



G. L. Pothier Enterprises Inc.  
2197 Galloway Drive  
Oakville, Ontario, Canada L6H 5M1

tel: (905) 844-5174  
fax: (905) 844-7368  
em: glenn@glpi.com

Meeting notes from:

---

**The Fourteenth Meeting of the  
Detroit River International Crossing  
*Community Consultation Group***

---

Meeting Date/Location:

February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2007/Holiday Inn Select — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

## **Meeting Purpose**

This fourteenth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on sharing information about recent consultation activities and air quality monitoring station findings to date. More specifically, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of the key themes and issues from the December Public Information Open Houses — and the follow-up workshops conducted in January.
- Provide an overview of the highlights from the January social impact assessment workshops conducted to explore the potential impacts of the different plaza and crossing alternatives on the Sandwich Towne community.
- Update members on the re
- sults recorded to date at the two new air quality monitoring stations set-up along the proposed route for the access road — and to place this data in context.
- 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.

## **Summary of Meeting Highlights**

### ***Opening Remarks***

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order, welcomed all participants, introduced Study Team members, and provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

### ***Review of November 29<sup>th</sup>/06 Joint CCG/LAC/LAG Meeting Summary***

- Glenn Pothier noted that the summary of the November 29<sup>th</sup> joint meeting of the Canadian Community Consultation Group and the U.S. Local Advisory Council/Local Agency Group had been previously distributed to all CCG members. He then asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. No comments were offered.

### ***Public Comment***

- Glenn Pothier reminded the group that in the interest of openness, transparency and accountability, any member of the public can attend a CCG meeting as an observer. He then asked if any comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. None were raised.

### *Summary of PIOH #4 Outcomes and Follow-Up Workshops*

- Irene Hauzar (Senior Environmental Planner, URS Canada) provided an overview of various consultation activities that had taken place in December and January. More specifically, she described and referenced selected key findings from:
  - The December 6&7, 2006 Public Information Open Houses (PIOHs), noting that the combined attendance at these was over 500 people. The Open Houses included displays, DVD ‘moving image’ presentations and interaction with Study Team specialists who were available to answer questions, explain analysis methods and discuss results to date. The follow-up workshops held on January 9&10, which were sparsely attended, featured small group open format roundtable discussions that allowed participants to comment on issues of concern to them. Ms. Hauzar also described the overarching themes and issues raised by participants at both the Open Houses and follow-up workshops (these slides are available for review on the Project website [www.partnershipborderstudy.com](http://www.partnershipborderstudy.com)).
  - The January 26&27 Sandwich Towne Social Impact Assessment focus group-style workshops, which over 30 people attended. Ms. Hauzar 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, worship and recreate. Participants also discussed the perceived impact that the proposed project may have on themselves and the broader community. Ms. Hauzar also described the overarching themes and issues raised by workshop participants, including the finding that most attendees define the geographical boundaries of their community as the ‘pie’ shape that approximates the shape of Sandwich’s boundaries (this and other findings are included in the slides available for review on the Project website). SENES Consultants (the group with the primary role in conducting the Social Impact Assessment workshops) will be incorporating the input into their community and neighbourhood cohesion analysis.
  
- Ms. Hauzar noted that data gathered from all of the public open houses and workshops will be incorporated in the impact assessment of the practical alternatives.
  
- Both during and following Ms. Hauzar’s overview as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

*Question:* Who made the statements reflected in the slide presentation about the PIOHs — are they from the Study Team or Open House participants?

*Response:* PIOH participants submitted the written comments that were described.

*Question/Comment:* Who was invited to the PIOH workshops? I'm disappointed that I hadn't heard about them until tonight — I would have liked to attend them.

*Response:* The workshops were open to the public. A sign-up desk was placed at the PIOH #4 meetings in December.

*Comment:* If a person missed the PIOH, they would not know about the workshops. In the future, the Study Team should send out notices to everyone on their list.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* How were people notified for the Sandwich focus groups?

