August 22 and 23 PIOH 5 Workshop Sessions Summary Report

Workshop Purpose

The Public Information Open House #5 Workshop sessions were held on Wednesday August 22 and Thursday August 23 at the South Windsor Arena. The workshop sessions were focused on gathering input and comments about the material presented at the recent Public Information Open Houses held August 14 and 15. More specifically, the workshops were to gather input from the public regarding:

- what their issues and/or concerns were about the analysis presented at the recent Public Information Open Houses,
- their comments on the analysis conducted to date; and
- their comments and ideas regarding the new Parkway alternative.

Over 200 members of the public attended the two nights of workshop sessions. Workshop sessions consisted of a brief presentation that gave an overview of the update on the study process and progress, the analysis results conducted for the access roads and plazas, and an overview of the parkway alternative.

Workshop sessions were organized into round table discussions, with between five to six breakout group table discussions, headed by a DRIC Study Team member. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and provide their comments and opinions on the three general topics of discussion. All questions asked by the public were recorded, and together with the answer are provided in this summary report.

Workshop participants asked questions and provided comments which were recorded and are presented below.

Comments/Questions	Response
Illustrative Alternatives	
Route should have bypassed the City of Windsor Location of the highway is wrong; it should not be in Windsor; should be outside the city; should be in Amherstberg; crossing should go to Zug Island	In June 2005, we presented 15 river crossing alternatives, and associated plazas and access roads for public consultation. The analysis and evaluation, carried out between June and November, concluded that access route, plaza and crossing alternatives in the Area of Continued Analysis provide a good balance of transportation service and mobility, with fewer associated community and environmental impacts, in comparison to other alternatives. This analysis was completed using 7 major factor groups and over 35 evaluation criteria. Each alternative was assessed according to how well it fit the needs of both Canada and the United States. Given the nature and extent of land uses and development along the Detroit River in Canada and the U.S., it is not possible to develop a new or expanded river crossing, plaza and connecting roads that entirely avoid impacts on local communities. The goal of the Partnership is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the extent practicable. The Area of Continued Analysis was identified on the basis of an assessment that considered the transportation and mobility benefits and the impacts to social, cultural, economic and natural features, as well as cost. The evaluation concluded that the balance of advantages and disadvantages of the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor to access a new crossing in the Brighton Beach/Sandwich area was fundamentally better than that of the other alternatives. Details of this assessment are included in the Generation and Assessment of Illustrative Alternatives Report, Draft November 2005, available for viewing/downloading at www.partnershipborderstudy.com.
Reconsider the DRTP proposal	The Canadian and U.S. Project Teams studied the DRTP proposal as both a two-lane truckway (as proposed by DRTP) utilizing the existing rail tunnel and as a six-lane freeway with a new bridge crossing in downtown Windsor/Detroit. The capacity provided by the Detroit River Tunnel Partnership's two-lane truckway proposal does not meet the region's long-term needs. Quite simply, two lanes are not enough to accommodate future traffic growth at the border. The Project Teams also looked at a six-lane freeway utilizing the same corridor as the DRTP proposal. This option was eliminated because it would cut through a number of Windsor's residential neighbourhoods and would replace existing low-volume rail line with a major freeway, with direct and indirect impacts on more than 2,300 businesses and homes. Other alternatives provided comparable transportation benefits with lower community impacts on the Canadian side, and were more cost-effective in terms of meeting the needs of the project while having acceptable impacts on the U.S. side. On an end-to-end basis, the disadvantages of the rail corridor option outweighed the advantages.
Consider building a bypass to a twinned Ambassador Bridge Twin the Ambassador Bridge; extend Highway 401 to the Ambassador Bridge; build a tunnel to the Ambassador Bridge	The Canadian and U.S. Project Teams assessed twinning of the Ambassador Bridge as an illustrative alternative. Twinning the existing Ambassador Bridge would require an inspection plaza to be located in Sandwich Towne, adjacent to the University of Windsor. The access road would also require either the conversion of all of Huron Church Road to a six-lane freeway, or construction of a new route through historic Sandwich. More than 500 homes and businesses would be displaced and another 3,500 would be disrupted. Based on the community impacts of the access road and inspection plaza on the Canadian side, the option to twin the Ambassador Bridge was eliminated from further consideration in the DRIC Study. Details of this assessment are provided in the Generation and Assessment of Illustrative Alternatives Report, Draft November 2005, available on the project website (www.partnershipborderstudy.com). The Ambassador Bridge has been moving forward with proposals for a second span adjacent to the existing bridge. These proposals, which do not include an access road connecting to Highway 401, are under review by the governments in both Canada and the U.S. Extending Highway 401 to the Ambassador Bridge would result in a greater number of homes and businesses being displaced, and would contradict the recently adopted urban design plan for Huron Church Road Urban Design Master Plan and Development Guidelines (February 2006) which includes policies to create a gateway into Windsor from E.C. Row Expressway to the Ambassador Bridge through landscaped features, signage and other street accessories.
