Nancy Pancheshan
Bob Thibert	Ian Naisbitt
Terry Kennedy, Truck Watch Coalition	Mary Ann Cuderman
Moe Haas, Citizens in Support of DRTP	Ed Oleksiuk
Larry Stiers	Frank Mallat
Mary Stiers	Helen Moore
David Baker	Tina Stagno
Kevin O'Neil	Mike Duchene, Citizens in Support of DRTP
Conrad Grant, BP Canada Energy	Carmen Micalleff
Maria Ala	Pat Morneau
Alice DiCaro, Ojibway Now!	Ray Bezaire, CPOW Citizens Protecting Ojibway
Denise Ausman	Anna Lynn Meloche
Rebecca Rudman, Concerned Citizens of LaSalle	Ron Jones, City Council
Dave Brown, BP Canada Energy	Ted Szalay
Ross Clarke, Mich-Can	Buck Sleiman
Ingrid Rose, Oakwood School	Jaye Lacerte
Ann Arquette, BGMI	William Marshall
Bill Carter, K-Scrap	Alan McKinnon
Elizabeth Havelock	Santosh Chaudhry
Ed Arditti, Ojibway Now!	Mario Iatonna
Josie Iannetta	Mario Valente
Robert J. Benson	Mark Petro, WEDC
Dennis Boismier	

LAC Members and Public Observers:

Larry Arreguin	Alex Bourgeau
Glennie Barber	Roshawn Dantes
Alison Benjamin	Amanda D'Angelo
Corki Benson	Ron Delaney
Thomas Cervenak	Sylvia Elizalde
Mike Dempsey	Chris Gulock
Tiffany Draper	Richard Huebler
Marlene Dudzinski	Paul Innes
Gale Govaere	Lisa Katz
Karen Kavanaugh	Candace Lynch
Delores Leonard	Cynthia Maxwell
Mary Loubriel	Danny Maxwell
Patrick Loubriel	B. McCallahan
Caddie Nagy	D. Miller
John Nagy	D.R. Mineau
Maria Elena Rodriquez	Heidi Mucherie
Olga Savic	David Nagy

Josephine D. Smith
Marcell Todd, Jr.
Rhonda Anderson
Charles Barbee

Dena Nagy
Jesse Nagy
Krystal Nagy
J. Parent

Partnership:

MTO

Dave Wake
Roger Ward
Joel Foster
Kevin DeVos

MDOT

Gerri Ayers
Lloyd Baldwin
Tom Hanf
Hugh McNichol
Sherry Piacenti

Consultant Teams:

Canadian Team

Murray Thompson
Len Kozachuk
Irene Hauzar
Tim Sorochinsky
Sandra Hantziagelis
Audrey Steele
Abby Salb
Grant Kauffman
Gwen Brice
Amir Iravani

U.S. Team

Craig Richardson
Rick Saporsky
Ted Stone
Bradley Touchstone