*Response:* The Study Team mailed-out over 4,000 meeting notices to residents in the Sandwich area in the vicinity of the riverfront. Local municipal councillors also assisted in getting the word out about the meetings.

*Question:* Only about 30 residents attended out of 4,000 mailings?

*Response:* That's correct.

*Comment:* There were other meetings that were going on that week, including City Ward meetings, and the Sandwich Towne Historic District Study meeting, which competed for everyone's time. This likely had an impact on the focus group attendance.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* Is it too late to add comments about the information discussed at either the PIOHs or the Sandwich focus groups?

*Response:* No, there is still time. However, the Study Team would appreciate your comments as soon as possible.

*Question:* Is the Study Team hearing anything new — are the points raised at these meetings different from what you've heard previously?

*Response:* Most of the points are familiar, but some information is new. For example, recently there have been a number of questions and comments about the Ambassador Bridge enhancement proposal — people are looking to the DRIC Study Team for information about what is happening at the bridge and what it means to the DRIC project as a whole.

*Question:* I understand that about 65% of those living in Sandwich Towne rent their homes. Who came to your focus group meetings — were they property owners or renters?

*Response:* A mix of both.

*Comment:* When you assess the potential impact of any new DRIC-related crossing or plaza, you need to consider the cumulative impact of that initiative in combination with anything that may happen with the Ambassador Bridge (whether its twinning or something else). You need to consider the ‘worst case’ and assume both Ambassador Bridge expansion and a new crossing.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* With the Ambassador Bridge Company proposing a new crossing, doesn’t that suggest that some options — including the DRTP — were dropped prematurely from the DRIC process prior to a full investigation of their relative merits?

*Response:* The Study Team looked at twinning the Ambassador Bridge and the DRTP option at the illustrative alternatives stage of the study. Based on a thorough and systematic comparative analysis, these were set aside from further study under the DRIC process. However, the Study Team recognizes that the Ambassador Bridge Company and DRTP can continue to pursue approvals for these undertakings on their own.

*Question:* The Study Team evaluated the DRTP option as only a two-lane tunnel. DRIC should consider DRTP’s latest proposal that includes more lanes and tunneling of the approach roadway by boring — this is less disruptive to the community and would require less mitigation. This needs to be noted again as part of the formal consultation record.

*Response:* The DRIC Study Team examined two options within the DRTP corridor and noted several disadvantages, many of which are not addressed by tunneling the Canadian approach road. The Study Team sees no compelling reason to study this option further. Again, the DRTP can seek approvals for its proposal under a separate process.

### ***Report on Air Quality Monitoring Station Findings***

- Glenn Pothier introduced the next meeting component — namely an update on findings to date from the two new air quality monitoring stations set-up along the proposed route for the access road.

- Abby Salb (Air Quality Specialist, SENES Consultants) provided an overview of the air quality information collected at the new monitoring stations between October 1/06 to December 31/06. Ms. Salb:
  - Noted the locations of the two new air quality monitoring stations within the ACA — one beside the Ontario Public Health Lab, the other opposite the entrance to St. Clair College.
  - Described the various pollutants that are being measured and noted that the approach also includes the recording of meteorological and traffic data.
  - Reported that the wind direction recordings show that the predominant winds blow from the southwest.
  - Described the daily concentrations for various pollutants — for example, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, and other air toxics — and the number of times, if any, that various criteria thresholds were exceeded.
  - Noted that the Ontario Ministry of the Environment has audited the new stations and their equipment, and that they are satisfied with the manner in which the data is being collected.
  - Noted that a comparison with the PM<sub>2.5</sub> data collected by the MOE for the fall 2006 time period will be made once the MOE data is available. Currently, the MOE has posted data as recent as 2005 — a request for 2006 data is being made.
  
- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Director, URS Canada) noted that the data being presented represents only three months of monitoring. The findings reflect what is directly being recorded at the air quality monitoring stations. In its assessment of air quality impacts, the Study Team will be looking at the differences between the air quality results for each alternative, not necessarily what is causing the changes. The Team is developing the baseline conditions for air quality to predict the 2015, 2025 and 2035 conditions.
  
- During and following Ms. Salb's presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

*Question:* Why isn't an air quality monitoring station located on Huron Church Road at Assumption High School?

*Response:* The Area of Continued Analysis does not go north of the E.C. Row Expressway — air quality monitoring stations were placed along the corridor that is being proposed for the new access road.

*Question/Comment:* Why use wind direction (wind rose) data from the airport — is this valid? The airport is in an open area and far from the proposed route.

*Response:* The Ontario Ministry of the Environment encourages the use of wind roses from a broader area as part of the meteorological data collection. Airport wind rose data is valid and is important, in part, because

the Airport is sited in an open area. Wind data is also being collected at the new monitoring stations.

*Question:* What do the colours on the wind rose mean?

*Response:* They indicate wind speed intensity. The brighter the colour, the more intense the wind speed.

*Question:* What does the PM<sub>2.5</sub> data mean?

*Response:* The Canada Wide Standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub> is 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This standard is the maximum desirable concentration. It includes all sources. This is not a legally enforced criterion. There are a number of contributing factors that have an impact on air quality in Windsor including trans-boundary airflow. The MOE's threshold of 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for PM<sub>2.5</sub> comes into effect in 2010. Air quality is a provincial jurisdiction. The Canada Wide Standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub> was developed by the provincial and federal governments.

*Question:* Are the first quarter air quality monitoring station results reliable, given that the station is, in my view, on the wrong side of the road?

*Response:* The first quarter air quality monitoring station results reflect the data that is collected from both of the air quality monitoring stations, one station is located on each side of Huron Church Road/Highway 3.

*Question:* To what degree does the volume of truck traffic influence the first quarter air quality monitoring results?

*Response:* The Study Team is collecting traffic data in conjunction with the air quality data, but any correlation has not yet been analyzed. The Study Team is looking at traffic as one of many sources that contribute to Windsor's air quality.

*Question:* The line graph for PM<sub>2.5</sub> for October shows a 30-point difference between the St. Clair College site and the Ontario Public Health Lab site. Why is that?

*Response:* There is no simple explanation, but October is generally considered the last month in which this area experiences smog conditions. Air masses between the two stations are different, and different sources for PM<sub>2.5</sub> are found both upwind and downwind of each station.

*Question:* The alternative routes being proposed show changes in elevation that may require vehicles to gear up or down along the route and that will cause a change in air quality along the roadway. Will this be covered in your projections?

*Response:* The changes in grade have been taken into account in the alternatives design process. The proposed freeway grades that are shown for the alternatives are at a three percent slope or less, which typically does not affect the engine dynamics or the way engines perform.

*Comment:* You should keep the access road below grade — grade fluctuations are worse than starting/stopping at stoplights.

*Response:* Again, the grades that are shown for the alternatives are at a three percent slope or less, which typically does not affect the engine dynamics or necessitate changing gears. The new facility will be a highway without stoplights. There are alternatives that are continuously below grade.

*Comment/Question:* Your slides show that the pollution is generally below the threshold level. What is the minimum air quality standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub> as prescribed by the other provinces?

*Response:* 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is a Canada Wide Standard, which is prescribed for all the provinces. This Standard is an objective for air quality, not a legally enforced criterion.

*Question:* Is there a worldwide standard that is used?

*Response:* There are a few used in other jurisdictions — however, they are generally target levels, not standards.

*Comment/Question:* The data seems to suggest that the pollution from the diesel truck traffic is generally below the threshold level and that the trans-border air pollution sometimes pushes it over. How many of the days above the 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> is caused by diesel traffic?