Place the customs plaza on Highway 401	The DRIC Study Team has developed the size and layout of the plazas in close consultation with the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), which operates all Canadian inspection plazas at border crossings. The Study Team has held many discussions with Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) regarding the location of the new inspection plaza. CBSA has indicated that, to reduce security and monitoring concerns, the new plaza should be located within approximately 1500 metres of the border. The Study Team worked closely with the U.S. Project Team and members of the public to identify plaza and crossing locations that reduce impacts to neighbourhoods and community features as much as possible. Further opportunities for reducing project impacts will be explored in on-going consultation activities.
Environmental Assessment Process	
Want a guarantee that the outcome of this process will be carried out.	The Governments of Ontario and Canada have repeatedly expressed their commitment to the DRIC project.
Concern that the original process schedule (timeline) concerning the announcement of a Preferred Alternative has slipped.	The DRIC Study is a large, multidisciplinary study that involves specialized analysis and modeling in order to determine what the best transportation solution. The Study Team is proceeding as quickly as possible, while providing for meaningful public input throughout the process. With such a large study involving various disciplines and analysis, unforeseen delays to the schedule unfortunately occur. We are currently looking to complete the planning phase by the mid 2008, enabling construction of the new crossing to be completed by the end of 2013.
Are the evaluation factors for a preferred crossing location the same as for the access road alternatives (ie. air quality, noise, natural features)	Yes, the seven evaluation factors that the study team has used throughout this planning study have been the same for the crossing, plaza, and new freeway alternatives. The seven evaluation factors include Changes to Air Quality, Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Characteristics, Maintain Consistency with Existing and Planned Land Use, Protect Cultural Resources, Protect the Natural Environment, Improve Regional Mobility, and Cost and Constructability.
What process has the Ambassador Bridge Company followed with their recent construction activities; are they following the same process as this study?	The Ambassador Bridge Company is required to follow the Environmental Assessment guidelines established under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, which is the same act that the DRIC Study is adhering to. Despite recent construction activities, no permits or final preferred alternative approval has been given by the Ministry of the Environment to the Ambassador Bridge Company for their enhancement project.
What is the estimated timeframe for construction? Construct it as soon as possible to reduce noise impacts	Construction is estimated to begin in 2009, with four construction seasons anticipated. The goal is to open a new transportation facility by the year 2013.
The new bridge will be redundant; is it needed?	The Ontario Ministry of Transportation, Transport Canada, along with Michigan Department of Transportation and the U.S. Federal Highway Administration (the Partnership) recognized that a new crossing was needed in order to alleviate the unacceptable traffic tieups that occurred at the border crossing between Windsor and Detroit, MI. In January 2004, the Partnership produced a final Planning/Need and Feasibility (P/NF) Study Report, identifying a long-term strategy to meet the needs of the transportation network serving the border between Southeastern Michigan and Southwestern Ontario. The current Southeast Michigan and Southwest Ontario border crossings are among the busiest international crossings in North America and represent nearly 50 per cent of

Comments/Questions	Response
	traffic volume crossing the U.S./Canada border. Traffic at the Ambassador Bridge/Huron Church Road/Highway 3 corridor is expected to reach capacity around 2010.
Concern about existing traffic when construction commences; concerned about construction staging.	During construction of this project, Highway 3/Huron Church Road will remain open to carry traffic in the corridor. Details of staging will be determined as the project proceeds.
Why is the U.S. government dictating where the crossing should be located?	The Area of Continued Analysis was determined jointly by the U.S. and Canadian Study Teams based on a balance of benefits and impacts.
How are all the access road alternatives and the Parkway alternative being evaluated against each other?	The access roads and the Parkway alternative are all evaluated by the seven evaluation factors, which include Changes to Air Quality, Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Characteristics, Maintain Consistency with Existing and Planned Land Use, Protect Cultural Resources, Protect the Natural Environment, Improve Regional Mobility, and Cost and Constructability. The Parkway alternative will be evaluated as thoroughly as the five access road alternatives, four plaza locations, and three crossing locations.
Who are the key decision makers? Is it the city or the community?	Once a preferred alternative has been selected by the DRIC study team, the Environmental Assessment will be submitted to the Ontario Ministry of Environment for approval. It will be up to the Ontario Minister of the Environment to approve the analysis and recommendation of the preferred alternative.
