SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECORDED DURING COMMENT PERIOD

The following comments reflect the depth and breadth of the views expressed prior to, during and since the public hearings held March 18 and 19, 2008. They do not indicate the frequency, accuracy nor validity of any particular comment. It is recommended that the complete transcript, including written comments received from elected officials, coordinating agencies, governmental agencies, advocacy groups and others be reviewed for a complete analysis. Comments will be categorized and responded to in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

- DRIC would have damaging effects on this region, including the irreparable harm to the Ambassador Bridge, the Detroit/Windsor Tunnel and Blue Water Bridge. The DEIS has acknowledged and confirmed these facts:
- DRIC was and still is not a solution for transportation growth in this region. International traffic has been declining since 1999.
- There is absolutely no transportation justification for a DRIC bridge in this corridor.
- I would like you to consider my property; houses are being taken right up to our house . . . [We] are in a hardship.
- A new monitoring system should be permanently on top of Southwestern High School to determine the rate in which pollution has increases.
- A "wall" is not going to keep the diesel pollution in the plaza.
- Since the Detroit-Windsor Truck Ferry was closed to bicyclists in 2006, there has been no way to cross the border on bicycle. Open the border to bicyclists.
- The DRIC Study is not a solution for transportation problems that exist in our region and is nothing more than an effort to cannibalize international trade and travel at the current border crossings, including the Ambassador Bridge in clear violation of Congressional intent.
- The DRIC - DEIS confirms our position that the DRIC would bring devastating harm to our company and other border crossings . . . the DRIC Draft EIS has acknowledged and identified the extreme and devastating negative affects the Ambassador Bridge would experience should the DRIC go forward.
- Our company has rights established by treaty, defined by lengthy litigation in the US and Canada, and acknowledged by written agreements. Those rights are being violated by the actions of individual members of the State government and the government as a whole. A continued violation of those rights would constitute a denial of our due process.
- Why not build the river crossing at the end of Dearborn Avenue?
- Right and left of Dearborn Avenue are plenty of empty lots for a plaza.
- You will be exposing the neighborhoods with the newer dangers of increased truck traffic carrying dangerous cargo.
- There will be higher levels of noise.
- There will be higher levels of air pollution.
- You are adding a terrorist target in our backyard.
- Please reference and explain as appropriate the Fort Wayne Master Plan in Section 3 . . . on pages 3-43, 3-44, 3-75, and 3-125.
- Please clarify any relationship between the Fort Wayne Master Plan and the Rouge River Gateway Master Plan Trail.
- Broaden the discussion on "Visual Impacts," pages 3-126 to 3-133, and impacts of views from within the neighborhood and from Fort Wayne to the proposed plaza areas.
• The description of "easier access" to Fort Wayne is not fully explained . . . access is described as to be enhanced along Campbell or Junction Streets; as either road is roughly one-half mile or more from intersecting with the primary road north of the fort - Jefferson Avenue - how will the reminder of the access to the Fort be treated?
• The three "Tiers" graphically presented on page 3-113 regarding above ground resources do not correspond with the description of Tiers 1, 2, and 3 in the December 3, 2007 consultation letter to the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office in Appendix E.
• Project . . . benefits [should] occur locally . . . [with] components of economic, environmental, and neighborhood revitalization to this host community . . . . Benefits should include issues like air quality monitoring, air filtering for schools, diesel emission reduction programs, housing development and renovation, work force redevelopment and training, and commercial redevelopment in the area.
• There should be an enforceable community benefits program
• There should be more consideration for exposure modeling or risk assessment in the air quality analysis
• There should be some more local scale analysis versus just looking at combined benefits from breaking up the traffic . . . . Particularly impacts on Southwestern High School.
• For consideration of different mitigation features for emissions, the plaza area could look at truck staging facilities to have the truck engines turned off.
• What is MDOT proposing to do for Southwestern High School to mitigate the negative impact of the adjacent truck plaza where over potentially 5,000 trucks could be idling daily?
• Have you considered starting a college scholarship fund for graduates or something compensatory?
• Will a noise wall be built around the plaza adjacent to the school?
• It was mentioned seven churches, will be quote, "relocated," end quote. Are you talking about relocating the parishioners or . . . actually physically moving the buildings to preserve them . . . particularly some that may have historical value?
• There is a way [an alternative to the DRIC], particularly if you're going to concentrate on commercial traffic, that could be handled in well under six months for well under $6 million.
• I have concerns about Harrington. If you're going to consume most of that area . . . you should be able to add that one block.
• St. Paul AME Church . . . I've been going ever since I was 6 years old, now it's on your wall [to be relocated]. But you're telling me that you don't have plans.
• I lived right there on West Jefferson and Harrington Street. All I see is trucks all day and all night. What about the noise?
• What [are] you going to do about the air?
• This study itself had a negative impact on the Delray neighborhood because people were saying, . . . They're going to put a bridge in. And so people, perhaps, did not invest or moved out.
• If the DRC study does go through . . . we would . . . like to see . . . people . . . have available for them new homes built in the Delray neighborhood . . . I've actually talked to people from Michigan State Housing Development Authority . . .
• The community is developing . . . A community benefits agreement that would be mutually signed off by people in the community and the State of Michigan. We'd like to see . . . redevelopment of the housing, air quality improvement, air filtering systems in the neighborhood for the schools, diesel emission reduction, work force and
development and training funding for our residents in the neighborhood, and more commercial development.

- We developed a mission statement: "We envision a community in which area residents and a new publicly owned international border crossing will mutually co-exist and benefit from each other. Our vision includes those areas in Southwest Detroit impacted by the border crossing and specifically a viable and redeveloped Delray neighborhood. The foundation of this vision will be set forth in a legally binding community benefits agreement that includes implementation of the DRIC study community land use plan relating to residential and economic development, environmental mitigation, and other benefits that are primarily for the Delray neighborhood and other impacted area residents. And then finally without endorsing any outcome beyond this vision statement, we support the continued funding, community involvement, and then completion of the DRIC study."

