



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

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

Meeting notes from:

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

Meeting Date/Location:

May 21st, 2008
Macedonian Community Centre — LaSalle, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi

Meeting Purpose

This sixteenth meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on providing an update on Study progress and sharing noise impact assessment-related information. More specifically, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of the noise impact assessment process and findings — and the range of mitigation options available.
- Walk participants through the technically and environmentally preferred access road (i.e. the updated Windsor-Essex Parkway option).
- Update members on the status of the work/analysis on the plaza and crossing project components, and U.S. study progress.
- Provide an update on the property acquisition process.
- 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 the August 21/07 CCG Meeting Summary

- Glenn Pothier noted that the summary of the August 21/07 CCG meeting had been previously distributed to all CCG members, but that this had not occurred until quite recently. He then asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. No comments were offered. Glenn then offered the option for members to provide any comments on the summary up to and including June 6/08. No comments were received by that date.

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.

Noise Impact Assessment

- Fred Bernard of SENES provided a presentation on the noise impact assessment process, selected findings and mitigation options. More specifically, he:
 - Explained how a noise impact assessment is conducted and noted that the results of the noise analysis is incorporated into the broader Social Impact Assessment, which is also being conducted as part of the DRIC study.
 - Noted that noise and sound are typically described as the same thing, and are measured in decibels (and that a decibel, or dBA, is the measure used to gauge the way a human interprets sound);
 - Noted that the noise impact assessment for DRIC was conducted according to a work plan that adheres to both the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Ministry of Environment protocols (and that was approved by both ministries);
 - Explained that the noise impact assessment compares future conditions pertaining to the different options to the ‘no-build’ scenario — and that any changes resulting in noise increases of greater than 5 dBA (that are sustained over a certain time period), require mitigation measures to lessen potential impacts;
 - Described the two models that are used to predict noise impacts for the DRIC Study: The STAMSON model (which is typically used on transportation projects) captures all transportation sources, and the CADNA model, which was used primarily for the plaza and crossing analysis (the CADNA model incorporates transportation sources and stationary sources);
 - Noted that noise is modeled from transportation sources such as engines and tires on pavement, and that the model accounts for various vehicle types: cars, trucks, buses and so forth;
 - Described the range of factors that the model takes into account, including such things as roadway elevations and local topography (the latter being important given that topography influences how far noise will travel within a certain area);
 - Noted that sensitive noise receptors — including homes, schools, retirement and seniors facilities, hospitals, etc. — are also mapped and examined, and he reminded the group that, as a general rule of thumb, the further away one is from traffic, the less traffic one will hear;
 - Noted that there are no areas along the access road alternatives where changes in noise exceeds 10 dBA (with mitigation) — and that mitigation measures such as berms or noise wall barriers (typically 5 metres high) can reduce noise by 5 dBA or more. He also noted that there are certain areas in the Spring Garden/Malden Road area that may experience a change in noise greater than 5 dBA and that further investigation is required for these locations.

- Both during and following Mr. Bernard’s presentation as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions to which various DRIC team members responded:

Question: What is the difference between dB and dBA?

Response: dB is an indicator of measured sound — whereas dBA refers to the A-scale, that is, sounds that either a human can or cannot hear.

Question: What is the ambient noise level?

Response: Ambient noise varies from area to area. Ambient noise can range from 55 dBA to 70 dBA, depending on the location, the volume of traffic and other noise sources. The noise impact analysis that was conducted for this study looked at the future ‘no build’ scenario out to the year 2035. The predicted range in ambient noise is from 60 dBA to 80 dBA.

Comment: The Spring Garden/Armanda Street area already experiences noise impacts due to the location of EC Row Expressway. Area residents are concerned about what the future noise levels will be in this location as a result of this project.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: What is the distance between the new roadway and existing residences along the route?

Response: Depending on the route segment, the roadway could be as close as 15m or as far away as 50m.

Question: Is there a safe noise level for both adults and children — is noise measured differently for each?

Response: Noise levels/limits are developed for both adults and children. Requirements applicable to the DRIC pertain to any noise level change greater than 5dB. There is no outdoor noise threshold as there may be for indoor (occupational) conditions. [The fact that there is no safe outdoor level established was deemed unacceptable by a CCG member].

