



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

---

Meeting Date/Location:

October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2006/Holiday Inn Select — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

## **Meeting Purpose**

This twelfth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on sharing information about recent consultation activities and updating the group on some key issues. More specifically, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of the Context Sensitive Solution (CSS) Access Road and Plaza Workshops and Social Impact Assessment Focus Groups — and the upcoming Bridge-related workshops.
- Update members on air quality monitoring — rationales for the site selection of the new monitors, the monitoring and analysis plan generally, the essence of the air quality modeling process, and so forth.
- Update members on the overall status of both the Canadian and U.S. initiatives — including the drilling programs on both sides of the border.
- 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.

In addition, a component of the meeting was focused on re-confirming the CCG's purpose/role and seeking input on potential enhancements regarding the future conduct of the Group.

## **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 September 6/06 CCG Meeting Summary***

- Glenn Pothier noted that the summary of the September 6<sup>th</sup> CCG meeting had been previously distributed to all CCG members. He then asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. None were identified concerning the summary format or substance. However, there was a request, made later in the meeting, to get the summary to members in a more timely fashion (given that it can be difficult to recall meeting specifics after a significant passage of time). The Project Team and facilitator committed to work diligently to get the meeting summary to members in a timely manner.

### *Confirmation of CCG Purpose and Role*

- Glenn Pothier noted that the composition of the CCG has evolved over time — that some are original members who participated in the first discussion of the Group’s purpose/role, while others have joined quite recently and may be less knowledgeable in this regard. Membership changes were anticipated from the beginning and not unexpected given the identification of the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA) and the implications this narrowing of the area for geographic study has had on interest levels — serving to lessen interest among some and heighten it among others.
- Mr. Pothier noted that he wanted to review the CCG’s purpose/role with the whole group for three reasons:
  - To ensure that all members — in particular, new ones — are operating from a common understanding and set of assumptions;
  - To help ensure that meetings are as constructive and productive as possible — and that meaningful dialogue is maximized; and
  - To invite feedback on the facilitator’s performance and ideas for meeting enhancements.
- Mr. Pothier noted that the first CCG meeting was held in May 2005 and the Group’s purpose/role (see below) was discussed and confirmed at that time:
  - Dialogue and information exchange;
  - Advice/input on and joint exploration of key issues;
  - A sounding board: review/comment on project materials, tools and reports;
  - Liaison — a conduit to/from the community; and
  - Facilitate effective/efficient project completion.He also noted that the Project Team was committed to listening, seriously considering and being respectful of member’s views, perspectives and opinions.
- Mr. Pothier explained that through the ensuing discussion in the May 2005 meeting, the following points were clarified:
  - The CCG does not have decision-making authority — its focus is dialogue and information/perspective sharing (it’s a forum for discussion);
  - The CCG is not construed to be nor is it considered representative of the broader populations of the Canadian border communities;
  - The CCG will not be ‘voting’ on preferred crossing alternatives/solutions;
  - The CCG will not be issuing statements as a collective to the broader public; and
  - The work of the CCG would be transparent (meeting summaries will be available to the public; the public may attend meetings as observers).

- Mr. Pothier then asked the group for feedback on his performance as the Group’s independent facilitator and for any ideas on how the CCG meetings might be made more productive or effective. In response, CCG members indicated widespread satisfaction with Mr. Pothier’s performance and meeting management. Given meeting time constraints, one member suggested that the facilitator and project team as a whole work to ensure efficiency — that timelines be enforced, that the essence of a question/comment be clarified, that repetition be minimized and circular discussions curtailed, and that ‘don’t know’ be accepted as a valid response assuming follow-up at a future meeting or through additions in the meeting summary.

***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 question was raised:

*Question:* The response to the question referenced in the September 6<sup>th</sup> CCG meeting summary at the bottom of page 7 — about whether the Project Team considered tunneling as part of the original 15 alternatives — was not adequate. What’s the full answer to the question?

*Response:* The Project Team evaluated the 15 illustrative alternatives based on surface impacts. All surface impacts were documented as part of the major evaluation factor groups (changes to air quality, protecting community and neighbourhood characteristics, maintaining consistency with existing and planned land use, protecting cultural resources, protecting the natural environment, improving regional mobility, cost and constructability). Cost of the tunneling options was not part of the evaluation of the illustrative alternatives.