Interest appears to be speeding trucks through the city; not concerned about citizens and the city.	The goal of the Detroit River International Crossing Study is to find a transportation solution that will provide for the safe, efficient and secure movement of people and goods across the Canadian-U.S. border in the Detroit River area to support the economies of Ontario, Michigan, Canada and the U.S. All access road alternatives features a six-lane freeway as well as a separate service road for local traffic. These improvements will provide many benefits for residents as well as international travelers.
If there is too much opposition is the "No Build" alternative a possibility?	In seeking approval for the preferred alternative, the DRIC Study Team is required to demonstrate that the effects of the project result in a better condition than the do-nothing solution.
Hope is that the Preferred Alternative does not hurt too many people/residences.	The DRIC Study Team is looking to choose a preferred alternative that will avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the highest extent practicable.
Will the Province and the Federal government endorse the cheapest alternative?	The Province and the Federal Government will endorse an alternative that results in the best balance of benefits and impacts based on an assessment of seven factors. Cost is only one of the seven evaluation factors that have been taken into consideration.
Air Quality	
How was the air quality modeling for the tunnel alternative done?	To assess future change in air quality in the corridor with a tunnel alternative, a computerized air dispersion model is being used. The model incorporates current air quality conditions, the characteristics of the new roadway, the anticipated future traffic flows, and future vehicle emissions to determine the potential change in air quality. The model output for each type of roadway (at-grade, below-grade and tunnel) is also compared to model results of future conditions if nothing is built in the corridor. This methodology is being conducted in accordance with the Air Quality Impact Assessment Work Plan, which was reviewed by provincial and federal government ministries and agencies, and made available for public comment at the outset of the study. The Work Plan and the results to date of the impact assessment are available for viewing and downloading at the project website: www.partnershipborderstudy.com.
Why were scrubbers/filters for the tunnel alternative not included in the air quality modeling?	The first step in assessing the impacts of any alternative is to do so without mitigation, to determine if there are any potential effects on air quality. The air dispersion model results for the tunnel alternative without any scrubbers/filters show that there would be a reduction in particulate concentrations resulting in an improvement in air quality within 50 to 100 m of the right of way in comparison to future conditions if nothing is built. Generally speaking, beyond 100 m there is essentially no difference in air quality among any of the access road alternatives. Emissions from the exhausts required at the tunnel ventilation buildings, are predicted to slightly increase air pollutant concentrations at distances farther away (~400 m) from the road if no scrubbers/filters are used in the tunnel; Therefore, air cleaning devices were determined to not be required if a tunnel were built.
The perception is that air quality is better with the tunnel alternative.	Our technical analysis has determined that air quality will be better no matter which type of roadway is built in the Huron Church Road/Highway 3 corridor. Based on anticipated changes to engine technologies and fuels in both Canada and the U.S., preliminary estimates are that annual emissions of NOx from road related transportation sources in Windsor will be reduced from approximately 4,000 tonnes in 2004 to 500 tonnes in 2035. These changes will occur over time as the vehicle fleet is replaced. Based on these projected decreases, cars and trucks will likely contribute less than 10 per cent of the total regional NOx emissions. As well, the tailpipe fraction of PM2.5 emissions is currently a maximum of 30 per cent of the total road based PM2.5 emissions from the corridor. By 2015, this fraction will be reduced to less than 10 per cent of the total PM2.5 emissions, because of the combined effect of cleaner fuels and because free flow traffic conditions on a freeway eliminates braking, idling and acceleration at traffic signals. Even with the expected improvements to fuels and technologies, air quality is likely to remain a concern for the Windsor/Essex County area. Our analysis found that air quality in the Windsor/Essex County area is heavily influenced by pollutants from transboundary sources (i.e. Ohio Valley and Michigan) and other sources than by transportation. During typical conditions, these sources comprise approximately 56 per cent of the total concentration of particulate matter in the Windsor area. During a smog event, this contribution increases to over 80 per cent, as polluted air flows into the region from upwind sources in the U.S. Reductions in pollutants from non-transportation sources will have a greater improvement on local air quality. Among the access road alternatives considered to date for this study, our analysis has determined that is little difference to air quality between the alternatives. Air dispersion modelling of air quality impacts of the Practical Alternatives indicates that there are slight differences between a tunnel, at-grade and a below-grade access road within 50 - 100 m (164 - 328 ft) from the right-of-way (ROW). Below-grade alternatives result in a reduction in maximum predicted PM2.5 and NOx concentrations in the vicinity of the ROW, in comparison to at-grade alternatives. For example, within 50 m (164 ft) from the ROW, below-grade sections show slightly lower predicted concentrations of PM2.5 and NOx than at-grade sections. At approximately 100 m (328 ft) and beyond, there is no discernible difference between at-grade and below-grade alternatives. Within 50 m (164 ft) of the ROW, the end-to-end tunnel alternative results in lower maximum predicted concentrations of PM2.5 compared to at-grade and below-grade alternatives. At 100 m (328 ft) from the ROW, there is little difference between the alternatives in terms of maximum predicted PM2.5 concentrations. At 250 m (820 ft) from the ROW there is no difference between any of the alternatives in terms of PM2.5 concentrations. The end-to-end tunnel alternative results in increases in the maximum predicted 1-hour and 24-hour NOx concentrations in the vicinity of the ROW, compared to at-grade and below-grade options. These increases are also indicated over a broader area in comparison to the at-grade and below-grade options. This reflects the effect of the tunnel entrance and exit portals, in addition to the dispersion characteristics of the exhaust stacks at the ventilation buildings.