- If a bridge is built, we hope, we very much pray that it will be publicly owned.
- With respect to relocating the current residents . . . If they could build homes in our areas, and turn some of our renters into homeowners and help them enhance their quality of life, that would be a plus.
- We know jobs are coming. Who are these jobs going to, and are they going to be for the union laborers?
- I am the Chair for Detroit Community Initiative and we do housing development. We're building the east side . . . and those types of things can also benefit Delray.
- Your graph shows that the Ambassador Bridge is not being utilized to its capacity. Traffic is down 39 percent in seven years but you only show it through 2004.
- This graph is hypothetical so it's meaningless . . . . It has to be updated to prove what they wish to make us believe - that there is a need.
- The Blue Water Bridge built a second span in 1996. At that time there was roughly six million vehicles going across it annually. It is now down to somewhere about five million and a half, I believe. They projected . . . nine million . . . [It] never did come to fruition, nor is the bridge being used. So that second span was a waste of money, as I see it.
- The Gateway Project . . . limits all traffic going downtown via 75. If the bridge should go forward, in about three years . . . it isn't going to get any better.
- I don't think there's enough justification to increase my taxes to make another bridge.
- I'm very concerned about what the future plans will be with the new bridge for homeland security.
- We . . . brokers . . . facilitate the U.S. Customs. We are licensed . . . to release shipments from all over the world . . . . So this opens up such a trade that you would not believe all over the world . . . . This is going to be a really big situation for the economy.
- Request that the results of both the U.S. and Canadian environmental processes be printed in one brochure to move the project forward without arguments and indecisions and discontinuity.
- The bridge is right at my street. It's going to take up Post Street and Green Street. Harrington is in the middle of that. There's only about seven or eight hoses on Harrington Street. How could they leave those few homes?
- How about the noise . . . there . . . They skipped over that.
- The noise factor [on Harrington] would be a problem
- The scenery around is going to be one brick wall . . . . At least put up some kind of a greenery, trees, or something to make it look nice.
- I would rather have MDOT acquire the permission, instead of it being owned by one individual.
• Purchase the houses a head of time I would hate to do work on it knowing that somebody's just going to come and tear it down.
• Trucks block all the crossings.
• Alternative #5 appears to [have] the most impact to our organization . . . [taking] a corner of the property where the new building footprint is planned, effectively taking half of the facility that we are so diligently working to build . . . . Therefore we ask that Alternative #5 be removed from consideration.
• A number of cross streets that connect the neighborhoods north and south of I-75 will be lost. This . . . will most certainly result in isolation for businesses and residents . . . and for CHASS it will further limit access to our users. Many of our clients walk to the clinic via Junction.
• The owners of the Ambassador Bridge state that there will actually be less traffic crossing our border in the next 35 years. And I've heard tonight . . . things are going to pick up after continual downturn of another eight years.
• What type of businesses and industries are going to be attracted to the area?
• What is going to stop the decline in our local economy as to warrant the projections of increased bridge traffic between the U.S. and Canada?
• With more traffic how will noise and air pollution actually decrease?
• Since there is overlap with the remaining alternatives, it seems like some mitigating features would be the same no matter what alternative is chosen. And it would be very helpful to the community to know any proposed mitigation prior to the Final Environmental Impact Statement since there is so little time at that point for the community to process any response.
• I heard last month that homes will be purchased at market value rather than replacement value. I think that has the potential for decimating the community.
• The ramps should be below grade level like they are at the I-696/ Woodward interchange, which protects the animals at the Detroit Zoo.
• I heard that noise barrier walls, might not be on the freeway side, but on the other side. Well, if that's going to block residences, I'd rather those residences be taken.
• Delray is a neighborhood. If this were just a suburb, or if there was a ward system of city council, then there would be someone representing the people at every meeting. That hasn't been the case . . . . While I believe these hearings are required by federal law . . . they don't give people any real input or choice.
• I believe that homes should be purchased for a value that's sufficiently high that people can afford to purchase homes with the money they've received.
• [Bridge design] is just a matter of aesthetics.
• There really has to be adequate shielding, not just in terms of noise, but in terms of appearance, a sense of neighborhood.
• All of the proposed alternatives in Detroit city limits will require significant water distribution and sewer and outfall modifications to accommodate various proposed approach routes and plazas to new bridge locations. Costs allocated for such utility modifications for this alternatives range between $143 million and $183 million.
• DWSD's future CSO facilities planned along the Detroit River are not considered in the DEIS. DWSD's future Summit CSO facility being finalized in our LTCSO Plan Amendment due to the MDEQ later this year will be located on portion of the Revere Copper property parcel adjacent the Campbell south of Jefferson will impact and may conflict with aspects of Alt. X-11. Similarly, our future Schroeder CSO facility will likely impact Alts. X-10A and X-10B.
• Request a 120-day extension of the public comment period so that we might give the failings of the DEIS the full attention they deserve . . . . allowing everyone in the affected
community sufficient time to thoroughly review the 6,000-plus page DEIS. Your agencies must revisit, revise and re-circulate for comment their Draft Environmental Justice analysis.

- The DEIS claims that harm from the DRIC project "would not be disproportionately high and adverse to minority population groups" because "impacts to minority population groups are not appreciably more severe than the impacts that would be experienced by non-minority population groups in the study area." This sort of "analysis" subverts the entire purpose of environmental justice review. The issue is not whether minority groups within a study area will suffer as much as non-minority groups in that same area, but rather whether it is environmentally just to build the DRIC project in a neighborhood largely populated by minorities.

- There is no discussion in the environmental justice analysis concerning potential impacts to the community from noise and traffic emissions.

- Your agencies did not include a health risk assessment. Additional effort must be made to quantify such potential serious increases as to both acute and chronic exposure risk, as well increased cancer risk from the listed acute and hazardous air toxics.

- The proposed mitigation for environmental justice impacts is virtually meaningless, consisting only of mandatory relocation assistance and a required security fence for the proposed plaza.

- The development of a second span across the Detroit River will increase impervious surface. A storm water management system that avoids discharge, but rather collects, detains, and treats on site should be developed as part of the project.

- For houses or other structures that will be demolished or relocated, sewer lines should be filled with concrete or grout at the basement level. Abandoned wells should also be filled with concrete or grout from the bottom up.

- Compliance with and a permit under Part 91 (Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control) if PA 451 of 1994 may be required.

- 0.70 acres of wetland have been identified. Thus, compliance with and a permit under Part 303 (Wetland Protection) of PA 451 of 1994, the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, may be required.

- p ES-5 indicates the No Build Alternative includes the proposed six-lane replacement of the existing Ambassador Bridge. Do the Build Alternatives in this bridge as well? This project should be included as part of the analysis, particularly with respect to indirect and cumulative impacts.

- p ES-24 indicates I-75 and its service drive would be realigned under Alternatives #3 and #11. This does not appear to be addressed anywhere else in the descriptions of the Practical Alternatives.

- p 2-5 introduces four private-sector alternatives. The Mich-Can proposal and Don Flynn proposal are never fully described, nor is it adequately explained why they were dropped.

- It is difficult to follow the narrowing of alternatives. A table listing the 51 original illustrative alternatives and the fatal flaws that narrowed the list down to 37 may help. Another table showing the narrowing of the Preliminary Practical Alternatives to Practical Alternatives would also help.

- It is not clear from the discussion of p 2-51 if crossing X10A remains viable for further analysis or not.

- Table S-8, p ES-43, indicates the combined traffic at the Ambassador Bridge and the new crossing would increase under the Build Alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative. Is this increase due to induced traffic or does it represent a shift away from the Blue Water Bridge and Detroit-Windsor Tunnel?
Is there any concern about the continued validity of proposed Blue Water Bridge plaza enhancements?

Are the six upcoming projects referenced on p 3-33 included in the traffic analysis? If so, are they included in only the No Build Alternatives or the Build Alternatives as well?

p 3-62 indicates local roads would operate at an acceptable LOS under Build and No Build Alternatives. The discussion of the freeway segments is limited to the Build Alternatives. Will the freeway exceed capacity under a No Build situation?

p 3-70 indicates additional coordination will occur regarding congestion in the area of the new crossing. SEMCOG fully supports and encourages this coordination.

Simply because non-minority groups would also be impacted does not negate the heavy burden on minority populations. Compared to regional averages, minority persons and low-income households are over-represented in the project area, which in SEMCOG's estimation will always lead to disproportionate impacts.

The discussion of residential relocations indicates there is a sufficient supply of properties in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties to absorb the displaced. This seems to be a very wide area of analysis. What is the level of supply in the more immediate project area for those who may not wish to move far away?

The relocation strategy should adequately address the particular needs of renters.

The project will reduce neighborhood cohesion in the blocks surrounding the existing plaza . . . . This division of the neighborhood could potentially present a challenge to the local low-income population to find sufficient alternatives to the departed businesses of comparable types.

The proposed plaza would be directly adjacent to the existing Southwestern High School. Adequate buffers are required to prevent any unreasonable safety and hazardous impacts to the high school and/or its students and faculty.

The DEIS indicates a number of pedestrian crossing over I-75 will be removed and some existing transit routes will be impacted . . . . Given that non-motorized and transit modes are vital in this community, a more strongly worded commitment to replacing crossings as appropriate and maintaining adequate transit service should be considered.

P ES-42 discusses . . . exploring concepts to enhance the Delray community . . . . The agencies should continue to work with [the] community [and] develop action plans to ensure the implementation of those plans.

There are at least four major facilities that are either under construction or consideration - the Ambassador Bridge Gateway Project . . . Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal, Detroit River Tunnel Partnership (replacement tunnel), and Ambassador Bridge Enhancement Project (replacement bridge). While it is not required by the NEPA process, MDOT and FHWA should work with the community to assess the cumulative impacts of these projects and develop strategies not only to mitigate the negative impacts, but to take better advantage of the community's strategic location as a transportation hub.

The sidebars on p ES-17 are out of context as these items are not discussed in the summary text.

p 3-1 references the seven-county SEMCOG region, but it is never explained what SEMCOG is or which counties are included.

p 3-42 indicates . . . "They have the potential to reinforce the compatibility of residential and industrial areas of Delray." It needs to be clarified that the Practical Alternatives would reinforce this compatibility. SEMCOG has no authority to do so, but given the current sentence structure, this seems to be implied.