***CCG Member Comments/Questions***

- Glenn then invited CCG members to share any comments or questions with the group as a whole that would not logically fit under any of the upcoming meeting agenda items. The following were raised:

*Question:* Was tunneling considered to be an option only after the public requested that it be studied? Does the Project Team feel obligated to look at tunneling the routes for the other alternatives previously studied?

*Response:* There is a difference between tunneling the crossing and the access route. In the fall of 2005, the Project Team studied tunneling under the Detroit River and found that it was not feasible. The Project Team recognizes that tunneling is a way to help mitigate surface impacts and is looking seriously at this option — our own analysis and public input took

us in this direction. The Project Team will not go back to evaluate tunneling along the DRTP route or the other non-ACA illustrative alternatives. The DRTP was evaluated and not pursued given a variety of concerns — for example, issues associated with tunneling, land use impacts, economic impacts, and the need for suitable locations for the Canadian and U.S. inspection plazas. We will continue to study at grade, depressed, and tunnel options as part of the access road corridor analysis that is currently taking place.

*Comment/Question:* The DRTP is already in place. Will DRIC look at the other tunneling groups and their recommendations? You could tunnel to the proposed replacement bridge as discussed at the June 1<sup>st</sup> *Choose Tunneling* conference.

*Response:* The Project Team has determined that the new access road will be located on Highway 3/Huron Church Road as represented in the Area of Continued Analysis. The ACA represents the best balance of transportation needs and potential impacts. Tunneling is being studied within this corridor as part of the access road alternatives.

*Comment:* There has recently been some presentations by the Ambassador Bridge Company regarding construction of a second span adjacent to the existing Ambassador Bridge, and repairs to the existing span. The new bridge would be a six-lane crossing. The meetings that DRIC has held during this same timeframe have dealt with aesthetic treatments to the proposed new crossing and do not address this much more significant issue of a twinned Ambassador Bridge. I'm fearful about ending up with the Bridge company's proposal. The Project Team needs to comment as to where the project is heading relative to the Ambassador Bridge Company's proposed plans.

*Response:* The new structure proposed by the Ambassador Bridge Company is an entirely separate initiative from the DRIC project. The DRIC Project Team studied an option of twinning the Ambassador Bridge and removed it from further consideration due, in part, to the unacceptable impacts to Sandwich associated with the required expansion of the plaza at the Ambassador Bridge, and the lack of redundancy in roadway and crossing options. A second span will require approval under the Canadian Federal Environmental Assessment Act — this will require an open process in which the public can participate. A notice has been placed for the Ambassador Bridge Company project on the CEAA website. The link is as follows: [www.ceaa.gc.ca/050/viewer\\_e.cfm?SrchPg=1&CEAR\\_ID=21100](http://www.ceaa.gc.ca/050/viewer_e.cfm?SrchPg=1&CEAR_ID=21100). The scope of the Bridge Company's proposal is not yet final. Transport Canada and the Windsor Port Authority are the key review agencies for this proposal. On the U.S. side, a similar environmental review process is underway, involving the U.S. Coast Guard and other environmental agencies. The approval processes in place in both Canada and the U.S. will

address issues associated with building a second span. The DRIC project team cannot predict the outcome of the Bridge Company's initiative.

The Project Team has conducted workshops relating to the aesthetic treatments to the access road and plazas in order to help determine the look and fit of the transportation facility on the community. Although it may seem premature to some, it is a necessary component to help determine what the community feels are the physical attributes to be incorporated once a preferred alternative is chosen. Remember that the discussion around aesthetics is just one component of a diverse, comprehensive and rigorous workplan.