*Response:* The Ontario Public Health Laboratory recorded that PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels were above the 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup> 13 out of 92 days in the first quarter of monitoring, while the St. Clair College site recorded 8 out of 92 days. These readings are from all sources combined — it is not possible to separate the contributions from diesel traffic. All the air toxics that are being monitored are well below the prescribed standards. There were no NO<sub>x</sub> exceedances.

*Question:* Why is there a difference in the benzene level measured at the Public Health Lab site and the St. Clair College site?

*Response:* There may be a non-traffic source located near the St. Clair College air quality monitoring station — such as a paint manufacturer, an



auto-related manufacturer, and so forth — that is contributing to the higher benzene level at that location.

*Question:* What does the benzene measurement mean? Where does benzene come from?

*Response:* There is no stated standard for benzene as there is no level that the government will designate as ‘safe.’ Benzene is often associated with auto manufacturing, in particular, with the spray paint booths used for painting new cars.

*Comment/Question:* Based on what’s been collected so far, it appears that the data you will have available will be insufficient to support recommendations that are proposed to be announced by the end of the year. Is this correct?

*Response:* The data currently being collected from the air quality monitoring will be incorporated into the decision-making process. This data will serve to help confirm baseline conditions along the corridor. Though the Study Team will not have a full year of data from the new monitors, we are using data from the other Ontario Ministry of the Environment air quality stations to assist in determining the air quality baseline conditions.

*Question/Comment:* Will your next steps include monitoring the existing tunnel ventilation buildings? There is an already existing tunnel in Windsor — you should use it to gauge the level of tunnel emissions.

*Response:* The Study Team is focusing on monitoring as a means to assess the background conditions within the Area of Continued Analysis. It would be difficult to draw any conclusions about a new tunnel based on monitoring of the existing one. Any new tunnel will have different traffic volumes/speeds, different ventilation systems and so on. A new tunnel would likely have very different air quality data from that of the current Windsor/Detroit tunnel.

*Comment:* Monitoring at the existing tunnel will still give you some indication of air quality even if the conditions at a new tunnel are different.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* What does the ‘no build’ alternative mean?

*Response:* The no build alternative means evaluating the future traffic conditions without any changes to the existing roadway network.

*Question:* The Ontario Ministry of the Environment lists the standard for Formaldehyde to be  $65 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  — can you give an example of a place where this standard might be exceeded?

*Response:* This standard may occasionally be exceeded in areas located directly adjacent to certain types of industries.

*Comment:* There is a concern that your numbers may be skewed given that the air quality monitoring stations operated by the MOE are ineffective. The monitor located on College Avenue was just recently cleaned up — I believe it had been neglected, with weeds growing around it and so on. I'm very concerned about using existing air monitoring stations to present background data — I would oppose this.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Comment/Question:* A study was conducted by the Great Lakes Institute in August 2006 in which air quality monitoring took place near the existing Windsor-Detroit tunnel. Will the Study Team use the results of this study and incorporate it as part of the analysis? Even though the monitoring provides only a brief snapshot, the data could be of value.

*Response:* The study was conducted near the tunnel for a very short period of time. Notwithstanding this significant limitation, the Study Team will review and consider this study. Again, any new tunnel could have very different operating parameters than the existing one.

*Question:* Generally speaking, what is the anticipated height of the stacks of the ventilation buildings that would be required for the tunnel option?

*Response:* The stacks of the ventilation buildings are usually constructed to be 2.5 times the building height. The preliminary stack height is approximately 45 m. There is no single answer to the question. Under various scenarios, the ventilation buildings would have different sizing dimensions.

*Question:* When comparing the air quality monitoring data collected by the Ministry of Environment monitors at the airport and elsewhere, with the results from the two new monitors, are the concentrations of air quality toxics similar?

*Response:* Air toxins data are not routinely collected at all stations — therefore, it is not always possible to make these comparisons. However, comparisons will be made where the data is available.