Comments/Questions	Response
What is the air quality findings in the Spring Garden/Malden Road area?	The results of the air quality assessment of the access road alternatives in the Spring Garden/Malden road area predict that PM2.5 concentrations will be between 5-15% higher than the "no build" option in 2035 under certain conditions. In this area, NOx concentrations are predicted to be the same as the no build option for all years modelled.
What are the air quality impacts to the Villa Borghese neighbourhood?	The air quality assessment results predict that all alternatives essentially result in an improvement in air quality in comparison to future conditions if nothing is built. This improvement is in part due to the location of the access road being further away from the neighbourhood compared to the existing Huron Church Road, and because the free flow traffic conditions of the freeway eliminates braking, idling and acceleration at traffic signals.
How does Canada enforce air quality emission standards?	Air quality is under provincial jurisdiction, and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is responsible for setting and enforcing air standards in the province. This is done through Ontario Regulation 419 (O.Reg.419/05) Air Pollution - Local Air Quality. This regulation sets out the standards and guidelines that facilities (stationary sources) must meet and use to get a permit to discharge emissions into the air. Environment Canada, which is a federal body, has a number of guidelines and standards that have been adopted for use by the individual provinces. The Canada-Wide Standard for Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) is one of them. This standard, which does not come into force until 2010, has been adopted by the MOE for use in assessing potential air quality impacts, and was used in the DRIC air quality assessment, in addition to the MOE's criteria for nitrogen oxides (NOx). Once the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative is selected, the analysis will be re-done using additional air pollutants, and will be compared to the relevant MOE and CWS limits. For mobile sources (vehicles), the Federal Government has implemented regulations and measures aimed at reducing vehicle emissions including gasoline and diesel sulphur regulations, new vehicle emission standards. The Ontario Government has implemented additional measures including the Drive Clean Program, the SMOG patrol, and fuel taxes.
Concern about human health effects; in particular baseline health pertaining to blood tests, heart and lung conditions, asthma rates, diabetes, and cancer in Windsor.	Health issues such as cancer rates, asthma, heart and lung diseases encompass of a number of factors not solely pertaining to transportation (e.g. lifestyle, diet, occupation, genetics, environment). The air quality impact assessment undertaken for this study incorporates federal and provincial air quality criteria and standards, which are developed in consideration of potential effects on human health. The air quality impact assessment presents the results for each of the access road alternatives in terms of changes to air quality as compared to a future "no build" scenario. The results indicate that beyond 100 m from the right of way, there is essentially no difference between at-grade, below grade and a tunnelled access road.
More air quality monitoring stations should be placed along the corridor.	Two air quality monitoring stations were established for the purposes of the DRIC study and have been in place for approximately one year. The air quality stations were specifically located to determine the current levels of air pollutants in the immediate vicinity of the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor. The locations were chosen based on recommendations from the DRIC Community Consultation Group (CCG) as well as technical requirements (such as access to power, and unobstructed air flow). There are also two other air quality monitoring stations in the west Windsor area operated by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment that provide relevant data for this study.
Concern about road dust; in particular diesel exhaust and brake dust.	These sources of particulate emissions were included in the DRIC air quality impact assessment. Our analysis found that total road emissions of PM2.5 are predominantly comprised of road dust, and will increase as traffic increases in the Highway 3/Huron Church Road corridor. Measures to reduce the amount of road dust generated by the new facility, such as regular street sweeping and washing, will be considered for this study. The fraction of PM2.5 emitted by vehicle exhausts and tailpipes is currently a maximum of 30 per cent of the total road-based PM2.5 emissions from the corridor. By 2015, this fraction will be reduced to less than 10 per cent of the total PM2.5 emissions, because of the combined effect of cleaner fuels and because free flow traffic conditions on a freeway eliminates braking, idling and acceleration at traffic signals.
Current diesel truck turnover rate is 50 years, not 20.	As part of the air quality impact assessment, vehicle registrations of cars and diesel trucks from both Detroit and Windsor for the past 25 years were used to assess the future fleet turnover in the region. The analysis of these registration records indicate that within 25 years the fleet is essentially fully turned over. The DRIC air quality impact assessment assumed a similar gradual turnover of vehicles from present day in order to incorporate the changes in emissions due to technological changes that have recently occurred and will continue to occur in the coming years. These results are reflected in the assessment conducted for each of the three separate horizon years (2015, 2025, 2035) considered in the analysis.