*Comment:* If the Ambassador Bridge is twinned, there will be a large portion of traffic using city streets to access the crossing. One of the fundamental concerns I have about the DRIC process is that it does not appear to be adequately dealing with the issue of continued traffic to and from the Ambassador Bridge — this needs to be taken into account as part of traffic planning and management.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

### ***Update on Consultation Activities***

- Irene Hauzar (Senior Environmental Planner, URS Canada) provided an overview of various consultation activities that have taken place in the recent past. More specifically, she referenced selected key findings from both the October 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Workshops concerning the access route/plaza and the October 21<sup>st</sup> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Focus Groups.
- Regarding the CSS Workshops, Ms. Hauzar:
  - Described the content and purpose of the Workshops, and the number of attendees.
  - Noted that the Project Team had developed three themes — based on public input from earlier this year — on the look and fit of the access road and plaza. The *Rose City* theme brings to mind the cultural heritage of Windsor and includes formal plantings and landscaping that is reminiscent of classical turn-of-the-century parks and gardens. The *Carolinian* theme brings to mind the natural heritage of the Detroit River and Windsor-Essex area, and incorporates a naturalized look — with native trees, lots of shrubs and grasses, rolling hills and softer textures. The *Motor City* theme includes aspects of both past and future technologies, and includes linear plantings, glass, steel and concrete accents and state-of-the-art lighting and signage. [Examples of each theme were shown to the Group.]
  - Noted that most of the workshop participants favoured the *Carolinian* theme, given its perceived natural look and ease of maintenance. The *Rose City* theme was considered generally attractive, though the expense associated with maintenance was a concern to many. The *Motor City*

theme was the least favoured, due to its contemporary look which some participants felt could soon appear dated.

- Provided an overview of various landscape features that should be considered for the access road and plazas.
- Regarding the SIA Focus Groups, Ms. Hauzar:
  - Noted that residents who will be potentially disrupted and/or displaced by the various alternative access road options, inspection plaza and crossing locations were invited to attend the focus groups — approximately 80 residents participated.
  - Provided an overview of the Workshop exercise in which participants defined their neighbourhood boundaries and described how they interact within the community — including where they shop for groceries, worship and recreate. Participants also discussed how they feel about their community, how they use their property and how the proposed project may have an impact on those uses.
  - Noted that data gathered from the focus groups together with input received at public meetings, open houses, and various correspondence will inform the impact assessment of the practical alternatives across the seven major analysis factors.
- Following Ms. Hauzar’s overview as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

*Question:* Who was invited to the Focus Groups and how many were invited? I didn’t receive an invitation — was anyone from Sandwich invited?

*Response:* Invitations to participate in the Social Impact Assessment were sent to residents that live 200 m from Crossing C.

*Comment:* I only heard about the focus groups on the Friday before they were to be held. I got a call on too short notice.

*Response:* Everyone in the area identified should have received a letter invitation by mail. The calls were a follow-up to help boost attendance levels and remind people of the Focus Groups.

*Question:* Was the bridge design discussed at the Context Sensitive Solutions workshops?

*Response:* No, only the access routes and plazas. The Bridge design workshop is upcoming. We’ll be talking more about it later tonight.

### ***Project Update***

- Glenn Pothier introduced the next meeting component — namely a Project Team update on three topics: air quality monitoring, the upcoming Context Sensitive Solutions Bridge Workshops, and the general status of the Canadian and U.S. DRIC initiatives.

*Presentation on Tunneling*

- Abby Salb (Air Quality Specialist, SENES Consultants) presented information on the current air quality monitoring currently occurring in Windsor and analytical modeling that is underway. In so doing, Ms. Salb:
  - Noted that there are two new air quality monitoring stations within the ACA — one beside the health lab, the other opposite the entrance to St. Clair College.
  - Described the rationales for the placement of the new monitors and described their purpose and how the data would be used.
  - Described the various pollutants that will be measured, including PM10 and PM 2.5 — and noted that the approach would also look at meteorological data and allow for coordinated data capture with passing traffic.
  - Noted that both stations would run continuously, with measurements automatically taken every hour of every day — and manual samples collected twice a week on different days of the week.
  - Described how air quality impacts will be modeled and assessed — and that air dispersion models will be set-up for each of the alternatives.
  - Noted that the air quality model that will be used is specifically designed for highway and road scenarios, and takes into account such factors as ‘moving’ vs. ‘idling’ vehicles, and ‘at grade’ versus ‘below grade’ roads, and so forth. For the plaza sites, the air quality modeling will include projected traffic volumes, inspection booths in operation, and projected queue times.
  - Noted that the model also takes into account ‘sensitive receptors’ such as schools.
  - Explained that the air quality monitoring will reveal if there is any time where air quality will be in excess of federal and provincial standards — and that results of the modeling will be incorporated into the Social Impact Assessment.
- During and following Ms. Salb’s presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

*Question:* Can the monitoring stations exclude holidays, when there is less traffic? When can you start using the data?