Will an opportunity be provided to consider the findings of [the Canadian environmental process] within the context of the FEIS or even before then?
• Air Quality Technical Report - Section 2.1.2 - While the three-year average ending in 2006 showed Southeast Michigan meeting the national ozone standard, high values at three monitors in 2007 pushed the latest three-year averages at these monitors over the standard. Thus, the region has not yet demonstrated attainment.

• Air Quality Technical Report - Section 5.1 - The CO conformity budget is 3,842.8 tons/day, not 1,946 tons/day.

• Air Quality Technical Report - Section 5.1 - Table 5-1: On March 12, 2008 USEPA changed the 8-hour ozone standard from 0.08 ppm to 0.075 pp. The one-hour standard has been revoked.

• The project has already been included in a regional air quality conformity analysis. Depending on the Preferred Alternative selected, minor adjustments may be necessary.

• Air Quality Technical Report - Section 5.3.2.2 - The last paragraph of this section (Summary) says the Southwestern High School and Lafayette monitors are "well within the 24-hour standard." In fact, both of these monitors are currently violating the 24-hour standard. The standard is 35 ug/m3. The latest three-year averages for these monitors are 40 for Southwestern High School and 37 for Lafayette.

• MDOT should require contractors to use construction equipment that at least meets USEPA's Tier 3 standards for off-road equipment. If Tier 4 equipment (which is being phased in between 2008 and 2016) is available, this should be used.

• The project design should include landscaping - using native vegetation - to help absorb pollution, reduce fugitive dust, and approve overall aesthetics in the vicinity of the project.

• Once the study is completed and the preferred option presented, the decision to proceed or not is out of your control, but a wonderful effort has been made to make the host community aware of what can be done as far as improving their quality of life and economic status.

• The crossing that is to the east of Fort Wayne will desiccate Olde Sandwich Towne, which is under a great deal of stress already as the ambitions of the existing (Ambassador Bridge) are being fought.

• The DEIS either gives short shrift to or totally ignores air quality issues and the impact of the project on the health of the community.

• The potential impacts of increased freight traffic as a result of a new bridge crossing and the associated infrastructure (plazas and roads) need to be studied very closely in terms of the region's already poor air quality standards.

• The environmental justice analysis for the DRIC study has not been given the serious consideration it deserves, especially since the plaza for the bridge will be located near Southwestern High School. Exposure of diesel emissions to children has shown to cause serious health consequences, and it is inexcusable to issue a DEIS without considering these and other issues and simply saying "we'll think about that later." I149

• Many members of our communities hardest hit by the proposed crossing are not fluent in English. These materials, or even substantive summaries of community impacts and proposed mitigation measures, have not been provided in Spanish, making it extremely difficult for English-learners to participate in this process. The translators provided at public meeting are helpful, but insufficient to address this need . . . . We respectfully ask that the agencies provide the community with, at the very least, substantive summaries of the community impact portions of the DEIS translated into Spanish and sufficient time to review and comment on the information.

• I am very concerned that the new bridge being proposed by the . . . DRIC partnership could further divide Delray and further suffocate the community’s efforts to revitalize.
• A new bridge is not even necessary. The owners of the Ambassador Bridge have already acquired the land they need to expand the currently existing crossing . . . .
• This study pays only lip service to the considerations and careful analysis afforded to such a community by the Environmental Justice policy in Executive Order 12898.
• It appears to me that your agencies believe Delray residents simply burn to the ground anyway.
• Your agencies are also assuming that the hundreds of displaced Delray residents can be "absorbed" by the Metro Detroit tri-county area . . . . The DEIS, however, does not explain how a community that generally lives below the poverty line and lacks access to vehicles is supposed to move out to the suburbs.
• The fundamental question should be whether putting a bridge in Delray, as opposed to some other community, has disproportionately adverse impacts on a minority population. The site selection process is essential to preventing environmental racism. Delray residents and community organizations should be afforded the opportunity to participate in a meaningful, transparent process.
• Delray residents and community organizations should be afforded the opportunity to participate in a meaningful, transparent process.
• It is difficult to be expected to comment on a document that does not provide concrete information about significant potential impacts to the Delray community and provides only guesses as to the mitigation of those impacts. Delray must be provided with timely, complete information about . . . noise, local transportation systems, relocation of families, destruction of church congregations, demolition of historic buildings and the impacts to air quality . . . .
• Some . . . students who attend our school live in Delray and if this project moves forward, we will lose students and their families from this community and the City of Detroit.
• These materials, or even substantive summaries of community impacts and proposed mitigation measures, have not been provided in Spanish or Arabic, making it extremely difficult for English-learners to participate in this process. Therefore, we request that you put a stop to moving forward until this community understands the entire process through bi-lingual material (Spanish and Arabic), a more concise explanation of the DEIS and to give them sufficient time to review and comment on the information.
• I am writing in support of not destroying the Delray community by using it as a bridge site [which] would surely disrupt a lot of people who are currently in dire straights.
• Relocation . . . would also disrupt the school enrollment.
• The Bridge Company . . . proposal seems to make more sense . . . .
• We believe that the DEIS falls short of understanding the short and long term effects not only on the quality of education, but most importantly health and safety of the Delray and surrounding communities.
• We strongly urge for the DEIS to withdraw . . . and take into serious consideration the voice and issues expressed by this community.
• As an educational institution we are also very concern since the results of this project will be a hindrance and add yet another stumbling block to the lack of educational access . . .
• We respectfully asked that in order to get a full understanding of what the community needs are that you provide translators and material that are considerate of the cultural diversity in this community. All materials published (questionnaires, flyers, brochures, etc.) should be publish in Spanish, Arabic, and any other languages spoken so that communication is clear and expectations are very well understood.
• We sincerely believe that it is essential to have the Environmental Justice and Health Impact Study completed and available for . . . comment . . . .
• We are pleased with the support of the Governor of Michigan for continued development of plans and permits for the Ambassador Bridge enhancement project between Detroit and Windsor Ontario, Canada. The Governor's November 1, 2007 letter to you [Hon. Mary Peters, Secretary, Department of Transportation] clearly states that level of support, and we continue to firmly believed that the privately financed second span of the Ambassador Bridge should continue to be an international priority for both the United States and Canada, and a viable option for the taxpayers of the State of Michigan and America.

• We recently became aware that the published Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) project has a current deadline for public comment on this more-than-6,000-page environmental study of April 29, 2008. Due to the significant impact that this study has for all stakeholders, and so that all parties can fully understand the report, we believe it would be reasonable that the agencies extend the comment period on the DEIS for a six-month period.

• There is an obvious need for better coordination and timing with the Canadian environmental process that has yet to issue a document for public review and comment describing the proposed project in Canada (including the customs plaza and roadway connection plans)

• We have concerns about adequate disclosure in the DEIS of the cumulative effects and transboundary impacts of the DRIC project when considered together with other transportation projects in the region, including the Ambassador Bridge expansion project and the Blue Water bridge project.

• It is our hope that the DRIC study, which has cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and significant energy, effort and work, comes to closure and a decision on the bridge is made expeditiously.

• We recommend in the strongest terms possible that the Administration accelerate its efforts both in the United States and through its dialogue with Canada, to follow the direction of Congress and ensure the construction of the second span of the Ambassador Bridge.

• Since the licensed health care facilities/services are not in close proximity to the proposed construction; most of the patients, visitors, and staff at these facilities will not be adversely impacted for the duration of the project in terms of longer travel times to/from these facilities. Thus at this time, we believe there would be no significant adverse impact of the proposed project on licensed healthcare facilities.

• The Draft Environmental Impact Statement has been issued. While it may contain valuable information, it is written in somewhat technical terms. Delray is a valuable sector of Southwest Detroit, with a wealth of history and committed multi-cultural Detroiters. We ask that you slow down and work together with us to get a more concise explanation of the DEIS in small groups that may be less intimidating.