What are the effects of air quality emissions on the landscaped areas?	The standards and guidelines set by the Ministry of the Environment are set such that both human health and the flora and fauna in the natural environment are protected. Many species of trees and plants can absorb gaseous air pollutants and act as particulate matter filters (through screening), which also help to improve air quality.
Why are only two ventilation buildings being considered?	Four separate ventilation options were considered for this study: • VB1A – use of two separate ventilation buildings to circulate and remove air from the tunnel. One vent building located approximately 1/3rd of the distance from the south tunnel entrance/exit at the present Highway 401 terminus at Highway 3; the second vent building located approximately 1/3rd of the distance from the north tunnel entrance and exit, which is half way between Malden Rd. and Huron Church Road. • VB1B – use of two separate ventilation buildings at the main tunnel entrances/exits to circulate and remove air from the tunnel. One vent building located approximately at the present Highway 401 terminus at Highway 3; the second vent building located approximately half way between Malden Rd. and Huron Church Road. • VB1C – use of a single ventilation building at the approximate half way point of the tunnel to circulate and remove air from the tunnel. One vent building located in the vicinity of Todd Lane/Cabana Rd. • Jet Fans – use of multiple jet fans located in the tunnel interior to continuously circulate the tunnel air; assumes no vent buildings required. The results indicated that the location of the ventilation buildings does not have a notable affect; the locations of the entrance and exit portals have a higher impact on the results. The results of the "Jet Fans" tunnel ventilation option indicated that this option produced unacceptably high $PM_{2.5}$ and NO_x concentrations, and thus this option was not carried forward for further analysis. The option with two separate ventilation buildings located away from the portals (VB1A) was selected for the tunnel alternative evaluation.
Ventilation buildings should be aesthetically pleasing.	We have examined several different ventilation buildings located throughout North America and have noted the different treatments that can be applied to the exterior to make them more aesthetically pleasing.

Comments/Questions	Response
Noise	
What noise mitigation is being considered for each access road alternative being studied?	Noise mitigation measures that are being considered include berms, noise walls, and landscaping.
Why does the tunneling alternative not reduce noise substantially more than the other alternatives?	Based on the noise modeling results, the tunnel alternative generally achieves substantially higher noise reduction than other alternatives. The results show that the alternatives can be generally ranked in the order of least to most in terms of noise reduction potential, as follows: • surface alternatives (Alternatives 1A and 2A), • below-grade alternatives (Alternatives 1B and 2B) and; • the tunnel option (Alternative 3). In all cases, however, mitigation (berms, barriers) will effectively limit change in noise levels along the corridor to 5dBA or less (3dB is barely perceptible to the human ear).
What are the noise impacts associated with Plaza A?	The noise generated solely from the plaza locations, including Plaza A, is not expected to cause a high noise impact at the receptors closest to the plazas. In most cases, the receptors are more than 50 m (164 ft) away from the plazas. However, the noise modelling results identified two areas that might potentially experience a high noise impact associated with the approach roadway connecting Plaza A to all crossings: These are: • Areas between Ojibway Parkway and Malden Road, south of E.C. Row Expressway- Two receptor locations (near Ojibway Parkway at the starting point of the approach roadway) are predicted to experience a high noise impact even after proposed mitigation measures are applied. The noise levels, after mitigation, at these receptor locations are predicted to be at maximum 2 dB above the regulated limit for the different crossings that connect to Plaza A. • Brighton Beach Industrial Park- One receptor located in the Brighton Beach community is predicted to experience a high noise impact (greater than 10 dB above the regulated limit) from route options Plaza A to Crossing A and Plaza A to Crossing C, via both Brighton Beach and Ojibway Parkway, even with acoustic barriers in place. However, this receptor is located in the remnant residential properties in the Brighton Beach Industrial Park.
Tunneling	
Tunnel through neighbourhoods	The Parkway alternative contains 10 tunnels sections that provide linkages to various neighbourhoods within the Area of Continued Analysis.
Consider an end-to end tunnel alternative.	The results of the analysis do not support further investigation of an end-to-end tunnelled access road (Alternative 3). The tunneling option provides limited benefits that do not justify additional cost when compared to other alternatives. Other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and less risks.
Tunneling alternative should be compared with the Parkway alternative and not the other alternatives.	In order to meet the requirements of the provincial and federal Environmental Assessment Act, all reasonable alternatives must be compared to one another in deciding what the preferred alternative should be. Therefore, the Parkway Alternative is being evaluated along with the other access road alternatives under consideration.