*Response:* The monitors will not exclude any particular day. It’s important to monitor every day, especially holidays, because that allows for comparisons of significant differences in the data. All measurements are



compared to established Provincial and Federal data. The Project Team will use an air dispersion model to demonstrate various scenarios. The dispersion modeling will help indicate the impacts associated with changes in traffic volumes. It is important to note that the first grouping of data will be ready in less than a month. It is not necessary to model for the entire year before making use of the data.

*Question:* How is noise pollution assessed?

*Response:* There are documented procedures that help determine noise impacts — areas are monitored and areas with similar traffic conditions are taken into account. There are other specialists from SENES who are working on this on behalf of the Project Team. [Note: Glenn Pothier suggested that a presentation on noise assessment be a future CCG meeting agenda item — there was group concurrence with the suggestion and a request that the presentation also address the issue of ‘engine braking’.]

*Comment/Question:* The wind in Windsor is predominately from the west to the east and includes air pollution from elsewhere. The air monitoring station is currently on the southwest side. Are you getting an accurate measurement?

*Response:* In any hour of the day, the direction of the wind changes. The purpose of the air quality monitoring station is to establish existing conditions around the roadway. This includes wind direction variations. When the wind comes from the west, it carries with it other pollutants and this is part of the overall picture and will be recorded. There is also a monitoring station on the west side of Huron Church Road at the Public Health Laboratory site.

*Comment:* The air quality data collected at St. Clair College may need to be altered because it is coming from the west side.

*Response:* There is no altering of data — the air quality monitoring stations measure concentrations where they exist.

*Question/Comment:* As part of your modeling, are you considering new identification procedures — such as the need for passports — that will be employed at the border crossing? These may result in longer wait times, more idling and traffic build-up.

*Response:* The example you gave is not currently factored into the model. However, the effect of any new identification requirements can be incorporated in the impact assessment.

*Question:* Is it possible to have access to summaries of the raw data being collected for the air quality monitoring?

*Response:* We will make summaries of the data available to the CCG and the broader public.

*Question:* There are upcoming changes in fuel, technology and in vehicle engines, most notably trucks. Are you considering this in your model and subsequent evaluation?

*Response:* All new technologies are being considered in the model — fuel regulations are changing and the truck fleet turnover rate is factored in. The modeling will look at known potential future changes regarding technological advances.

*Question:* If great improvements in fuel and technology are achieved, will there even be a problem with air quality? Is this something we need to spend a lot of time and money studying?

*Response:* We can all anticipate great improvements, but cannot be assured of them. Regardless, we need to rigorously model potential air quality impacts. This is important to the study and in-line with community expectations.

*Comment/Question:* Air pollution is linked to high levels of cancer in the Windsor area. Is the Project Team going to improve air quality?

*Response:* The DRIC project is not about improving air quality — we are focused on minimizing any impacts that new transportation facilities might have in this area. There are provincial and federal guidelines to be used when conducting an air quality assessment. The Project Team will look at changes in concentrations among the alternatives as well as in comparison to future and existing conditions.

*Question:* If modeled pollution concentrations for a particular alternative are beyond federal/provincial standards, will you eliminate that alternative?

*Response:* Not necessarily. In such instances, mitigation measures could be used to help offset impacts. Change to air quality is one factor to be considered in the assessment of alternatives.

*Question:* Are you aware that the air quality issues in Windsor are not only a result of truck traffic?

*Response:* Yes. We understand that a portion of the pollutants come from sources unrelated to transportation, such as Zug Island and the Ohio Valley in the United States. This data will be added to all our modeling.

*Question:* Why isn't humidity measured as part of your air quality monitoring program? How often are the air quality monitoring stations manually checked for 'clogs'? Does or will the air quality model take into account partial roadway obstructions such as: road work/closures, accidents, border security events, etc. — and the pollution concentration peaks they may cause?