*Question:* Will you be using models from other air quality studies (such as those conducted in other jurisdictions like California) to determine if there are any predictable levels of air toxins?

*Response:* The Study Team will review similar models and air quality studies to determine if there are any predictable levels of air toxins.

*Question:* Are you monitoring for lead, mercury and sulfur dioxide?

*Response:* No. Since lead is no longer added to gasoline, lead is not typically monitored in air quality assessments. There is some mercury that may be present at a given location, but we are not monitoring for it. Sulfur dioxide is not a main contributor to air quality concerns in this area of Ontario.

*Question:* In future meetings, I would suggest that the data be presented as it relates to the dispersion patterns and how quickly pollutants fall back to the ground — you should also show MOE ambient air levels.

*Response:* The Study Team will consider presenting data as it relates to the dispersion of pollutants as they fall back to the ground. Typically PM10 is measured at the fenceline where measurements are taken at ground level.

*Question:* Does the existing Windsor-Detroit tunnel have air scrubbers?

*Response:* We will have to ask the City of Windsor this question and report back to the CCG.

*Comment:* There is sulfur in diesel gasoline used for trucks — you can smell it in the exhaust. The asphalt would contain lead from the leaded gasoline used in the past.

*Response:* The MOE air quality monitoring stations are measuring relatively low sulfur in the air around their stations — But sulfur is highly odorous, as well as other components in diesel exhaust, which means you smell them at very low concentrations. These are what you may be smelling. Lead used in gasoline would not be in the asphalt — it would have long since been washed away.

## **Report on Federal Environmental Assessment Status**

- Glenn Pothier noted that the report on the status of the Federal Environmental Assessment was a new item added to the meeting agenda.

- Kaarina Stiff (Environmental Assessment Project Manager, Transport Canada) reminded CCG members that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act draft guidelines relating to the DRIC project are available for public comment — and that comments can be provided to her or any Study Team member. Though some comments have already been received, more are welcomed. Ms. Stiff also noted that the guidelines show how the DRIC Study Team is coordinating the provincial and federal processes. The guidelines will be distributed with the CCG meeting notes and are available on the Project website [www.partnershipborderstudy.com](http://www.partnershipborderstudy.com).
- Following Ms. Stiff's overview, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

*Question:* When do you expect to finalize the document?

*Response:* Our initial timeline was the end of February, but our new estimate is sometime in April or May.

*Question:* If there are differences between the Canadian and Ontario standards, do you use the higher standard? Are the Canadian standards sometimes higher than the provincial standards?

*Response:* It's not so much an issue of standards as it is process regulations. There are different requirements that must be met to comply with the regulations of the Ontario and Canada Environmental Assessment Processes. For example, there are differences in how cumulative effects are reported. The entire DRIC study is a coordinated joint Ontario and Federal process. Where there is a difference in standards, the Study Team would strive to use the stricter standard, as appropriate.

*Question:* Sandwich Towne may end up with two new bridge crossings, the one proposed by the Ambassador Bridge Company, and the one proposed by DRIC. Will the combined impacts to the community be documented within the EA process if these two new bridge crossings are approved?

*Response:* Under the Canadian Environmental Assessment process, the analysis of cumulative effects is evaluated and documented. Projects that may be constructed in the reasonably foreseeable future will be taken into consideration. However, it is often a challenge to determine which projects may be constructed in the reasonably foreseeable future. Transport Canada and other federal authorities determine which projects fall into this category, and decide what is appropriate for the cumulative impacts study — the level of analysis may differ.

*Question:* When evaluating cumulative impacts, will the Study Team consider global warming and carbon dioxide and ozone level depletion? Environment

Canada shows an increase in ozone along the corridor from Windsor to Toronto — how does this get factored into the cumulative effects? Can I petition for it?

*Response:* Government agencies are looking at how to best incorporate climate change in the assessment of a project — no determination has yet been made on this issue. Yes, you can petition for including this in the assessment and it will be considered.

*Comment:* You should just construct a tunnel with scrubbers.