Comment/Question: In some homes, you can currently feel vibration from passing vehicles. Is vibration a factor that is considered as part of the analysis?

Response: Vibration is considered as part of the impact assessment and is documented as part of the community and neighbourhood impacts.

Question: What are the existing noise levels within the study area?

Response: The existing noise levels within the study area range between 55 dBA and 70 dBA. Any noise level resulting from a DRIC project

component that exceeds the current level by more than 5 dBA would require mitigation measures.

Question: What are recommended safe noise levels?

Response: There is no recommended level. In this approach, what is considered safe is the existing noise level plus an increase of 5 dBA.

Comment: It is totally unacceptable that there is no recommended safe noise level.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment/Question: In the noise presentation, Crossing C and Plaza A are shown. Why are you focusing on these two locations in particular?

Response: Crossing C and Plaza A are located near residential lands and are, therefore, among the most sensitive locations within the study area.

Question: What are some reference examples for sounds pertaining to different dBA levels — for example, 40 dBA, 50 dBA, 80 dBA?

Response: As a few examples, a human voice is normally 50-55 dBA, heavy truck traffic is 70-75 dBA, crickets on a summer night is 55-60 dBA.

Question: Has the noise model taken into account the noise from jake brakes?

Response: The Ministry of Environment model does not specifically deal with noise from jake braking.

Comment: It is unacceptable that the model does not account for jake braking.

Response: The comment will be noted, but when the roadway grade is less than 3 percent, there is no need to jake brake.

Question: What is the dBA assessment in the Howard Avenue/Oliver Farms area? Do you have the specific numbers? How will you mitigate noise increases?

Response: With a five-foot sound barrier and berming, the predicted noise in this area will be within 5 dBA of the existing level. Though there are specific numbers for the Howard Avenue/Oliver Farms location, we do not have them with us this evening — this information could be made available at a future meeting. Over the summer, Context Sensitive Solutions workshops will be held with the community to get public input on various design issues, including noise walls, berms and other noise mitigation strategies.

Question: In an industrial setting, what is the level of dBA that is detrimental to human hearing?

Response: For eight hours of exposure, a noise level of 85 dBA and above is detrimental. Normal noise levels are between 55 and 70 dBA.

Question: Is vibration dealt with separately from noise?

Response: We model and assess a combination of the two, both noise and vibration. Though noise and vibration are regulated differently and have their own requirements, they are assessed together.

Comment: It's unacceptable to separate noise and vibration.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: What amount of time was spent monitoring noise? The DRIC U.S. study monitored noise in 15-minute segments.

Response: Noise modeling was based on traffic predictions, not noise monitoring.

Question: Where do the STAMSON inputs come from and how well does the noise model represent existing conditions?

Response: The STAMSON noise model is based on data from multiple studies and has proven over time to be very accurate and reliable. Modeled results are very close to actuals — they are generally within 1-1.5 dBA when compared to the existing situation. The STAMSON model was developed by the Ministry of Environment some time ago and it is the standard by which noise modeling is conducted.

Comment: When considering noise barriers such as berms or sound walls, please incorporate something better for Windsor than the “normal” or “standard” that’s typically used elsewhere.

Response: As mentioned earlier, there will be consultation on these and other design issues.

Question: Is the decibel level lower with a below-grade freeway?

Response: Yes, compared to an at grade option. There is a drop in decibel level due to the embankment walls acting as a noise barrier.

Question: If the existing noise is 70 dBA at the surface, what is it below-grade — is there a standard percentage drop by number of feet you go down?

Response: The noise level below grade could drop by about 3 dBA. It varies from situation to situation — there is no precise linear relationship.

Question: Can you please clarify what is meant by the words used in slide 12?

Response: Noise mitigation measures such as berms and/or barriers can reduce noise levels by <5 dBA in most areas. Future noise study is being conducted in the Malden Road/Spring Garden area.

Question: Were sound levels monitored throughout the study area?

Response: Sound levels were determined through noise modeling. Ambient levels were not monitored.

Question: This seems unbelievable — how do you establish ambient noise levels without noise monitoring?