*Response:* Air quality models do not use humidity as part of the model measurements. The models that are used to assess changes in air quality do not use relative humidity as part of the measurements that are taken. Humidity is not a parameter that is part of this study. The air quality monitoring stations are checked/maintained/calibrated every two weeks. It is impossible to predict the severity of accidents or other traffic altering events — they are not part of the day-to-day operations of a road and are not typically considered in the modeling exercise.

*Question:* Will the air quality monitors or your model be able to tell the difference between pollutants coming from background land uses/industrial sources compared to pollutants from vehicle traffic?

*Response:* Yes, the model is able to tell the difference from what is coming in from the road compared to the background conditions.

*Question:* Are you taking air quality measurements from the existing Ambassador Bridge Plaza? From where are you getting truck idling information?

*Response:* The Project Team has truck idling data from all across North America and will be using that data in the modeling. The Ambassador Bridge is privately owned — we will not be taking measurements from this facility.

*Comment:* The message communicated at a recent meeting at the University of Windsor was that air quality in Windsor was exceptionally good — Windsor residents do not agree. There are real issues of trust. We need to be confident that you will use the data properly and interpret it correctly.

*Response:* Regarding the meeting you referenced, the Health Department was comparing air quality data that was collected in other areas of Ontario with the City of Windsor. There are other municipalities in Ontario that have worse air quality given the industries located there. In part, this is why Windsor's air quality was described as exceptionally good. Our air quality modeling and analysis will be rigorous — the data and findings will be openly available. We're committed to doing this properly.

*Question:* Are air quality measurements being taken at the existing crossings — the bridge and the tunnel?

*Response:* The bridge and tunnel air quality statistics are not public information. They are collected by private enterprises. Moreover, the manner in which the information is collected and the sensitivity of the instruments used raises some questions about data reliability. The Project Team is using data that is provided by the Ministry of Environment, which is considered valid and accurate. The data collected by the Ministry is publicly available. The data used by the DRIC team will be publicly available as well.

*Question:* Are you assuming that many trucks will fill-up with less expensive, but poorer quality U.S. gas?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* Is the air quality model based on U.S. (California) or Toronto studies and data?

*Response:* We will be using Windsor-specific data in the modeling. The model itself was developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and is based on information from across North America, including data collected in California.

*Comment:* It's surprising that humidity is not factored into the model — it has an impact on air quality.

*Response:* None of the air quality models incorporate humidity — we won't be accounting for this factor in the analysis.

*Question:* What is the age of the equipment being used for the air quality modeling?

*Response:* Most of the equipment is new.

*Question:* What are the years on which you are basing your analysis?

*Response:* The threshold years that will be analyzed are 2015, 2025, and 2035.

*Question:* Will you be taking air quality readings from around the existing bridge and plaza sites?

*Response:* No, for the reasons mentioned earlier.

*Comment:* Emissions statistics are different in Canada compared to the U.S.

*Response:* We know this — these differences are accounted for.

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) then reminded the CCG that the air quality specialists retained for this project are independent professionals with the requisite technical skills and experience. They are scientists who are committed to doing a thorough and accurate job. The air quality workplan has been submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Environment Canada for approval. All work conducted on this project is done with the highest possible professionalism and objectivity — and must stand-up to scrutiny.

#### *Overview of Upcoming CSS Bridge Workshops*

- Len Kozachuk then provided an overview of the upcoming Context Sensitive Solution Bridge Workshops to be held on November 2nd (in Detroit) and 15th (in Windsor) in collaboration with the U.S. Project Team. He noted that:
  - The bridge will be an important, highly visible landmark in the community.
  - The Workshops are being heavily and widely promoted — and asked that CCG members help spread the work to maximize participation.
  - The Workshops are all about the look and fit of the crossing — and will allow the public to identify their preferences for the bridge (lighting, colour and so forth), the type of bridge, and the theme for the new crossing.
  - The workshops are being conducted as a drop-in format, with computerized workstations.
  - Participants will be able to take away a representative image showing their preferences.
  - There will also be workbooks available for participants that are not comfortable using the computer terminals and a bridge architect would be available to sketch ideas onsite.
  - Specific crossing locations will not be examined as part of the workshop exercise.
- Following Mr. Kozachuk’s presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

*Question:* What was the dominant bridge type selected by participants at the June Context Sensitive Solutions workshop — did DRIC post the number of how many preferred a cable stay versus suspension bridge?