• This is a letter of support for the new bridge going through Delray. . . . I support the new bridge [because] 1. . . . Free trade . . . . Economically it is a benefit for the Detroit and Metropolitan area; 2. Security . . . . Just in case something happens; 3. Trucks have become so congested that there is need for another crossing; 4. There is a need for new life in this community with I feel will happen with the construction of a new bridge.

• We are a historical denomination. We are the oldest black institution in the United States. We believe that the church is the people not the building.

• I believe it is essential to have the Environmental Justice and Health Impact Study completed and available for comment in the DEIS.

• We are the owners of Kovac's Bar...and . . . . [a]fter receiving volumes of information . . . We have concluded that a new bridge is necessary . . . . And feel that plan 7 would be
the best. Any further delays for additional studies would not be in the benefit of anyone who is affected.

- As a State Senator and member of the DRIC Local Advisory Council (LAC), I have had the pleasure of observing a public process that has gone above and beyond to encourage the use of public input. . . . In addition to the 40 formal public meetings and workshops held during the DRIC study over the past 36 months, I have attended or been represented at over 30 DRIC LAC meetings which were also open to the public. These meetings were advertised in thousands of direct postal and electronic mailings, broadcast over radio and television, and explained in detail on the DRIC website. Citizens, community leaders, business groups and other interested parties were provided with information in multiple languages and were given ample opportunity to comment.

- I anticipate there may be some who will request an extension to the public comment period. . . . However, an extension . . . would only serve to bog down a process that has remained transparent and open to public scrutiny for over three years. The citizens of the State of Michigan and others affected by this potential project would not benefit in any way from an extension.

- The DEIS indicates that indirect and cumulative traffic and air quality impacts are not expected to increase. The DEIS fail[s] to take into account the indirect and cumulative traffic and air quality impacts for the six important transportation projects that affect the study area (page 3-33).

- The DEIS state[s] that air pollutants will increase in the Plaza and Crossing areas. MSAT increase within the DRIC project area will be offset by a MSAT decrease at the Ambassador Bridge when referring to the No Build Alternative. This statement assumes a net balance in MSAT. Additional data/analysis is required to support this assumption. Furthermore, the DEIS failed to provide a comparison for MSAT No-Build verse Build Alternatives.

- The [Detroit] DEA agrees that further evaluation of the noise wall is required. Also, a discussion between the City and MDOT regarding a potential agreement needs to occur prior to the development of the FEIS.

- Contaminated site assessments and cleanups are not contingent upon the construction of the DRIC, but redevelopment potential.

- The DEIS leaves an impression (based on 2035 projections) that the construction of the DRIC would provide approximately 25,000 jobs to the state, and in contrast expects major job loss (approx. 71,000), if not constructed.

- It is interesting to note that in all discussions while jobs will be lost within the host city/community due to the construction of the DRIC neither the host city/community is mentioned in regards to jobs created/growth.

- A direct correlation of this point would be the current 56 businesses, roughly making up 686-920 jobs that currently exists (2008) verse the 775 permanent jobs estimated for the bridge operations in 2035. Our position is that the City has a current market that would be jeopardized by relocated/displaced as a direct result of the DRIC, leaving a net loss of approximately 145 jobs in 2035.

- In addition, 324 to 414 dwelling units would be relocated/displaced as a direct result of the DRIC that would be realized as a loss in property tax. Yet, the DEIS mentions that "there would be significant gains in income taxes from jobs and associated sales tax from construction spending that would off-set the expected loss." Need more detail.

- What is being asked of the City is to sacrifice the Delray community for the good of the state and region. This is indicative of the general statements . . . That "past trends will continue," when in fact progress is being made.
• Various policies and procedures have been and are put into place to address many of the concerns mentioned in the DEIS, such as "heavy industrial growth." . . . Such as rezoning, Industrial Review Committee resolutions and Host Community Agreements to name a few. . . . It is unfair to state that Delray is expected to grow more industrial without a crossing.
• What parameters are being used to identify the "local" economy?
• What efforts are in place to preserve Delray's identity during and following the DRIC construction?
• Of the 8,939 to 10,416 direct jobs and 22,986 to 26,784 indirect jobs during the construction period - how many will be specifically allocated to Detroit/Delray residents?
• Just Compensation/Fair Market Value may not be appropriate nor feasible given the current economy and market particularly given "A house in need of repair can be purchased for as little as $15,000," within the Delray community.
• The . . . DEIS . . . asks the reader to assume that only two alternatives exist . . . . In fact a third alternative exists and that is to build another river crossing further downriver.
• The DEIS states that traffic in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT), especially for trucks, will improve overall in the SEMCOG Region while getting significantly worse in the border crossing area if one of their suggested alternative river crossings are built. This would seem to be in direct contradiction to Environmental Justice goals and principles.
• The DEIS goes on to assert . . . Air equality will improve due to improved emission equipment on trucks and low sulfur diesel fuel. This may be overly optimistic.
• The DEIS states that the overall air quality in the region is improving. This is not correct. USEPA has designated Wayne County and six (6) other Michigan counties as non-attainment for both ozone and PM\textsubscript{2.5}.
• The DRIC based its conclusion on the assumption that the new EPA regulatory standards . . . will generate adequate emission control . . . to reduce emission levels in 2035 to below levels identified in 2004. However, the number of vehicle hours in the Border Crossing area will increase upwards of 150% over the numbers identified in 2004.
• At a minimum an analysis of health impacts needs to be added to the DEIS.
• The DRIC did not account for an accumulative effect from other transportation projects forecasted for Detroit.
• The analysis for reduction of air emissions in 2035 is based on the fact that all the fleet vehicles will be in compliance with the EPA standards triggered in 2007. It does not account for . . . Canadian owned and operated vehicles . . . Or identify the number of trucks that are owned/operated by individuals whom tend to operate the older vehicles.
• EPA has determined that diesel exhaust is likely to cause lung cancer after years of exposure.
• Our Department recommends that prior to starting construction and once the specific alternative is selected, MDOT conducts a Health Assessments on all potential impacts the project will have on a localized basis within the Border Crossing community. . . . It is contention that MDOT fail to adequately address the adverse health and environmental effects to the local community and its residents.
• It is not clear why the Fort was not considered a Sensitive Receptor.
• The DEIS did not adequately analyze and evaluate the impact of noise on the Fort's immediate surroundings and users, and what special concerns might need to be addressed in regards to both interior and exterior use during and after construction.
• The EIS did not adequately analyze and evaluate the visual impact of the DRIC on the Fort's immediate surroundings, users and what special design concerns should be implemented to help integrate the Plaza with the Fort.
• The air pollution sections focus on Southwest Detroit and ignores . . . the Fort's immediate surroundings and its users.
• The EIS was silent on the potential impact vibrations will have on the Fort structures during construction and long-term post construction.
• Significant impacts within the Delray community will result. . . This in not to say that many of the concerns are insurmountable, but dialogue is needed, as the host city/community yet have questions and concerns needing to be addressed.
• Additional traffic . . . from both the DRIC and the Gateway Project can only add more pollution.
• A 160 acre truck plaza . . . . I understand that they don't turn off their engines. . . . We should expect best available technology to reduce pollution from idling trucks.
• We will lose 2 or 3 cross streets and 2 or 4 of only 5 foot bridges over I-75. . . . We need to keep continuity.
• I am concerned about increased traffic on the freeways and the loss of use for commuters, and for our continuity with the downriver suburbs.
• We need to keep good and attractive access to the site [Fort Wayne] and not throw away still unclaimed opportunities for public good.
• It's my preference, if there is a bridge, that it not be ostentatious in style.
• When I went to Bowen Branch library today, I did not find the DEIS, nor was the reference librarian able to provide me with one, therefore I believe the comment period should be extended.
• We believe that it is a matter of simple human and "environmental justice" that MDOT continue to work with the community to actually implement the proposed land usage plans.
• The best way for this to occur is the formulation of a legally binding community benefit agreement between the residents, local organizations and the State of Michigan and other appropriate governmental entities.
• Central to . . . Redevelopment is the need to build new housing and commercial development in Delray, which will replace single resident housing and businesses, taken for the DRIC project and to build infill housing for residences lost to community neglect.
• People's Community Services would therefore like to formally request a meeting with MDOT and the DRIC study group to discuss the role People's Community Services could play in the redevelopment of Delray and . . . the DRIC usage plans. . . .
• We are concerned that the . . . DEIS . . . Does not fully catalogue the effects of the . . . DRIC . . . On the population in the Delray community. . . . The new DRIC bridge could further divide Delray and further suffocate the community's efforts to revitalize. . . . and Detroit is also one of the worst cities in the nation in terms of fine particle, or "soot," pollution. . . . For all of these reasons, we respectfully request ask for a 90-day extension of the public comment period.
• It [the DEIS] needs to be redrafted because people who live there [Southwest Detroit] need to read it in their own language which means, Spanish, English, Arabic and other languages.
• Now for the Section 4(f) Evaluation of historic properties. . . . I want you to go tell people who live in these historic buildings that they can't live there no more because you might need their property.
• All alternatives . . . Severe!y affect neighborhoods that already bear the disproportionate burden of . . . the high volume of transportation passing through the community. The
The Delray neighborhood and the proposed DRIC interchange and plaza areas are some of the most distressed areas in the nation. . . . environmental justice issues . . . including noise, visual and spatial impact, and especially air quality, would be made worse by a new border crossing.