Response: The noise model approved by MOE predicts what will happen in the future, with the additional traffic. The model is well researched and has been used reliably for many years in a variety of jurisdictions. It is accurate at determining existing and predicting future noise levels. It takes into consideration such things as pavement surface, topography, speed, and traffic volume. The model provides the accurate ambient noise levels similar to a noise monitor. The noise model has been calibrated over the years and is considered to be the industry standard.

- *Note:* Following a number of further comments concerning the lack of current noise level monitoring, the facilitator noted that the community's concern about this topic would be identified in the meeting summary as per this special note.

Question: Do vibrations increase when a roadway goes below grade or in a tunnel?

Response: No, not necessarily. It's not a given that vibration levels increase as the roadway level decreases.

Comment: Your answer is unacceptable.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: I understand that the proposed route will result in noise increases in some cases, but also decreases due to the fact that trucks will not be starting and stopping anymore as they currently do on Huron Church.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Update on Canadian Study Progress

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) began the update by referencing the May 1st announcement of the technically and environmentally preferred alternative for the access route — that is, the updated Windsor-Essex Parkway — and noting the website address at which additional information can be found (www.weparkway.ca). He then briefly described the original access road alternatives and the analysis resulting in both the ‘at grade’ and ‘full tunnel’ options not being considered further by the study team given that they do not provide the best balance of advantages and disadvantages. Mr. Thompson noted that the Parkway alternative was initially shown to the public some months ago and that public input led to the updated version brought forward as the recommended one. He then reviewed the Parkway, explaining where the tunnel locations and ramps are located, and where design changes were made as compared to the August 2007 design. He also explained that the Laurier Parkway was part of the design as it will help get traffic to and from Howard Avenue and Highway 3.
- Following Mr. Thompson’s overview, Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) reminded the group of the seven evaluation factors used to assess the access road, plaza and crossing alternatives: changes in air quality; protection of community and neighbourhood characteristics; consistency with existing and planned land use; protection of cultural resources; protection of the natural environment; improved regional mobility; and cost and constructability. He then described how the alternatives — and, in particular, the Windsor-Essex Parkway — performed against each of them.
- Following Mr. Thompson’s and Mr. Kozachuk’s remarks as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

Question: With the new connection to Windsor Airport why are improvements to Laurier Parkway being considered?

Response: The improvements at the Windsor Airport will strictly be for passenger traffic. Improvements to Laurier Parkway are part of the future plans for that area given anticipated growth — including employment growth. Through discussions with MTO and the City of Windsor, the extension of Laurier Parkway was determined to be necessary to serve a future need.

Comment: It’s archaic to make MTO the sole government agency responsible for the DRIC decision and determining the location of the access route and size of the tunnels. These decisions should be made by a combination of government

departments and ministries, and in cooperation with such bodies as the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Health, Environment Canada and Health Canada. The benefits of a tunnel should be considered for health and environmental reasons. We're doing more for trucks than for people.

Response: The Detroit River International Crossing study is an environmental assessment. The overall study approach and models used have been shared with, reviewed and commented on by the Ministry of the Environment and others that were mentioned. The Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Transport Canada engaged multiple departments and ministries to comment on how the DRIC study team intended to this work. They provided the DRIC team with important feedback and recommendations. Everything produced for this study has been shared with various ministries, departments, agencies and levels of government.

Comment: From the beginning of this study, the objective should have been to focus on how the project impacts residents.

Response: That has been an important aspect of the work.

Question: How much land is covered by tunnels in the Windsor-Essex Parkway as compared to the GreenLink?

Response: The Windsor-Essex Parkway covers 1.8 kilometres of land with tunnels, and the GreenLink covers 3.8 kilometres.

Question: What is the estimated cost of the Windsor-Essex Parkway compared with the GreenLink?

Response: The Windsor-Essex Parkway is \$1.6 billion and the GreenLink is between \$2.3 to \$2.5 billion — based on DRIC's cost estimates.

Question: Why was GreenLink priced differently by DRIC compared to the City?

Response: Different cost parameters were used, which results in variation between the two.

Comment: I think the GreenLink proposal is an improvement over the Windsor-Essex Parkway. There is a reluctance to spend more money. You should spend more to get more.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: What is the study currently taking place between Malden Road and Matchette Road?

Response: That is part of the DRIC initiative — snake counts are currently being conducted in this area by LGL Limited.

Question: Is there a measurable improvement in air quality with the use of tunnels?