*Response:* Though we didn’t tabulate and post the exact numbers, I can tell you that participants’ in the June workshops were about evenly split between the cable stay and suspension bridge options. Our intent was to qualitatively gauge responses to them. There were two themes that were generally supported by participants at the June workshops and at the August Local Advisory Committee (LAC) workshop: *friendship* and

*history.* A bridge architect has attempted to convey these two themes in the bridge designs and we are looking for comments on them.

*Comment/Question:* Many who come out to these meetings are commuters, some of whom travel back and forth between Windsor and Detroit everyday. Will there be a workshop on signage/directions from the point-of-view of road and crossing users?

*Response:* Thank you — we will note this as an idea to consider.

### *Other Canadian/U.S. Activities*

- Len Kozachuk then provided an overview of and update on selected project activities on the Canadian side:
  - The Project Team is continuing to collect data and move forward with the assessment of practical alternatives.
  - The geotechnical drilling program, air quality monitoring and modeling, noise modeling and traffic work are all continuing.
  - The natural environment specialists are currently conducting their assessment of impacts, with three seasons of fieldwork completed thus far.
- Mohammed Alghurabi (Michigan Department of Transportation) then provided an overview of and update on selected project activities on the American side:
  - The upcoming CSS Bridge Workshops are an important initiative — hopefully, many will choose to attend and participate.
  - The U.S. Project Team is working to secure the requisite permits and right of entry permissions to begin their geotechnical drilling program — the drilling on the American side is anticipated to begin in early December.
  - The American team is also continuing with the data collection and impact assessment.

### *Other Upcoming Meetings*

- Len Kozachuk noted that the next CCG meeting would be conducted jointly with the U.S. LAC and will be held Wednesday, November 29, at 7:00 p.m. at the Southwestern High School, 6921 Fort Street, Detroit, MI 48209. A number of CCG members indicated an interest in ride-sharing to the event. [Please note that bus service will be provided to those CCG members that are interested in attending. A Windsor Transit bus will be at Mic Mac Park parking lot (opposite the Novelletto Rosati Complex, 3939 Carmichael Avenue). The bus will be leaving at 5:45 p.m. sharp. Proper photo identification is required to leave and enter Canada. The bus will return to the Mic Mac parking lot after the meeting, which will likely run until approximately 9:30 p.m.]

- At the November 29<sup>th</sup> joint CCG/LAC meeting, data collected for each of the seven major analysis factors will be presented, as a prelude to the upcoming Public Information Open Houses to be held in early December (December 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> in Windsor). Though not yet complete, the analysis to date for all of the practical alternatives will be available for review.
- 
- Following the above noted joint session, the next CCG meeting is likely to be in January 2007. A notice will be sent to CCG members when a date has been set.

### *Open Forum/Public Comment*

- Glenn Pothier asked whether the Project Team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No issues were raised.
- Glenn Pothier then asked whether CCG members had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. The following questions/comments were noted:

*Question:* Will there be a summary of the joint CCG/LAC meeting?

*Response:* Yes.

*Question:* Will smog be incorporated into the air quality analysis?

*Response:* We understand that there will be smog days and the air quality monitors will capture data when these events occur. Smog days will occur regardless of which transportation alternative may be chosen.

*Comment:* Please provide the street address and zip code for Southwestern High School in Detroit.

*Response:* [Note: As shown above in the ‘other upcoming meetings’ component of this summary, the address and zip code are as follows: Southwestern High School, 6921 Fort Street, Detroit, MI 48209.

*Question:* Is it possible at this point in the study to go back and re-review the DRTP proposal or other eliminated alternatives?

*Response:* While it is not impossible to review it again, the Project Team gave the DRTP proposal a thorough assessment last year and concluded that this option should be eliminated from further study. Other alternatives provide comparable transportation benefits with lower community impacts on the Canadian side, and were more cost-effective in terms of meeting the needs of the project and having acceptable impacts on the U.S. side. On an end-to-end basis, the disadvantages of the rail corridor option outweighed the advantages. Though we would review any new proposals, what we have seen to date would not change the Project Team’s views.

