



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

Meeting Date/Location:

June 26th, 2006/Holiday Inn Select — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

This tenth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on sharing information about three key topics:

- Context sensitive solutions — that is, a variety of design options and approaches that could be used to address community concerns relating to the bridge, plaza and access roads.
- The upcoming drilling program to better understand the geology of selected parts of the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA).
- Potential locations where ventilation buildings could be placed were a tunnel to be built as part of the access road.

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of recent community consultation activities — including both recent bus tours and community workshops.
- Discuss potential sites for the placement of additional air quality monitors.
- Update members on the status of both the Canadian and U.S. initiatives.
- Provide an overview of next steps in the project, including the meetings schedule.
- Allow for public/CCG member comments and questions about issues of their choosing.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- 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 April 27/06 CCG Meeting Summary

- Glenn Pothier noted that the summary of the April 27th CCG meeting had been previously distributed to all CCG members. He then asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. No errors/omissions or concerns were identified at the meeting concerning the summary format or substance. However, post-session feedback from a CCG member who was unable to attend the June 26th meeting included:
 - A request that the following italicized passage be added to the comment on page 11 of the summary beginning “There is a risk of an ‘urban canyon’ effect...” — *The soccer and baseball fields would be downwind of the urban canyon.*
 - A request that the project team (and the CCG meeting minutes) make reference to Talbot Road when it is so named by CCG members — and not as Highway 3.

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. The following were raised:

Comment: There is not enough notification of people living on Armanda Street regarding this study — communication with residents needs to be improved. Too few people are being made aware of upcoming meetings and the project generally. You need to use better methods.

Response: The Project Team has been sending out notices of public meetings and consultation activities via Canada Post. Upcoming project meeting information is also posted on the project website (www.partnershipborderstudy.com). URS will verify the addresses on Armanda Street for its mailing list. We also hope that residents will help make each other aware of project-related developments.

Comment: Armanda Street residents should not be expected or be relied upon to assist in the project notification process. Many residents do not have access to a computer and, therefore, are unable to check for upcoming meeting notices on the website.

Response: The DRIC team also has a toll-free number [1-800-900-2649] and a local phone number [519-969-9696] and fax number [519-969-5012]. In addition, there is extensive coverage of this project in the local media. The Project Team is committed to making access to information about the project as easy as possible.

Comment: The new crossing should have a bike/pedestrian path on it to connect the two countries.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: There needs to be an improved education process regarding the impacts of this project on the community. Not enough people know about it or understand its implications.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Update on Consultation Activities

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) provided an overview of various consultation activities that have taken place since the previous CCG meeting. More specifically, he referenced the following:
 - June 8th Bus Tour of Glass City Veterans' Skyway Bridge in Toledo, Ohio and the Blue Water Bridge in Port Huron, Michigan. The tour included visits to existing crossings and surrounding neighbourhoods.
 - June 14th Tour of Delray Community (Detroit, Michigan) with the Sandwich Towne Community Task Force. The tour included an overview of ongoing redevelopment in this area and the Master Planning efforts that the U.S. Team is currently undertaking.
 - June 23rd and 24th Context Sensitive Solutions Workshops held at St. Clair College in Windsor to get input from the public regarding the look and feel of the crossing, plaza and access road options.
 - June 26th Bus Tour of Michigan Interstate roadways that provided an opportunity for the public to see first hand various freeway installations and detailed design solutions that could apply to the DRIC study.

- Mr. Kozachuk also noted that there is technical and environmental fieldwork currently being conducted as part of the analysis. The results to date of these activities will be presented by the end of the year.

- Following Mr. Kozachuk's overview as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments:

Comment: Communities on both sides of the border need to be involved in this study so that their concerns will be heard by the Project Team and included in their recommendations.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: You should consider inviting the local cable access channel to videotape the CCG meetings — this might assist with public outreach. Cable has shown a willingness to cover these kinds of community issues.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Context Sensitive Solutions

- Netami Stewart (Project Manager, PMA Landscape Architects) presented examples of different design approaches/treatments that could be used to address various community issues and concerns — this covered the same information shown at the June 23rd and 24th context sensitive solutions workshops aimed at getting input from the public on the look and fit of the bridge, plaza and access road alternatives. The examples presented had not been specifically applied to the Windsor context. Rather, they included ideas from other jurisdictions that could have local applicability.
- Following Ms. Stewart’s presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

Question: Why did you choose to show poplars given that they are very poor quality trees? Why not maples or oaks?

Answer: Poplars were shown as an example of temporary vegetation — they grow fast and would serve to fill-in space prior to phased plaza expansion. No decisions have been made about the type of trees to be planted. Maple, oak and other types of trees will be considered as well.