Tunneling requires less property acquisition when compared to the other alternatives.	Property impacts associated with tunneling are lower than the at-grade alternatives, however property is only one consideration in assessing the impacts to the protection of community and neighbourhood characteristics.
Tunneling is preferred from an aesthetic perspective.	Thank you for providing this comment. We understand that tunneling the freeway is preferred from an aesthetic perspective.
Why is a bored tunnel not a viable tunneling option for the access road alternative?	In evaluating the two methods of constructing a tunnel (bored versus cut and cover) the Study Team evaluated each method based on a six-lane roadway profile. Currently, a tunnel boring machine for a six-lane roadway would be approximately 1.5 metres larger in diameter than the largest tunnel boring machine constructed to date. The Study Team has identified this as one of the risks associated with a bored tunnel for this project. The study corridor also has soft ground conditions found throughout the access road corridor. Soft ground and high water table conditions increase the risks of uncontrolled settlements during construction.
Tunneling provides better community connectivity.	Community connectivity is one of the factors that is evaluated for all the access road, plaza and crossing alternatives. The DRIC Study Team has carefully considered community connectivity and cohesion, and as a result, the Parkway Alternative contains 10 tunnel sections that are located in areas that promote community connectivity to both sides of Highway 3 and Huron Church Road.
Tunnel or dome the road (if an at-grade solution is chosen)	The results of the analysis do not support further investigation of an end-to-end tunnelled or domed access road. The tunneling option provides limited benefits that do not justify additional cost when compared to other alternatives. This outcome is similar for a domed road. Other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and less risks.
Need to hear both the pros and cons of a tunnel alternative.	The results of the analysis do not support further investigation of an end-to-end tunneled access road (Alternative 3). This conclusion is based on the results of the analysis of Practical Alternatives, including: • All of the access road alternatives will address the future transportation and mobility needs of the region, which was one of the primary objectives for the project. Providing a freeway will separate international and local traffic, reduce the likelihood of international traffic infiltrating other local roads to access the border and eliminate the need for the international truck traffic to stop and start up at the many traffic signals. This will greatly improve operations and safety for all motorists in this area. • The end-to-end tunnel alternative was found to offer no real advantages in terms of reducing impacts to properties, land use, natural features or cultural features. • While an end-to-end tunnel alternative offers some advantages to air quality in the immediate corridor through lower particulate concentrations compared to the do-nothing alternative, through improvements to fuels and technology all the alternatives provide this same benefit to some degree. • The benefits offered by an end-to-end tunnel in reducing particulate concentrations are offset somewhat by increases in concentrations of gaseous pollutants emitted over a larger area beyond the access road corridor from the ventilation buildings and these cannot be captured with current pollution control technology. • The cost of the end-to-end tunnel was found to be three to six times more expensive than the other alternatives under consideration, representing a difference of between $2.5 and $3 billion. These costs are reflective of both the increased effort and materials needed to construct an end-to-end tunnel as well as the increased construction risks and complexities. • We have always said that we are focused on pursuing the solution that best balances impacts and benefits. The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction.
Concerned about accidents occurring in the tunnel.	Discussions about safety in the tunnel and in relation to the other alternatives currently under consideration during an emergency event have been ongoing. Discussions with emergency services personnel (fire, police, ambulance) have occurred throughout the study, and their input has been incorporated into the design of ramps and access points.

Comments/Questions	Response
Costs	
How were the cost estimates conducted?	The Study Team developed preliminary construction costs for six-lane at grade, below grade and above grade divided urban freeway sections. Quantities were estimated from conceptual plans, profiles and typical cross sections for major items including concrete pavement, asphalt pavement on shoulders, open grade drainage layer, granular base, earthworks, Tall wall median barrier, noise walls, and light poles. Unit prices for major items were obtained from the MTO's unit cost database. Cost of minor items was added as a percentage of the cost of major items. Speed change lanes and inside shoulder widening for sight distances were not quantified for each alternative, but are covered by an overall contingency of 20%. The Study Team also developed separate unit costs for 6-lane freeway tunnel section, municipal service road and interchange ramps. Preliminary construction costs for interchanges were based on the unit cost of interchange ramps, overall length of ramps, the number and cost of underpass and overpass structures at interchanges, and preliminary construction cost estimates for interchanges in the Windsor area provided by MTO. Cost estimates for the access road include the sections from North Talbot Road to Malden Road. Costs of the plazas and crossings also included costs of roadways from Malden Road to the Detroit River.
What cost estimates were considered specifically for a tunnel alternative?	Cost estimates were developed for all the access road alternatives, including tunneling. Full details of the cost estimates for tunneling (including structural costs) are found in the Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate Report for Practical Alternatives (Access Road and Inspection Plaza) found on the project website www.partnershipborderstudy.com.