Response: There is a reduction in PM2.5 within the first 50m of the tunnel. Other than that, there is no notable difference.

Question: By recommending the Parkway, is air quality being sacrificed to save money?

Response: Again, there is no notable difference in the air quality analysis between the Parkway and the GreenLink.

Question: Who will maintain the Windsor-Essex Parkway — who is responsible for the cost of maintenance?

Response: The Ministry of Transportation will maintain the highway portion of the Parkway. It is yet to be determined who will maintain the greenspace or the service roads — it will be either the Province or the City.

Question: Why was the tunnel at Cousineau not extended over a greater distance?

Response: Each tunnel must be a certain distance apart from the others. Tunnels longer than 240m require mechanical ventilation. We understand and have noted the request to extend the tunnel at Cousineau. We also understand that there is a perception that tunnels reduce air quality impacts. Our analysis concludes that there is no measurable difference in air quality between a shorter or longer tunnel.

Comment: The Cousineau tunnel should be extended near the school – do it for the school children.

Response: We will consider the suggestion.

Question: Will Matchette Road remain open if you choose Plaza A?

Response: Yes, Matchette Road will remain open, but it would be realigned.

Comment: You should extend the tunnel at Cousineau by the six homes not just by the school.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment/Question: Those residents that are disrupted by the new freeway and plaza and crossing should be told what the noise impacts will be. What are the noise conditions and mitigation approaches that will be used for homes along the route during construction?

Response: The next step of this study will explore various mitigation options available for the areas that will be impacted.

Question: What is the target date for construction to begin?

Response: Once the environmental assessment is approved — and assuming no unexpected delays — construction would begin later in 2009, though utilities may be relocated earlier.

Question: How will traffic be maintained during construction?

Response: As shown previously in video animations, the construction will be conducted in stages, with the goal of keeping traffic moving on Huron Church and surrounding roads during the entire construction period.

Question: What type of work is currently being conducted along Ojibway Parkway?

Response: There is active fieldwork being conducted by our biologists in this area.

Question: The federal government has allocated \$400 million for this project — will more money be coming from them in the future?

Response: The federal government has committed to providing 50% of the total eligible construction costs. That final figure has not yet been determined.

- Len Kozachuk then provided a brief overview of the potential plaza and crossing locations, noting that the analysis of these is ongoing and that no decision can be made until this work and the U.S. process is complete. Murray Thompson then reviewed the deep drilling work that was recently completed in the plaza and crossing locations. He described the comprehensiveness of the program and some of the techniques used, noting that drilling occurred to a depth of 500m in order to determine suitability for an approach road and bridge footings. Mr. Thompson emphasized that all findings were reviewed by an independent group of professionals who are experts in geology and rock mechanics. He then described the findings and their implications for the plaza/crossing locations.
- Following Mr. Thompson's and Mr. Kozachuk's remarks as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

Question: If the government decides not to build a new crossing, would you still build the new access road?

Response: The government is committed to building an end-to-end transportation facility to provide alternative transportation capacity in the Windsor-Essex region — this includes a new access road, plaza and bridge.

Question: The U.S. EIS has extended its response period by another month — how does this affect the Canadian study?

Response: The study team hopes to make an announcement on the plaza and crossing in late spring — that is, before June 21st — and we intend to be on schedule.

Question: In analyzing the feasibility of Crossing C and given the anomalies located in this area, would the weight of the vehicle traffic and the vibration from the truck traffic make this crossing option undesirable?

Response: The weight of the vehicle traffic is small compared to the weight of the bridge. The anomaly consists of areas where there is gravel rubble, rather than solid rock. It is these areas that need future study to determine if it is safe to continue to pursue a crossing there.

Comment: I would like to see analysis of the impact of truck vibration on the bridge and the impact on geological form.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment: I'm sensing that Plaza B/Crossing X11 is the most viable. There are issues with Plaza A due to its proximity to residential areas and with Plaza C/Crossing C due to the geological conditions of the area.

Response: We cannot make an announcement until the analysis is fully complete and the U.S. team finishes their EIS comment review period — again, we are talking about an end-to-solution that works for both countries.