Comment: The new bridge needs to be a grand landmark and a point of community pride. More tunneling images need to be included in the Context Sensitive Solution images shown to the public — I’m concerned that this option is the one least represented visually.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: Look to Spain for tunnel examples that can be used in images to show the public. There are some large tunnels. Also provide images that show the transitions from at-grade to tunnel — these areas are also opportunities for context sensitive solutions.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: The cross sections shown do not provide enough room for substantial context sensitive solutions and landscape treatments. These would require you to purchase a lot more land to do the landscaping shown in your photos.

Response: The amount of available property for landscaping is limited for those areas of straight road with a 100 m right-of-way, but there are also areas where the property requirements widen out (bends and plazas). The project team will have to determine what’s possible within the areas of surplus land, and those areas that are restricted. For example, there are opportunities to plant within the median of areas that have limited widths

for landscape treatments. One example shown is the median planting near Pearson International Airport.

Question: Plazas A and B are adjacent to significant wildlife areas. We need to think long-term and try to renaturalize as much as possible. Would you replace renaturalized areas with straight rows of poplars adjacent to these significant wildlife areas?

Answer: The buffer areas surrounding the plazas would incorporate the existing natural vegetation as much as possible to limit the area requiring any grading, new plantings or renaturalization.

Comment: The plaza areas are significant in terms of bird migration routes and lighting affects birds — the lighting proposed for the plaza and crossing needs to be environmentally friendly.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: The width of the pedestrian bridges needs to be wider than typically used over freeways and they need to have more greenspace incorporated into them.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Drilling Program

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) noted that there is an upcoming drilling program that will take place adjacent to the Detroit River waterfront. He also introduced Storer Boone, from Golder Associates, who will oversee the bore hole-drilling program and provided a brief overview of Mr. Boone's background (over 20 years of experience, including work on bridge and tunneling projects around the world).
- During his presentation, Mr. Boone explained that the purpose of the drilling program is to better understand the geology in the area of the crossings and to confirm the suitability of the soils and rock conditions around the sites. He also noted that the data provided in his presentation regarding depths and soil types is based on borehole data. In addition, Mr. Boone provided an overview of work to date and upcoming activities:
 - The geotechnical investigation started with vibration tests to identify underground areas of concern or 'anomalies.' These anomalies will be investigated further with boreholes to provide a better understanding of the suitability of crossing sites.
 - There are three drilling contracts and 12 holes that will be taken in two general areas around Crossings B and C (Crossing A is not in the vicinity

- of any known brine wells). One out of six boreholes will have core samples taken out of it.
- Blowout protection will be used to prevent the release of gases. Holes will be sealed and abandoned after investigation.
 - The borehole program includes vibration tests to identify areas of concern.
- During and following Mr. Boone's presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

Question: What is the cost of the drilling program?

Answer: The drilling program is currently being put out to tender and contractors are actively bidding on the project. Therefore, we cannot discuss cost at this time. For a similar number of boreholes, the U.S. drilling program is estimated at \$500 million USD.

Question: Does the basic pattern of brine mining also occur across the Detroit River?

Answer: Yes, it is similar. However, it does vary by elevation — the salt layer extends under the River to the U.S. side.

Question: Is the solution mining better recorded in Canada than in the U.S.? There are some mines on the U.S. side that are not well recorded.

Answer: Though the records may not always tell us what was taken out of the ground, we do know where the wells are located.

Question: What technology will be employed for sealing the boreholes once they are drilled? What is the depth of the drilling?

Answer: The holes will be filled with concrete and closed according to industry protocols. The boreholes will be drilled to a depth of 500m.

Question: The middle set of boreholes is in close proximity to a neighbourhood. What noise mitigation will be used?

Answer: Noise bylaws will be adhered to — work will occur between 7 A.M. and 7 P.M. and no work will occur on Sundays or holidays.

Question: If a new bridge were to be constructed in the area of the Ambassador Bridge, would this drilling program-related investigation work be required?

Answer: No salt extraction activity occurred in the area of the Ambassador Bridge, but drilling would be required to confirm the geological suitability of the crossing site.

Question: What goes into the drilling of sites?

Answer: Based on the location of the crossing, equipment must be chosen to fit the site — the equipment may vary from site to site. Holes need to be in prescribed relative proximity to one another.

Question: Would the drilling be able to map sulfur in the region?

Answer: We are not hunting for sulfur veins, but the presence of sulfur would be noted in the drilling logs.

Question: The presence of the tanks at Sterling Fuels precludes the Crossing C location. Why are we continuing with the investigation in this area — isn't it a waste of time and money?

Answer: It is not certain that the tanks preclude a crossing in this area. We are having potential safety and security issues reviewed by the RCMP regarding the risks of having a crossing in the vicinity of a fuel depot.

Question: You are drilling down 500m for your borehole program — how far down do you have to drill to determine suitability for a bridge structure?