What is the cost of this project in relation to other Provincial highway projects?	The DRIC project is the only new international crossing project planned in Ontario. It includes a new freeway, customs plaza, and crossing. These three components of this project make it one of the most costly new infrastructure projects in Ontario.
Compare the cost of this project versus the value of cross border goods.	Comment noted.
Cost should not be a factor to consider in the decision making process.	Your comments that cost and constructability should not be a factor in the decision making process are noted. We have always said that we are focussed on pursuing the solution that best balances impacts and benefits. The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction. We recognize that taxpayers expect our public funds to be spent wisely, and governments to make responsible fiscal decisions. Cost is only one of seven important factors we are considering throughout the EA process.
Costs have risen because other options outside of Windsor have been dropped.	Costs for all the access road alternatives were developed based on standard construction and labour costing for similar construction projects recently completed in Ontario. These cost estimates would apply to alternatives developed within Windsor and outside of Windsor.
Do not want money wasted on tunneling options.	As part of the Environmental Assessment process, a full evaluation of all reasonable alternatives must be completed. Therefore, conducting a thorough analysis of the tunneling option is necessary to determine if this alternative is reasonable and should be pursued.
Want final costs of all alternatives to include property costs.	The property requirements for the project are not yet finalized, so the total property costs are difficult to estimate during the planning stages. Property costs will be factored into the final costing estimate during the detailed design phase.
What are the costs associated with the Parkway Alternative? Who will pay for the Parkway Alternative?	The Parkway is estimated to cost $1.5 billion (2011). Costs for the Parkway Alternative are currently being analyzed, and will be presented to the public along with the other seven evaluation factors that have been considered for all the alternatives studied.
Design of Transportation Alternatives	
Why is the access road not below grade in the Spring Garden area ie. from Malden Road to Ojibway?	The section of access road between Malden Road and Ojibway is proposed to be constructed at grade, with overpasses at Malden Road and Matchette Road, similar to the E.C. Row Expressway. This proposed design avoids below grade construction in this area, which is know to have poorer soil conditions and a higher water table than other portions of the access road. These poor soil conditions increase complexity of construction and risks to cost and schedule.
Montgomery Drive cannot handle large volumes of traffic; current proposal is a poor choice for road access.	Traffic studies will be conducted for the preferred alternative and this issues will be addressed. Traffic control devices (speed bumps, four-way stops, etc.) may be recommended to reduce traffic infiltration in this neighbourhood.
Consider other interchange options at Todd Lane.	This interchange will continue to be reviewed to provide adequate local access.
Consider impacts at Cabana/Todd Lane.	Impacts will be reviewed as design refinements are made in this area.
Provide access to Howard Avenue.	Access to Howard Avenue is provided by the service road. Access from the freeway to the service road is provided at Highway 3 and west of St. Clair College.
Why not link to EC Row Expressway rather than go beside it?	Combining the new access road with E.C. Row Expressway between Huron Church Road and Ojibway Parkway to connect to a Plaza B/B1 or Plaza C option was considered. It was determined that due to the limited distance available for merging and lane changes, keeping the roads separated would provide for better traffic operations and improved safety for all motorists on both roadways.
Reconsider the design northbound at Huron Church Road and LaBelle.	This will continue to be reviewed.
Current exit ramp is too close to the existing signal at LaBelle; not appropriate for trucks starting and stopping. Look to bypass LaBelle signal for the proposed exit ramp.	This will continue to be reviewed.
LaBelle to Matchette should be designed to be below grade.	The section of access road between Malden Road and Ojibway is proposed to be constructed at grade, with overpasses at Malden Road and Matchette Road, similar to the E.C. Row Expressway. This proposed design avoids below grade construction in this area, which is know to have poorer soil conditions and a higher water table than other portions of the access road. These poor soil conditions increase complexity of construction and risks to cost and schedule.
Use Cousineau as a major access to Windsor Crossing and St. Clair College (ramps at Cousineau).	The Study Team has met with representatives from St. Clair College and Windsor Crossing and understand the importance of providing proper access to these facilities. Access is provided to both facilities via the service road. We will continue to investigate signage to direct motorists to the proper exits to access these facilities.
Consider adding a ramp to the service road from Cousineau; to provide additional access to the mall.	The Study Team has met with representatives from St. Clair College and Windsor Crossing and understand the importance of providing proper access to these facilities. Access is provided to both facilities via the service road. We will continue to investigate signage to direct motorists to the proper exits to access these facilities.
Improve access by adding a ramp to get from Highway 401 eastbound to Howard Avenue northbound.	Access to Howard Avenue for eastbound traffic is provided via the service road. The locations of ramps and service road connections must provide a balance between reasonable access and safe operations on the freeway. Multiple, closely spaced freeway ramps create potential traffic conflict points, reducing safety and operations on the freeway.