- It is a matter of human and environmental justice that MDOT continue to work with the community to actually implement the proposed Delray Land Use Plans for the new community that the residents designed.
- The best way for this to occur is the formulation of a legally binding community benefit agreement between the residents, local organizations and the State of Michigan and the Federal Highway Administration.
- The positive financial gains of this publicly-owned enterprise should be simultaneously shared with the community to . . . alleviate the burdens to resident and the community. . .
- Locating a nationally-important economic project in this area without restorative investment in the community would be akin to locating a business on a superfund site without the environmental cleanup. Thus local investment for community development should be considered integral to the development of the overall project.
- A community benefits agreement should include but not be limited to: building new homes . . . infill housing . . . mitigating homes and businesses. . .
- [A CBA should] redevelop existing areas and create new commercial areas.
- [A CBA should provide] funding for workforce training and new business incubation.
- [A CBA should] insure easy access to comprehensive health services within the impact area.
- [A CBA should] maintain sidewalk and street connections for . . . All forms of non-motorized transportation throughout the impact area and between the north and south sides of I-75. . .
- [A CBA should] designate and enforce truck routes to keep trucks off of residential streets.
- [A CBA should] facilitate a legislative remedy or provide compensation to reduce the negative impact of the "pop up tax" on relocated residents.
- All relocated residents . . . be offered replacement housing of equivalent or higher value.
- [A CBA should] protect all historical and archeological sites.
- [A CBA should] protect and promote Fort Wayne, including providing attractive and easy access.
- [A CBA should] provide for non-motorized transportation infrastructure in the entire bridge project. . .
- The CBA should be implemented concurrently with the DRIC.
- The populace of southwest Detroit will be undertaking another source of air pollutants adding to the already cumulative affects of air toxics. . . .
- High concentrations of diesel particulate matter . . . Are directly associated with the development of lung diseases, including asthma, as well as more insidious cardiovascular diseases.
- A long-term population study to observe these health impacts should be promoted by MDOT and FHWA.
- The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the potential health impacts of this shift of MSAT emissions for residents of Delray and students at Southwestern High School. . . Public health experts that our organization has consulted indicate reasonable estimates can be made using these models for dispersion modeling. . . The EPA 1999 National Air Toxics Assessment . . has methodology . . . Uncertainty should not be provided as a reason to not conduct necessary analysis of impacts.
Because of the cumulative impacts of multiple transportation and industrial operations, it is important that all efforts to minimize additional contribution of particulate matter in the community be undertaken as mitigation.

The FEIS needs to incorporate mitigation for the construction phase: limiting the age of on-road construction vehicles; minimizing engine operations; restricting activities around Southwestern High School and other sensitive receptors; instituting fugitive dust control plans; using diesel particulate traps and oxidation catalysts; using existing power sources rather than temporary power generators; using equipment meeting EPA's Tier 3 standards for off-road equipment (if Tier 4 is available, this should be used); and use of cleaner burning fuels when possible.

Once the border crossing is opened, mitigation should include: anti-idling policies during truck inspections; air filtration systems for systems for sensitive receptors, including Southwestern High School; funding for air monitoring including mobile source air toxics, PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{10}$, SO$_2$ and continuous EC/OC sampling, PM$_{2.5}$ speciation measurements and continuous PM$_{2.5}$; regular sweeping of roads; and landscaping using native and non-invasive vegetation.

Infrastructure design that least impacts noise levels should be incorporated since stakeholders will bear a primary burden. Mitigation for increase noise from the project should be addressed in the FEIS.

It is important that the FEIS contain a commitment to conduct noise monitoring.

We support the request of CHASS to have Alternative 5 removed from consideration.

MDOT needs to solicit input from parents of Southwestern students, students at the high school, school administration and the Detroit Public Schools for additional mitigation requests to protect the health of students and mitigate other impacts to this facility.

The proposed plazas appear to more than double the size of the existing truck plaza for the Ambassador Bridge, which does not seem necessary.

Environmental impacts to the school will be significant, including impacts on air quality, noise and congestion.

Air quality mitigation for the school should be included through retrofitting area truck fleets with diesel reduction technologies.

Air quality mitigation for the school should include construction an indoor recreation facility for the school an environmental justice issue.

Access to the school should be preserved from the north to the south side of I-75, including keeping Springwells open and reconstructing pedestrian bridges over I-75.

Improvements envisioned by the community for the area around the school should be implemented, including along Fort Street.

The school [Southwestern] should receive positive investments such as in sports and technological equipment.

The proposed Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal (DIFT), the widening of Interstate 94, the reconstruction of the Detroit River rail tunnel, the construction of the MDOT Gateway Project, and the DRIC Study project are all located in Southwest Detroit. Segmenting the planning and evaluation of these project dilutes the real impacts, particularly cumulative impacts.

A project of this scale demands that multiple agencies work together to cohesively design an overall system of transportation and place that maximizes efficiencies.

Livernois-Dragoon and the streets which have schools (Junction, Clark, Central, Vernor, etc.) need to be limited to local trucks only. The DRIC project is both an opportunity and an obligation to re-think conflicting land uses and designate truck routes to better deal with the various intermodal activities in the area.
• Various plans have been developed to create greenways and non-motorized transportation in southwest Detroit. The DRIC is an opportunity for collaboration to achieve these greenway links.

• All new roadway designs and changes should incorporate existing non-motorized and greenway plans, and maximize new potential connections to the river front and adjacent communities.

• In the future the budgets for major transportation studies should include a line item to provide funding for independent technical review of the DEIS and supporting technical reports for the community.

• We have also received feedback from a number of area residents that it has been very difficult to stay informed on the DRIC process.

• We urge MDOT and other appropriate state and federal agencies to discuss implementing a community benefits agreement.

• We ask that a meeting be set with representatives of the Community Benefits Coalition Board within 60 days of the announcement of the preferred alternative.

• Put lights on main cables of bridge. Such lights are on Ambassador Bridge, and the new bridge should (with cable lights) be as encouraging to cross this new span.

• I looked through the material left at the library. The only problem I found is that a lay person could not understand everything in the books - without a clear understanding it was impossible to conclude what was being conveyed to the public.

• This project is critical and extremely important to the success of the Michigan economy. We strongly recommend this project proceed expeditiously and should be a priority for all levels of government.

• We [U.S. Coast Guard] have completed our review of the DRIC DEIS and have no comments.

• As part of a four year process, the DEIS is the first milestone in the conclusion of the overall study. Following this process, we encourage further timely completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), determination of the preferred alternative and submission to both federal governments for the Record of Decision. We look forward to the conclusion of this process in 2008 to comply with the original intent and needs of the partnership.

• MDOT and the other parties involved have been informative, cooperative and courteous to those of us attending public meetings and seeking information on this process. However, I am concerned that if this project goes forward, we will be assured of this continuation of community involvement.

• I am a member of the Community Benefits Agreement Coalition and support the vision statement and the formal comments this group has submitted.