Suggestions for PIOH 6

- Glenn Pothier asked CCG members for their value adding ideas on how the project team can best convey and communicate information to the public at the next round of Public Information Open Houses (PIOHs) — particularly given that familiarity with and understanding of the project can differ greatly among attendees. More specifically, he asked for responses to the following question:

How can the project team best communicate recent progress and a forward-looking orientation, without unduly disadvantaging those without a historical knowledge of the project? CCG members offered a number of ideas as described below, some of which go beyond the PIOH forum:

- Display specific mapping that will show the entire facility as it will look in its expected location.
- Use large maps that clearly compare the Windsor-Essex Parkway and GreenLink — both the similarities and the differences.
- Present the air quality analysis that clearly shows the difference between the Parkway and GreenLink proposals — explain why you believe ventilation is not a good idea and the danger posed by stacks releasing unclear air into the area.
- Be fair in your assessment of GreenLink — there are potential benefits that go beyond air quality.
- Better explain that roadway emissions account for less than 10% of air pollution in the Windsor-Essex region.
- Show how keeping the trucks moving on a new access road will benefit air quality.
- Provide larger-sized maps generally.
- Show how your proposal connects communities/neighbourhoods and explain why it should be considered community-friendly.
- Tell people what you will or can do to reduce noise to below existing levels — current levels are not acceptable.
- Consider providing an overview of all of the original 15 location options — and why some were eliminated.
- Describe the number of jobs that will be created during construction and the economic benefits to the City.
- Hold smaller discussion sessions concurrent with the PIOH — have specific topics addressed in separate rooms.
- Bring PIOH materials into the local schools (high school and elementary) to get student/youth opinions.
- Get Cogeco (the local cable channel) to tape and replay a ‘video tour’ of the PIOH.
- Participate in local phone-in radio shows to provide information about and explain the project.
- Set-up displays in local community rooms at various venues that are ‘hot spots’ — and entice people with free snacks/coffee.
- To help increase attendance at the PIOHs:
 - Send notices to individual neighbourhoods along or in close proximity to the access route, plaza and crossing areas.
 - Reach border commuters by handing out information to people as they clear customs.
 - Provide handouts to shoppers in malls, plazas, and stores generally in close proximity to the route.
 - Provide notices to be sent home with students from local schools.

- One participant urged the DRIC team to continue dialogue with the City of Windsor with a view to finding a compromise solution acceptable to all. The Project Team noted that discussion with the City is ongoing though there is no guarantee that all parties will agree on a particular solution.

Property Acquisition Update

- In response to a pre-meeting CCG member request, Roger Ward (Senior Project Manager, MTO) provided an update on the DRIC-related property acquisition process. More specifically, he noted that:
 - There is now a more defined area for the access route — namely, the technically and environmentally preferred Windsor-Essex Parkway option. There is still uncertainty regarding impacts relating to the plaza/crossing areas.
 - The Ministry is open to discussing property acquisition on a ‘willing seller/willing buyer’ basis.
 - No expropriation has taken place — there is no authority for this to happen at this stage in the process given that the environmental assessment report is not approved.
 - To date, there have been over 400 enquiries regarding property acquisition. There are 65 signed agreements and nearly 200 more cases are in various stages of negotiation.
 - The acquisition process differs for residential and commercial properties.
- Following Mr. Ward’s presentation, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

Comment/Question: Thank you for sharing the statistics with CCG members. It’s important to realize that some homeowners who are approaching MTO to explore the purchase of their properties are not merely ‘enquiring’ — some are desperate and fearful of future expropriation, and want some type of resolution sooner than later. Of those you’ve spoken with, how many have had formal appraisals or offers made?

Response: Of the 200 or so properties that are currently being negotiated, there are a number of homes that have had appraisals done and offers have been made. It’s an ever-changing amount and I don’t have an exact number available this evening.

Question: Are you experiencing a normal rate of progress in terms of acquiring property?

Response: No. The DRIC property acquisition phase has started earlier than normal. It's unusual to be this far along this early in the process — before receiving formal environmental assessment approval.

Question: Have all of MTO's acquisition offers been made in situations involving homeowner hardship?

Response: No. Each property is looked at on a case-by-case basis. Of the 65 signed purchase agreements, none was done due to hardship.

Question: What steps has MTO taken once a property is vacant to ensure that the building and surrounding area do not deteriorate, and that the safety of the neighbouring residents is maintained?