*Question:* If you go back and reconsider one alternative, doesn't that open the door to having to reconsider them all?

*Response:* While we have not completely shut the door on new or enhanced proposals, to date we have not been convinced of the need to conduct detailed analysis of options other than those currently under consideration within the ACA.

*Question:* There is a lot of uncertainty among homeowners and businesses located on Huron Church regarding the future. What can the Project Team do to help alleviate the uncertainty? Will there be any compensation for people?

*Response:* We understand that there is a lot of uncertainty for both homeowners and business owners located along Huron Church Road. The Project Team will complete the study as quickly as possible while providing opportunities for consultation and information sharing. If property or business owners have specific concerns, they are encouraged to speak with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation directly — these will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

*Comment:* I am pleased that there will be full disclosure of data by the Project team to the residents of Windsor. I am pleased with the process that is being followed and would like to thank the Project Team. In the past, when a private sector interest, such as the Ambassador Bridge, did monitoring, the public could not access the data and had to go through the time consuming and costly expense of having to launch a freedom of information request.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* How many invitations were sent out for the SIA Focus Groups? Will there be future focus groups for those living outside of the ACA and would their comments be given equal weight to those of others?

*Response:* About 2,100 invitations were sent for the SIA Focus Groups. There are no current plans for additional focus groups, but the Project Team is open to social impact-related input from any member of the community — this information would be given due consideration and looked at in the context of all of the data collected.

*Comment:* I'm disappointed that you only got about 80 people to attend the Focus Groups given that you invited 2,100. You should consider outreach to various community meetings.

*Response:* The Project Team is open to attending various community meetings that CCG members or others might want to organize.



*Question:* Will you place an air quality monitoring station at a signalized intersection?

*Response:* One of the air quality monitoring stations is located at the signalized intersection at the St. Clair College entrance.

*Question:* For what years are you projecting traffic? Will your projections include trucks carrying hazardous goods that may switch from using the Sarnia crossing to using the new Detroit crossing?

*Response:* The Project Team will be projecting impacts for the years 2015, 2025 and 2035, and will take into account trucks diverting from Sarnia.

*Comment:* I attended the SIA Focus Group and thought the session was excellent. It was a good start to discussing some important community issues. [Note: A number of other Focus Group participants echoed the positive feedback about the session.]

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

*Question:* Are construction impacts and traffic restrictions incorporated into your air quality model/analysis? How much of the road can you work on at one time?

*Response:* For the practical alternatives phase of the study, construction impacts are assessed qualitatively. When a preferred alternative is chosen, a full assessment of construction impacts will be conducted. The road will be constructed in stages that are yet to be determined. It's important to remember that we will not be closing Huron Church/Highway 3 during construction.

*Question:* Can you place an air quality monitoring station on either side of the road at St. Clair College to capture the wind patterns on both sides of the street?

*Response:* Meteorological conditions are tracked at an individual monitoring station — there are hourly recordings. The current location of the air quality monitoring station is adequate to capture air conditions at the St. Clair College area regardless of wind direction.

### ***Closing Remarks***

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:35 to 8:45 p.m.).

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

***CCG Members and Public Observers:***

Lucy Malizia  
Dennis Boismier  
Alan McKinnon, CPOW  
Terry Kennedy, WWCTW  
Denise Ausman  
Robert Lea  
Connie Huschilt  
Dave Baker, CPOW  
Alice DiCaro  
Mary Ann Cuderman  
Bill Marshall  
Margaret Suh, Oakwood  
Clara Deck  
Susan Del Col  
James White  
Ruth Rotulo  
Ingrid Rose, Oakwood  
Kevin Desmarais & Michelle Bondy  
Terrie Nantais  
Ed Arditti  
Larry & Mary Stiers  
Tedd Szalay  
Kevin O'Neil  
Jaye Lacerte  
Margaret Douthart  
Ray Bezaire  
Louann Sharp  
June & Robert Thibert  
D. & J. Carley

***Partnership:***

Dave Wake, Roger Ward, Joel Foster and Kevin DeVos — Ontario Ministry of Transportation  
Mohammed Alghurabi — Michigan Department of Transportation

***Consultant Team:***

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Irene Hauzar — URS; Audrey Steele — LGL Limited; Abby Salb — SENES.