• I would like to go on record as opposing Alternative #5 because of the direct impact on the CHASS Clinic.

• TRU proposes serious consideration of an improved transit alternative between Detroit and Windsor, such as an extension of the planned Woodward Corridor light rail system under the Detroit River... appears to us to be a "reasonable alternative," as that term is used in the Council on Environmental Quality regulations [40 CFR 1502]... It therefore is necessary to comprehensively evaluate that option... in a supplemental DEIS, as required by 40 CFR 1502.9.

• While useful, the existing tunnel bus service is insufficient to truly meet the needs of the traveling public.

• Homeland security is improved by implementing a cross-border light rail transpiration service because it is a simpler task to process public transportation patrons individually.
The DEIS is a very detailed review of several highway options for building a new truck/automobile bridge over the Detroit River at locations between the existing Ambassador Bridge and the southern tip of Grosse Ile Township.

The context of this DEIS is twofold. First there is an overriding policy context. In addition there is a factual context.

There are at least three dimensions within the policy context: CEQ requirements; the President's agreement with the Prime Minister of Canada as stated on 21 August 2007; and the US government requirement that any new international border crossing requires a Presidential Permit before it can be constructed.

The second aspect of the policy context is the President's 21 August 2007 statement. Note that the statement does not commit the US and Canadian governments to any particular mode of transportation.

The third and final aspect of the policy context is that if any "development of enhanced capacity" involves the construction of a new bridge or tunnel, a Presidential Permit is required. The US Department of State processes applications.

The factual context of the DEIS is that regrettably it is but one of three environmental statements for three proposed international crossing projects.

Presumably an environmental statement will be required for each of the three Detroit River crossing proposals by the Canadian Government.

Unfortunately there simply is no way that the [DRIC] DEIS as it is constructed at this time can address the totality of environmental impacts of the three separate proposals.

In conclusion, the DEIS needs to be redone by the Office of the U.S. Secretary of Transportation rather than by the Federal Highway Administration or another modal administration in order to objectively satisfy the CEQ requirement for a DEIS.

The DEIS needs clarification as to what the DRTP proposes to do.

The DEIS should be modified to conspicuously indicate that one reasonable alternative to building new bridges over the Detroit River at this time is to route more traffic over the BWB [Blue Water Bridge] as long as the BWB has the ability to absorb more traffic.

There appears to be no information in any of the DEIS documentation regarding the assumptions in the travel demand forecasting process of the border crossing fees for the years for which the traffic forecasts have been made. The DEIS should be amended to clarify the traffic forecasting assumptions and to quantitatively evaluate at least the fare policy options identified above.

The DEIS uses 2004 as a base year. We now have three more years of data and the DEIS should be amended to establish 2007 as the base year. Traffic volumes on at least the BWB [Bluewater Bridge] declined considerably between the end of 2004 and the end of 2007. The DEIS should be modified to present the traffic counts for the AMB [Ambassador Bridge], DWT [Detroit-Windsor Tunnel] and BWB and amend the forecast for the planning horizon year, 2034.

Because significant fuel price changes have an impact on travel demand the travel demand forecast contained in the DEIS should be redone. In addition, the change gives impetus to identify the improvement of intermodal freight services as a reasonable alternative.

The 2034 peak hour PCEs [passenger car equivalents] projection derived above [by the commenter] is slightly less than 90% of the available capacity in place at this time, a result which suggests the need for providing more highway capacity across the Detroit River is not as urgent as is suggested in Figure S-2. The DEIS should be revised to explicitly state how the peak period PCE statistic was derived from the year 2034 travel demand forecast and the justification for the procedure.
Neither the DEIS nor the TDF [travel demand forecasting] contains an analysis of the sensitivity of the hourly PCE for 2034 to changes in assumption made in the calculations . . . It is possible to provide incentives to travel at times other than peak periods. The DEIS also should be amended to address the sensitivity of the peak hour travel forecasts to the implementation of various peak period travel disincentives.

The DEIS requires amendment to clearly present both existing and forecasted travel volumes between Detroit and Upstate New York that uses travel through Ontario as a short cut.

Given the non-availability of 2005 [origin-destination] data, and given that practical alternatives to the DRIC project can not be evaluated without such data, it is imperative that the DEIS be amended to include the 2005 origin-destination information and then released to the public for additional comment.

Given the statement quoted above that 44% of the truck traffic crossing AMB [Ambassador Bridge] as of 2004 is potentially divertible to rail . . . It is imperative that the intermodal rail option be addressed, even though the rail intermodal service alternative is not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency in this case.

The DEIS should be amended to do the requisite analysis of the public transportation alternate.

Low Cost Alternatives - . . . several bridge and tunnel pricing policies [could] provide incentives to travel either before or after the facilities’ peak travel hours and/or to travel in high-occupancy vehicles such as car pools or van pools.

Low Cost Alternatives - . . . A second option is to entice the drivers of trucks and autos to use the BWB [Bluewater Bridge]. . . A public education program is appropriate.

Low Cost Alternatives - . . . Establish a reversible lane program for BWB [Bluewater Bridge] and possible AMB [Ambassador Bridge] to take advantage of a major imbalance in directional traffic flows.

The record of working documents that are a part of the DEIS should be amended to include the TDF [travel demand forecasting] report.

Closing streets that cross over the I75 expressway or reducing the lanes on remaining crossovers will impact the community on both sides of Fort Street.

The community on the north side of Fort Street will experience additional truck traffic.

. . . . The DEIS suggests [noise] barriers may not be feasible in all situations; that additional streets would need to be cut off . . . for barriers to be effective . . .

Approximately 15-20 sites are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places . . . Rather than demolish these building, if all involved would consent, these building could be moved to the Fort Wayne area.

As expressway traffic backs up on I-75, truckers will seek the quickest route to enter or exit of I-75 to I-94 or I-75 and will use Jefferson Avenue in River Rouge down to South Schaefer.

A trucker expressed concerns about the proposed rerouting of trucks and stated in all probability routes trucker will take. Please reference this previous public comment.

. . . . To say PM10 is the standard or that PM2.5 is the standard or that the government has yet to define the standard is questionable.

Placing a plaza that abuts Southwestern High School where trucks will be idling or where additional truck traffic will be in the area in no way can be considered to "not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority population groups in the Delray Study area."

The key word is disproportionately which requires a comparison of something to something. The Community Inventory Technical Report presents Community Neighborhood Characteristics for specific Southwest Detroit neighborhoods . . . but it
The DEIS does not project additional health risks to citizens residing in these proposed impacted Southwest Detroit neighborhoods. A health survey should be conducted.

Governor Jennifer Granholm signed into law Executive Directive No. 2007-23 on November 21, 2007. Hopefully these guidelines will be finalized and included in a final approval document for a project such as this.

Where do low-income, disenfranchised people go when their homes are taken by eminent domain? Many persons living in the Delray neighborhood are a part of the Empowerment Zone which permits them to be exempt from paying the city of Detroit property taxes for 12 years. How will these people survive if they will now be required to pay higher utilities, property taxes and possibly a mortgage albeit at a low interest rate?

Education and income are key to survival. Did the DEIS consider both factors in their Community Neighborhood Characteristics?

The DEIS does not present socio-economic data that discusses or compares the survivability of a population of displaced person. It is suggested such a study be conducted.

The Build Alternative is projected to relocate 324-414 household (This equates to how many people? How many of these are senior citizens? Student who attend Southwestern High School? How many use public transportation?)

We are concerned about possible impacts on HUD funded activities along the proposed design and route. Enclosed please find the City of Detroit expenditures for HUD funded activities for the DRIC Study Area (Cluster 5 and small part of Cluster 4). We believe it is necessary to have a more thorough understanding of the Demolition and Relocation Plans.

[On page ES-19] "400 jobs": Is that CBP alone, or does it include the other federal inspection services?

[On page ES-19] "200 brokers": Seems to be a high number - the current population at the Cargo Inspection Facility, 2810 W. Fort St., is 18 broker firms, with a total employee population of approximately 50-60 persons over multiple shifts for a 24 hour work day. Electronic transactions have reduced the number of people needed on site.