Response: MTO is in the process of hiring landscaping companies to maintain the lawns and generally keep the grounds in good shape. We are also looking at issues of security. Some homeowners have chosen to extend their closing dates and will continue to live in and maintain their properties. MTO assumes liability for a property once it takes ownership of it.

Question: When will properties be expropriated?

Response: If expropriation is required it cannot happen until after the DRIC study has received EA approval, which is estimated to occur at the end of 2008 or the beginning of 2009.

Question: Has MTO contacted all homeowners identified as being displaced and from whom you want to purchase property?

Response: No. However, MTO has invited them to past PIOHs and will be notifying them of the upcoming PIOH. Again, at this point, property acquisition is still on a willing buyer/seller basis.

Comment: It appears that some people are engaging in property speculation. One person has purchased two homes on Bethlehem in anticipation of the entire street being purchased by MTO.

Response: Speculation is always risky and people may be acting with incorrect information. Based on the Windsor-Essex Parkway plans, the entire Bethlehem Street will not be required. The recent market sale of a home will be used in determining a fair market value. People should not assume that MTO's property buying can be used to make money by flipping properties.

Update on U.S. DRIC Study Progress

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) provided an update on the U.S. component of the study. More specifically, he noted that the US DRIC Team submitted their Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) containing their analysis and that this is now part of the public record. The DEIS was submitted on February 29th and the public comment period was extended to May 29th. The documentation on their preferred alternative should be complete by the end of the summer. The Record of Decision will be at the end of 2008/beginning of 2009.

Question: There is currently construction at the Ambassador Bridge at I-75 — how can the U.S. government afford another bridge/interchange?

Response: The Federal Highway Administration and Michigan Department of Transportation are fully aware of the gateway improvements occurring in Detroit and the cost of these. They are partners in this process and have repeated their commitments to the new crossing. They are looking at alternative means for financing a new crossing.

Next Steps

- Len Kozachuk provided a brief overview of next steps. In so doing, he noted that:
 - Additional analysis on certain engineering and environmental items will be completed for the technically and environmentally preferred access route option (and the plaza/crossing alternatives).
 - The team should be in a position to announce the technically and environmentally preferred plaza and crossing locations in the not too distant future — and this will be done at an upcoming PIOH.
 - The team will continue with its comprehensive consultation program and there will be some Context Sensitive Solutions workshops in the coming months.
 - The formal documentation for the Canadian portion of the environmental assessment (both federal and provincial) will be completed by the end of this year.
- Following Mr. Kozachuk's overview, a CCG member offered a comment:

Comment: Just a reminder that there have been a number of requests to have a meeting on governance-focused topics.

Response: [Comment noted.]

- In response to a question, Glenn Pothier noted that there is currently no specific date planned for the next CCG meeting, but that it is likely to take place in the

next few months – possibly July or August. A notice will be sent to CCG members when a date has been set.

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. No issues were raised.
- Glenn Pothier then made the ‘second round’ call for any comments/questions from meeting observers — resulting in the following:

Comment: MTO has purchased the homes of my neighbours and they will be moving out in a month or so. I would like some assurance that their lawns will be maintained when their homes are vacant.

Response: Your concern is clearly understood. As noted earlier, we are currently getting quotes from landscaping companies. We hope to have agreements within a few weeks. We are also looking at security issues.

Comment: The Citizens Environmental Alliance is holding a meeting on May 24th at the Windsor Public Library.

Response: [Comment noted.]

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:

R. Benson
E. Oleksiuk
Pierre Quenneville
Frank Mallat
Louann Sharp
Lucy Malizia
Denise & Paul Ausman
Moe Haas
June & Robert Thibert
Jim Martin
Domenic Troiani
Alice DiCaro
Mike Duchene
Kevin O'Neil
Larry & Mary Stiers
Jaye Lacerte
Terry Kennedy
Mary Ann Cuderman
Bill Marshall
Patrick Petro
Clara Deck
Alan McKinnon
Ian Naisbitt
Ray Bezaire
Leona Fracas

Partnership:

Dave Wake, Roger Ward, Joel Foster, Mike Harris, Lynn Sebastien — Ontario Ministry of Transportation

Consultant Team:

Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Irene Hauzar — URS Canada
Fred Bernard, Sandy Willis — SENES.