Answer: We do not have to drill down to 500m for the bridge footing. However, we need to determine if the supporting bedrock is stable.

Question: Will you be testing the soil conditions near the access road locations in addition to the testing you are conducting near the shoreline?

Answer: The current drilling program will address brine well concerns and crossing location suitability. A separate program with a different scope will be undertaken for the access road and plaza alternatives.

Question: Are there certain areas, such as the East side, where the bedrock is not a concern?

Answer: The brine well areas are of concern. Away from these, the bedrock is likely to be stable.

Question: If you find areas of instability, how will you mitigate this?

Answer: If there are small voids that are found, we could possibly fill them in — the size of any voids will be a consideration in developing any mitigation.

Question: What is the cost difference between building a 1 KM bridge versus a tunnel?

Answer: They are generally comparable for the crossing itself, but the approach roadways will be a larger consideration for a tunnel. Tunneling the approach roadways would be much more expensive than a bridge.

Comment: There is underground storage of hydrocarbons in the area. There are also major pipelines where the hydrocarbons are stored.

Response: We are aware of these storage areas. BP Petroleum uses the old brine wells to store its hydrocarbons — they are stored in the deepest of the salt layers and are maintained and stable. The gas pipelines in this area are nationally significant and we are aware of them.

Tunneling-Ventilation Buildings

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) provided an overview of where ventilation buildings could be located along the access route were a part-route or full-route tunnel to be the selected option. He noted that the Project Team is considering whether there should be one large ventilation building or two or three smaller buildings along the access road and that ventilation buildings could be 8-10 stories in height.
- Mr. Thompson also noted that the Project Team — working together with RWDI, the ventilation building specialists — will be identifying two potential locations for a ventilation building. He invited the group to offer their suggestions about best locations for where ventilation buildings might be placed.
- Prior to sharing suggestions for where ventilation buildings might be placed, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

Question: Can you bury the ventilation buildings?

Answer: You can partially bury them. However, the stacks on the buildings must be able to filter out tunnel exhaust into the atmosphere. They often have multiple stacks that operate at different rates. The ventilation buildings are not only used to ventilate air — they are also used for safety purposes.

Question: How far away from the roadway can a ventilation building be sited?

Answer: The further from the road, the more costly it would become to operate a ventilation building.

Question: Where are they usually placed?

Answer: Ventilation buildings are usually placed adjacent to the road.

Question: Can you place the ventilation buildings on vacant land away from residential areas?

Answer: At some point in that scenario the operation of the ventilation building will be compromised — effectiveness is typically reduced the farther it is located from the roadway.

Question: Can you bring some examples to the CCG of where ventilation buildings are located on industrial/vacant land and/or away from the roadway?

Answer: We will conduct research to see if such examples exist.

Comment: I can see the ventilation buildings being in open areas.

Response: If there are open areas that are available the Project Team will look for these opportunities.

Question: Could you design smaller ventilation buildings so that they will be less imposing?

Answer: We will take that suggestion to RWDI and see if it's possible. However, even if you have smaller buildings, you still need sufficient height for the stacks to allow for dispersion.

Comment: Small, high-speed fans associated with smaller ventilation buildings produce more noise than large, low-speed fans associated with larger buildings.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: Any idea what the decibel level is associated with ventilation buildings?

Answer: We can do a lot with the performance specifications of the buildings. Once we have decided on their locations, we will find out the potential noise level and design them to minimize concerns in this area.

Question: Is there anything you can do to help mitigate the look of the ventilation buildings — for example, using landscape architecture?

Answer: We could put in berms or partially sink the building, or place a lot of evergreen trees around it. Once it is located and designed, we will ask

PMA Landscape Architects to provide appropriate screening and treatments.

- CCG members suggested the following locations as potential sites for the ventilation buildings:
 - North of Todd Lane west of Huron Church Road— that location is zoned for commercial development and is opposite Oakwood School.
 - South of Todd Lane, east of Huron Church (at the Sandcastle Club).
 - Cousineau Road across from St. Clair College (on the vacant land in LaSalle).
 - Between Sandwich Parkway and Heritage Dr. (behind Windsor Crossing).
 - On vacant land in Tecumseh (if the tunnel is extended).
 - At the end of the Hwy. 401 area near Highway 3.
 - At the Ontario Public Health Laboratory on Huron Church Rd.
- In addition to the siting suggestions described above, CCG members also offered the following observations:
 - The ventilation buildings should be built to look like apartment buildings, with planted trees and flowering shrubs to help screen them.
 - Use soil excavated from tunnel construction to create large berms and place the ventilation buildings behind them.
 - There are several schools along the route and they are sensitive sites — ventilation buildings should not be placed near them.