[On page ES-27] Is consideration to physically relocate historic structure a possibility; to relocate displaced residents who desire to remain in Delray, to a "new" neighborhood community?

In general we (FAA) have no comments. We strongly encourage you to file a FAA form 7460 with the general bridge location and height, so that we can perform any required airspace analysis. T. This analysis will also provide information on what type of marking and lighting will be required for the project.

The bridge crossing will require a permit under Part 301, Inland Lakes and Streams, and Part 31, Water Resources Protection, of the NREPA. Proper storm water runoff controls should be implemented to ensure that there is no direct runoff from the bridge into the Detroit River.

LWMD staff reviews projects for consistency with Michigan's Coastal Management Program (MCMP). Provided no valid objections based on valid environmental concerns are received during the public notice period and all required permits are issued and compiled with, no adverse impacts to coastal resources are anticipated. Upon issuance of all necessary permits, this project will be consistent with MCMP.
• I will not support a federal initiative for a new crossing that would hurt our established and existing crossings . . . To protect Michigan and the U.S. taxpayers from further wasteful expenditure on the DRIC process, I not only support the request of my colleagues, Rep. Kilpatrick and Rep. Knollenberg, for a six-month extension of the DEIS public comment period, I also request that the Department put the DEIS on hold indefinitely to more fully understand the impacts that the DRIC may cause to our region.

• As the author of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), it is critically important that members of the community have ample opportunity to comment, however, it is equally important that an extension is not used simply as a tactic to delay the process . . . Given that the comment period of the DEIS ends this week [April 29] . . . How many public comments has the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) received in response to the DEIS? . . . [and] In your opinion, has the 60 day comment period been sufficient to meet the needs of the people? If so, please explain why. If not, please explain why not.

• It is critical that the bi-national partners take the steps to expand international border crossing infrastructure, and enhance the seamless flow of goods and people in order to strengthen the vitality of the Great Lakes economic region.

• Equally important is the need to revitalize urban neighborhoods . . . We must insure . . . Infrastructure is designed in a manner that limits its impacts on residential and commercial retail development.

• Public ownership is critical.

• As the DRIC Study progresses, . . . Discussion should include an initiative designed to ensure . . . Credible security protocols while improving efficiency and reliability.

• Current capacity at the border will be overloaded by as early as 2015 if high traffic growth occurs and by 2035 if traffic grows more slowly . . . It is prudent and appropriate to plan now.

• The DRIC Study Final Environmental Impact Statement should include, as a mitigating activity, funding for and a specific timeline for a coordinated and comprehensive community-based transportation infrastructure project plan.

• One of the most critical mitigation activities that must be incorporated into the DRIC Study Final Environmental Impact Statement is a comprehensive economic development strategy that focuses on Michigan’s significant international trade strengths.

• Several entities have articulated the need for an economic strategy designed to develop the Great Lakes region, Michigan, and southeast Michigan as a global logistics and transportation hub . . . The DRIC Study should advocate for such a coordinated strategy as well as provide funding and leadership to forward this critical initiative.

• Redundancy is a critical objective of the DRIC Study Project and an essential feature . . . The current international border crossing system does not work. A breakdown in one lane of traffic, on a local road, or a similar system failure can significantly disrupt the flow of commerce for the entire region. A natural disaster or terrorist attack on such infrastructure would have truly enormously debilitating impact . .

• I want to be sure that FHWA is aware that the law has, and continues to, restrict MDOT’s participation in the DRIC Study. Currently, the public comment period on the DEIS is set to expire on April 29, 2008. Because the legislative oversight hearings will not be completed before then, we believe that the public comment period should be extended for at least six months.

• For fiscal year 2006-2007, the enacted budget law directed that MDOT "shall not, directly or indirectly, expend any funds appropriated [through line-item appropriations] for design or right-of-way acquisition associated with a new crossing of the Detroit River between Detroit, Michigan and Windsor, Ontario."
For the 2007-2008 fiscal year (Public Act. 129 of 2007, Sec. 384) the law imposes more severe limits on MDOT. . . [it] prohibits MDOT from binding the State in any way to future action of any DRIC project recommendation. The law also specifies that "any additional spending to implement any recommendation of the DRIC Study will require prior approval of the full legislature."

It is critical that the bi-national partners take the steps to expand international border crossing infrastructure, and enhance the seamless flow of goods and people in order to strengthen the vitality of the Great Lakes economic region.

Equally important is the need to revitalize urban neighborhoods. We must insure . . . Infrastructure is designed in a manner that limits its impacts on residential and commercial retail development.

It is imperative that the spirit of environmental justice directives are followed to ensure that Southwest Detroit is not further disproportionately impacted by adverse air and noise impacts, loss of cultural and social resources, and an overall undermining of the residential and commercial development potential . . .

Redundancy is a critical objective of the DRIC Study Project and an essential feature. . . The current international border crossing system . . . does not work. . . . A breakdown in one lane of traffic, on a local road, or a similar system failure can significantly disrupt the flow of commerce for the entire region. A natural disaster or terrorist attack on such infrastructure would have truly enormously debilitating impact. . .

Public ownership is critical.

As the DRIC Study progresses, discussion should include an initiative designed to ensure credible security protocols while improving efficiency and reliability.

It is imperative that the growth and revitalization of the host community is equally as important of an objective of the DRIC Study as increasing international border crossing capacity. The Context Sensitive Solutions community workshops represent a strong commitment. As the DRIC Study proceeds, similar workshops should recommence. . . It will be important to complete the neighborhood land use plan through the design phase of the project.

Future design should include connections between neighborhoods and to the Detroit River; and increasing non-motorized routes and pathways. The design analysis must be extended to those areas that will be impacted north of I-75 by changes to the local roadway, new freeway ramps, and relocation.

Impacts to the West Vernor and Springwells commercial distracts must be thoroughly assessed . . .

It is critical that the preferred alternative is determined based on its ability to remove trucks from the local roadway system. The removal of truck traffic from the local roadway system [by the Gateway Project], particularly on Clark Street, must not be undermined by a new configuration of freeway ramps.

There will likely be a number of process-related lessons learned from the implementation of the Gateway Project that should be implemented during the construction phase for anew international bridge system.

Clark and Junction streets function as the main north and south access routes connecting Southwest Detroit neighborhoods. These routes should be protected for continued residential use.

A revitalized Delray neighborhood must be connected to surrounding neighborhoods.

Despite the fact that Livernois and Dragoon are residential, a substantial volume of truck traffic travels these streets Years of truck travel have resulted in a diminished quality of life for those living on these streets. There is strong consensus that trucks should be
permanently removed from Livernois and Dragoon . . . Achieving this outcome must be a priority of any DRIC Study alternative.