*Response:* [Comment noted.]

*Question:* Can we have a presentation on the CEAA process if there is sufficient interest?

*Response:* Yes, if there's interest. The DRIC Study Team is looking to receive comments regarding the Federal EA process.

- Ms. Stiff then went on to describe the process that applies to the proposed Ambassador Bridge enhancement project:
  - Transport Canada has received documentation submitted by the Canadian Transit Company for an enhancement to the current Ambassador Bridge.
  - The Ambassador Bridge project will need to follow the Environmental Assessment guidelines and it will require a navigational permit from Transport Canada.
  - There is a federal EA process that has been initiated for the Ambassador Bridge project that is separate from the DRIC study.
  - An advertisement requesting comments on the draft EA guidelines for the Ambassador Bridge project will be placed in the near future.
  
- This update was followed by a participant question:

Question: Could Windsor end up with three bridges in the future — the current Ambassador Bridge, the new Ambassador Bridge, and the DRIC bridge?

Response: Yes, potentially.

### ***Status Updates and Next Steps***

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) then provided a project status update for activities on the Canadian side of the River, and an overview of next steps. In so doing, Mr. Kozachuk noted that:
  - The Study Team has made no decision about the preferred alternative — analysis is ongoing.

- Air quality modeling is nearing completion and that the analysis of results will be completed shortly thereafter.
  - There are ongoing meetings with various groups in the community and the Study Team has completed the initial report on the impact assessment on business (and that this report is under review). The data from the Sandwich Towne social impact focus groups is still being analyzed.
  - The noise impact analysis is ongoing.
  - The land use assessment analysis is complete.
  - The cultural resources analysis is ongoing: the archaeology work will continue though there have been no significant findings to date; the built heritage analysis is nearing completion.
  - The natural environment fieldwork (three seasons of analysis) is complete — reports are being prepared for Study Team review.
  - In terms of regional mobility — analysis of traffic operations is complete; the review of safety/security issues is nearing completion; the Team is finalizing cross sections for a new crossing.
  - Bedrock investigation near the riverfront is continuing and alternatives for the Grand Marais Drain crossing are under review; crossing alternatives are still under analysis including the study of piers in the river; the plaza analysis is complete.
  - The drilling program in Canada should be completed by March/April.
  - There have been meetings with the Canada Border Services Agency regarding the potential plaza sites/designs.
  - The Study Team is looking at refinements to improve the access route design.
  - There continues to be a strong working relationship with the U.S. partners and a high degree of information sharing and cooperation.
  - All of the work being undertaken is contributing to the development of cost estimates for the various options.
  - Though there is still much work to be done, the Study Team is still working towards a decision by the middle of the year.
- Len Kozachuk also noted that the next CCG meeting is tentatively scheduled for sometime in June. A notice will be sent to CCG members when a date has been set.
  - Mohammed Alghurabi (Michigan Department of Transportation) then provided an overview of and update on selected project activities on the American side, noting that the U.S. Team:
    - Has begun its geotechnical drilling program (have drilled 3 of 14 holes to date) — it should be completed by the end of June if not sooner.
    - Continues to meet with Customs and Border Protection, and Homeland Security regarding their plaza issues.
    - Is intending to hold community workshops in March to review the community plan for the areas around the proposed plaza locations.

- Will be holding its next LAC/LAG meeting on February 28<sup>th</sup> at Southwestern High School (in Detroit) at 7:00 P.M. This meeting will include a drilling program update.
- Will be holding Context Sensitive Solutions workshops to examine the look and fit of the plaza/bridge crossing in April. Another CSS workshop will be held in June on the U.S. side. Other U.S. public meetings will be held over the next few months.

### ***Open Forum/Public Comment***

- Glenn Pothier asked whether the Study 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:* Has a cost-benefit analysis been conducted for the alternatives? The projected cost for the tunnel has been reported in the paper and it was stated that the cost is too high — has a cost-benefit for separate tunneling for both cars and trucks been done? Has a market feasibility study for a third crossing been conducted?