Air Quality Monitoring

- [Note: the Project Team added the following item to the meeting agenda.]
- Regarding air quality impact assessment, Len Kozachuk noted that the Ontario Government has agreed to set-up two monitoring stations along the Huron Church Road/Highway 3 corridor and that the Project Team is interested in CCG member suggestions for where the stations might be located. Mr. Kozachuk also noted that the stations will be temporary facilities that have certain requirements: access to AC power; placement in open air locations; unrestricted air flow; and appropriate security given that the portable monitoring stations are expensive and would need to be protected from vandalism or theft.
- CCG members suggested the following locations as potential sites for the portable air quality monitoring stations:
 - The Ontario Public Health Laboratory on Huron Church.
 - The Windsor Crossing Parking Lot.
 - St. Clair College.
 - The areas of Cabana/Cousineau/Howard at Huron Church/Highway 3(as close to the intersection as possible).
 - Near Bellewood School.

- CCG Member Jim Martin's offered his residence on Talbot Rd as a possible location.
- In addition to the siting suggestions described above, CCG members also offered the following questions and comments:

Question: Would the Project Team be using the data provided at a recent meeting hosted by Health Canada?

Answer: That data is preliminary and will not be available for the Project Team to use in developing the model, but will serve as a useful check of the model output for existing conditions.

Question: If it is determined that there is five times higher air quality impacts along the access road, but that it is still below the standard, are ventilation buildings still going to be proposed?

Answer: The Project Team will primarily be using the results of the air quality impact assessment to compare the alternatives. Mitigating impacts will be addressed with the selected alternative. The effectiveness of ventilation buildings in reducing local negative air quality impacts would need to be studied — perhaps other more effective mitigation measures may be identified.

Comment: The Project Team should contact David Andrews, who provided input on tunneling to the choosetunneling.com group.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: How would you take into account changes in air quality in the next few years?

Answer: The models used for air quality impact assessment are highly sophisticated models developed by the U.S. EPA and accepted for use in Canada by Canadian agencies. These models make it possible to incorporate changes in air quality due to developments in fuels/engine technology, changes in vehicle fleet mix, or changes in the local airshed. The impact assessment will test various scenarios including overall changes to air quality with each alternative, versus the 'do nothing' alternative.

Open Forum/Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier asked whether the Project Team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. Mr. Kozachuk noted that vibration testing would be commencing in the near future and that members of the community may see equipment (on the Huron Church/Highway 3 Corridor) that will be used for this purpose.
- Glenn Pothier then asked whether CCG members had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. The following questions/comments were offered:

Question: Is the Project Team concerned about the U.S. House and Senate potentially removing funding for the DRIC study in October?

Answer: The Canadian Partners assume that the money will continue to be available to continue this study on the U.S. side.

Question: At the beginning of the meeting it was mentioned that this study includes an economic comparison — what are the economic effects of this project as suggested by Al Teshuba's report?

Answer: The Teshuba study is more regional in scope. The Project Team will look at the data and consider it with ours. We are also collecting more local data as part of the Hemson consultant evaluation of economic impacts.

Question: Has Steve Salmon (Premier's Office) requested that the DRIC project study the option of separating international truck traffic from auto traffic by making the tunnel for international trucks only?

Answer: No, however, a meeting with Mr. Salmon is scheduled for the next day.

- Glenn Pothier then asked if any comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time:

Comment: A Detroit news channel mentioned that Detroit has the worst air quality of any U.S. city.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: I have not heard much at this meeting about the potential impact that the results of this crossing project might have on people.

Response: In fact, this has been a key point of many discussions at previous CCG meetings. Impacts on people and the community are key factors being considered.

Next Steps

- Len Kozachuk noted that the next CCG meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 31st and that the meeting agenda will be distributed in advance.

Closing Remarks

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:35 to 9:40 p.m.).

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

CCG Members and Public Observers:

Moe Haas
Ed Arditti
Bob Oliver
Mary Ann Cuderman
Terry Kennedy
Anna Lynn Meloche
Tedd Szalay
Bonnie Durocher
Jim Martin
Alice DiCaro
L. Sharp
L. Malizia
Michael Branton
Susan and Luciano Del Col
Simone Sagovac
Sue Malizia
Patrick Malizia
Connie Van den Steene
J. Lacerte
Mary and Larry Stiers
Dan Grosu
Floyd Sewart
Al Teshuba
James White
Mike Duchene
Robert J. Benson
Ken Delisle
Wayne Lessard
Pierre Quenneville

Partnership:

Dave Wake and Joel Foster — MTO

Consultant Team:

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Tim Sorochinsky, Colin Wong, Irene Hauzar, Sandra Hantziagelis — URS; Audrey Steele — LGL Limited; Dave MacLeod — Hemson Associates; Netami Stewart — PMA Landscape Architects; Storer Boone — Golder Associates; Abby Selb — SENES Consulting