- Design alternatives to the local roadway changes should include concepts for increasing green spaces, non-motorized paths, lighting, and signage. In particular, the West Riverfront and Rouge River Gateway plans should be components of the final land use design.
- There also is support for land bridge treatments that host local pocket parks, such as that which crosses Interstate 696 in Oak Park.
- The Community Benefits Agreement Coalition should be empowered to guide the process of developing a Community Benefits Agreement. A final CBA must provide legal rights for community signatories.
- The DEIS does not full identify those mitigation strategies associates with each alternative and therefore substantially limits the commentary that can be provided as part of the DEIS process.
- The DRIC Study Final Environmental Impact Statement should include, as a mitigating activity, funding for and a specific timeline for a coordinated and comprehensive community-based transportation infrastructure project plan.
- Several entities have articulated the need for an economic strategy designed to develop the Great Lakes region, Michigan, and southeast Michigan as a global logistics and transportation hub. The DRIC Study should advocate for such a coordinated strategy as well as provide funding and leadership to forward this critical initiative.
- 56 businesses may be relocated . . . An economic development strategy must be developed with the goal of retaining these businesses in southwest Detroit and Delray.
- It is imperative that these businesses [seventeen major employers] are consulted as to their traffic and truck routing needs.
- It is critical that housing units are retained within southwest Detroit. There are several community development corporations with a successful portfolio of housing projects in southwest Detroit. These entities should be included in the planning . . .
- Careful analysis of the impact of future property tax liability on low-income individuals is warranted as it is my understanding low income households would not be able to sustain the property tax liability of a replacement dwelling.
- It is difficult to fathom how air quality will be improved with the construction of expanded international border crossing capacity that will accommodate the predicted growth n commercial traffic.
- Real improvements to air quality must be a component of the DRIC Study project. Clearly mobile source emissions are not the only component of localized air quality impacts.
- There is a dire need for a comprehensive analysis of air quality. Such an analysis must include identification of point and mobile source toxins, continued monitoring of the emission levels, and a clear action plan that incrementally improves air quality with measurable results. The Final EIS should include funding for such an analysis in addition to specific mitigating measures.
- The CBA for the DIFT project may be instructive in the types of [air quality] mitigation . . . diesel emission control programs, anti-idling equipment, retrofitting of heavy equipment, indoor air filtering system for residential and institutional building located within a specific radius from the international border crossing system.
- The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the potential health impacts that the shift in Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) emissions will have on Delray residents and Southwestern High School students.
- Noise monitoring must be an ongoing activity following construction.
• CHASS Clinic is not slated for acquisition [but] it would be severely impacted by any alternative. The FEIS must include provisions for the planned campus expansion, ensure that passenger and pedestrian routes are optimal, and truck traffic is routed away from the facility.
• It is imperative that discussion commence immediately with Southwestern High School representatives and the Detroit Public School system regarding impacts, mitigation, and benefits.
• Increased greening and buffering must be designed with SWHS representatives as well as opportunities to enhance the campus, curriculum, and extra-curricular programs. Particular attention to the ingress and egress of the school campus must be a component of the design workshops.
• All local permits should be included in the FEIS.
• The Transportation Committee recommended that the MAC [Michigan Association of Counties] support "the completion of the Detroit River International Crossing Study and that the Board encourage another international crossing which may include a twin span of the Ambassador Bridge."
• Will the new Medical/Fire/Police on Fort Street still be able to respond to calls?
• Why didn't MDOT think the Gateway Project through to include a vision with the downriver site.
• The Detroit Friends Meeting (Quakers) is missing from the list of principal religious organizations (Sec. 3.1.3, p 3-1). I hope future versions of the environmental impact study will correct this.
• If Canada stays strong we can look forward to a great bridge in southwest Detroit. I am pleased at the detail in the planning and the clear way it is presented,
• We have been located at Junction and Driggs for nearly 100 years. Our factory employs 30 Detroit taxpayers and we are good neighbors. We are very worried about X-11 destroying our business. What method will be used to compensate and relocate? The cost of new building as well as the disruption would be huge. I am surprised we have not yet been contacted.
• Ontario does not want a new crossing in the vicinity of the Ambassador Bridge.
• I do not like alternative 11 because it looks like they will make west end a truck route and I am 100% against that because it will cut right through the area of Delray that will be left.
• If a bridge is built, I would rather it not be owned by one individual. I think (I know) building can only help the area as well as its residents. I wish it could be done as soon as possible, at least the property acquisition. Just do it!
• Has your projection of 128% truck traffic increase by 2035 taken into account: 1) price of fossil fuel; 2) decline in North American auto industry – which accounts for large percentage of that $1B/Day in transit; and 3) the projection of added hassle factors to traffic across the border that would likely make businesses limit their crossings and consolidate operations to eliminate previously easy trips?
• Object to any plan for plaza and freeway connection that eliminates or degrades the Junction Avenue overpass on I-75. Our company is on South Junction and we don’t want to be cut off.
• Your long dragged out study has caused fear and neighborhood decline.
• Prefer to not have sound walls interfere with our view of downtown and river.
• There is enough vacant land in Detroit to locate 100% of displaced residents in a contiguous new in-filled area and make a new Delray.
• If you must build a redundant, taxpayer funded bridge (and I am not convinced) then please make it one of the southern options – X-10.
• No-build is not an option.
• Please continue your work and listen to the community stakeholders.
• Make the investments to continue to support this neighborhood, economic growth, and efficient and safe borders.
• Would like to see a new dedicated truck route running along side of existing and newly proposed railways between Jefferson and Fort Street on the west end.
• The Detroit-Windsor Tunnel remains a critical access point to both the United States and Canada and is a leading driver to the success of both economies. The passenger traffic primarily consists of commuters going to and from work, including thousands of nurses and other medical professions. The Tunnel does not advocate a specific position; it continues to support the allocation of greater resources to make out border more secure and efficient.
• I vote that the DRIC adopt the Greenlink plan at the very least…However everyone around here still wants a tunneled solution.
• The Ambassador Bridge should not be expanded at its current location. Any new bridge should be publicly owned and operated.
• Keep the bridge west of Clark Park for safety reasons. Preserve Fort Wayne, the new span should not destroy a historical treasure. Respect our Canadian neighbors and place the bridge west of the Ambassador Bridge.
• All displaced residents and businesses should be properly compensated. No running roughshod over their rights to a fair settlement.
• It is possible that the bridge footings will be placed at or near a former Detroit Gas Company Station. Recent information has revealed that the former Station is located on the Northwest corner of the Yellow Freight property and that soils and groundwater are likely heavily contaminated. This site should be added to table 3-27.
• Please be advised that the City of Detroit Water and Sewer Department has requested a permit to construct an additional tunnel to increase their discharge capacity from their waste water treatment plant. The tunnel extends into the Detroit River. That tunnel terminates beneath the River at a location very near the X-10B and X-10A crossings.
• The “Illustrative Alternatives” section offers a glimpse into the initial planning aspects of the project, but it is not a discussion of Alternatives as contemplated by NEPA or the courts that interpret that act, regardless of how MDOT framed it.
• With gas and diesel prices increasing significantly each month, it is both unreasonable and irresponsible for MDOT not to consider public transit and freight rail as Reasonable.
• MDOT’s public transit alternative must include an analysis of potential ridership for bus and commuter rail, where the potential riders begin their trips, and what their final destinations are.
• One reasonable alternative to the selected alternatives, insofar as freight traffic is concerned, is intermodal rail.
• The DEIS misleadingly concludes that air quality in the area of the Preferred Alternative will improve regardless of whether or not the bridge is built. This assumption is based on more stringent EPA air quality rules for particulate matter and carbon monoxide going into effect over time. However, as acknowledged in the DEIS, Southeast Michigan current is in non-attainment for current air quality standards and sensors in southwest Detroit are consistently reporting levels of pollutants above current EPA guidelines. Establishment of air quality standards by the EPA does not guarantee improving air quality, as demonstrated by the current non-attainment status, and it can not be assumed that air quality will quickly improve as the standards become more stringent.
While the MDOT is to be commended for including options for reducing air pollution during construction, options for reducing air pollution once the plaza is open must also be included in any final plan.

Transportation options that lessen the use of fuel per mile and per kilometer traveled, are more sustainable and will be a necessity in southeast Michigan, southwestern Ontario and beyond. Enhancing border capacity infrastructure with the exclusive development of an additional road-based crossing would be a myopic use of public funds and environmental capacity.

The construction of any and all border crossings must include the financing and completion of all SW Detroit greenways connecting to the west riverfront up into and through the neighborhoods, and joining onto the Detroit International Riverfront river walk, and the SW greenway that connects to the Rouge Gateway greenway.

Though there are not many routes impacted by this development, the displacement of low-income families (30%) and the multitude of zero car households (25%) are a concern. These demographics are a reflection of DDOT's typical rider and a project of this magnitude could have a massive impact on our ridership.

Clearly MDOT is attempting to once again use highway development as a tool for removing urban blight, and displacing many low-income and minorities in the Delray community. The local benefits of this project are minimal in comparison to the rest of the region so why would the bridge need to displace so many people and businesses in our city?

To allow a community to develop a Master Plan for themselves when the city already has a plan in place is misleading and inappropriate for residents.

A public private partnership with the Bridge Company would have been the best solution for the City and State.

The fact that Canada has not developed the Huron Church Rd. to accommodate truck traffic is not the State of Michigan’s problem or the City of Detroit’s.