*Response:* The DRIC study has examined the impacts and benefits of each alternative — it is not a cost/benefit analysis study per se. The Study Team is examining what is important for the existing road network and the economy, the environment, the community and so forth — there are a range of analysis factors that are being addressed. The Study Team is looking at how to add border capacity and efficiently move both people and goods. There is a governance group — as part of a separate, but parallel process — that is looking at how to fund and administer any new facilities. We are not looking at separate tunnels for cars and trucks — the roadway will be a shared facility.

*Question:* Will you be examining security issues as part of your evaluation?

*Response:* Yes, it is part of the evaluation. The Canada Border Services Agency and the RCMP have been and will be weighing in on security issues.

*Comment:* The City of Windsor is undertaking a study to designate Sandwich Towne as a Heritage Conservation District. If Crossing C were chosen (Sterling Marine Fuels) it would be located beside Sandwich Towne and beside this District. What impact will the City's initiative have on the DRIC project?

*Response:* We are aware of the City's study, but cannot really comment until it is complete. If Crossing C were chosen, this would result in a proximity impact to Sandwich Towne. The Environmental Assessment would have to describe the impact and consider any heritage designation. Provincial and Federal project needs would also have to be considered.

*Question:* Who would make the decision regarding the impacts to Sandwich Towne and the proposed Heritage Conservation District — does the City of Windsor have a veto?

*Response:* The DRIC Environmental Assessment would be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment for approval. During that approval process it will be reviewed by the Ontario Minister of Culture. The Provincial and Federal governments will look to address the concerns of the local municipalities as much as practicable.

*Comment:* If you build a tunnel instead of a bridge, you will have lower infrastructure maintenance requirements.

*Response:* There is infrastructure rehabilitation work done in the province everyday. Maintenance is required for all roadways including tunnels.

*Question:* When will the preferred alternative be announced?

*Response:* We originally said that it would be the Spring of 2007, it is looking like June at this point — there are still a number of key questions to address.

*Question:* When the preferred alternative is submitted, will it be final? Can it be changed?

*Response:* The Study Team is working toward ensuring that it has a defensible/traceable basis in support of any recommendation. Nevertheless, the Environmental Assessment process allows for all decisions to be open to public review and comment. The Study Team's recommendation will need to be approved by various governmental bodies. The public has the opportunity to share comments and influence this approval process.

*Comment:* Advertising for future meetings should ensure more comprehensive reach to the public.

*Response:* We anticipate that the Study Team's preferred alternative will attract widespread attention and be broadly covered in local media. Still, the Team will consider enhancements to its advertising approach and will look at sending meeting announcements to more households in the future.



- Glenn Pothier then made the ‘second round’ call for any comments/questions from meeting observers. None were raised.

*Closing Remarks*

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group for their attendance and participation.
- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:40 to 9:10 p.m.).

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

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

Edward Oleksiuk  
Alice DiCaro  
Terry Kennedy  
Louann Sharp  
Larry & Mary Stiers  
Bob Fetherston  
Mary Ann Cuderman  
Lucy Malizia  
Mike Duchene  
Clara Deck  
June & Robert Thibert  
Elizabeth Havelock  
Leona Fracas  
Denise Ausman  
Pierre Quenneville  
Anna Lynn Meloche  
Ed Arditti  
Moe Haas  
Jaye Lacerte  
William Marshall  
Alan McKinnon  
Wayne Lessard  
Al Teshuba  
Dominic Troiani

***Partnership:***

Roger Ward, Joel Foster and Kevin DeVos — Ontario Ministry of Transportation  
Kaarina Stiff — Transport Canada  
Mohammed Alghurabi — Michigan Department of Transportation

***Consultant Team:***

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Irene Hauzar — URS Canada  
Abby Salb, Nick Shinbin — SENES.