Concern about Manning Road extension from E.C. Row Expressway to Highway 401.	This project is separate from the DRIC Study. Concerns pertaining to the Manning Road project can be provided to Windsor BIIG Office at 949 McDougall Street, Suite 200,

Comments/Questions	Response
	Windsor.
Concern about the E.C. Row expressway and Malden Road weave.	This design issue will be studied further if the Plaza A site is carried forward. The proposed design is reasonable.
Why is Todd Lane under study?	The DRIC Study only considered impacts to the Todd Lane/Huron Church Road intersection area.
Start the below grade option at Exit 42; outside of the current Area of Continued Analysis.	Constructing the freeway below grade reduces community impacts by limiting property requirements at cross roads. A below grade freeway beyond the Area of Continued Analysis would have few benefits and carry such high construction costs that this options is not practically feasible.
Provide access at Malden Road and E.C. Row Expressway.	Providing access to Malden Road at E.C. Row Expressway is a local traffic issue that is not related to the DRIC Study. The new access road will not alter or add new local road connections along E.C. Row Expressway.
Consider recycled roadway material (ie tires) for new road construction. Make the pavement/roadbed long lasting.	Comments noted. These will be considered in the design and construction of the project.
Lighting proposed should not interfere with bird migration.	Comment noted and will be considered for the new crossing.
What is the connection to the existing bridge? How does E.C. Row Expressway traffic access the Ambassador Bridge?	The connection to the existing Ambassador Bridge is provided through an exit ramp from the extension of Highway 401 east of E.C. Row Expressway. E.C. Row Expressway will access the Ambassador Bridge via the existing Huron Church Road interchange. No changes to the E.C. Row interchange at Huron Church Line are proposed.
Will truck traffic continue to use the Ambassador Bridge?	Both passenger and truck traffic will have the option to use either crossing.
Consider extending Highway 401 as a dedicated truck only route.	Highway 401 will be extended for both passenger car and truck traffic. It is important that the border transportation network be able to serve all traffic to provide as much choice and capacity as possible.
How do you justify that three lanes of truck traffic on the new freeway is required?	Results of detailed traffic studies indicate that three traffic lanes for both eastbound and westbound traffic are sufficient to meet future traffic needs.
Will six lanes of new freeway be enough to meet future capacity?	Results of detailed traffic studies indicate that three traffic lanes for both eastbound and westbound traffic are sufficient to meet future traffic needs.
Consider implementing a High Occupancy Vehicle or zipper lane on Highway 401.	Based on projected traffic volumes, three freeway lanes per direction will provide sufficient capacity and allow the freeway to operate at an appropriate level of service during peak travel periods over the long term (2035 and beyond). High occupancy vehicle lanes are usually implemented in areas where existing roadways are severely congested during extended periods of the day. No HoV lanes are proposed on the DRIC access road, but may be incorporated in future improvements, if warranted.
How was the current access road alternatives decided on (rationale for the service road locations).	In June 2005, we presented 15 river crossing alternatives, and associated plazas and access roads for public consultation. The analysis and evaluation, carried out between June and November, concluded that access route, plaza and crossing alternatives in the Area of Continued Analysis provide a good balance of transportation service and mobility, with fewer associated community and environmental impacts, in comparison to other alternatives. This analysis was completed using 7 major factor groups and over 35 evaluation criteria. Each alternative was assessed according to how well it fit the needs of both Canada and the United States. The service road alignments were developed in consultation with local municipalities and the public to maintain local access.
Why can you not tunnel under the Grand Marais Drain?	Tunneling under Grand Marais Drain/Turkey Creek with the Parkway alternative was considered but not carried forward. The results of geotechnical investigations indicate that the soils in this area are very poor and keep excavations required to pass under the creek would require stabilization and ground water control. These requirements greatly increase the costs, schedule and risks to costs and schedule of this section of roadway. The risks of uncontrolled settlements in the area of the drain was also considered a significant disadvantage of this design option. The Parkway will be below existing ground but above Grand Marais Drain. Opportunities for mitigation impacts of the roadway during and post construction will be considered for all alternatives.
Consider making the new freeway a toll road and including ramps for emergency services only.	There are currently no plans to implement any tolls on the new access road. The DRIC Study Team has had numerous meetings with emergency services personnel and have discussed access of emergency vehicles to all the access road alternatives being considered.
Keep trucks off existing city streets.	One of the main goals of the DRIC study is to remove truck traffic off city streets through the extension of Highway 401 to a new plaza and border crossing. The Parkway provides a freeway connection between the new crossing and Highway 401. For trucks using the Ambassador Bridge, the Parkway will also provide a means to bypass seven existing traffic signals in the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor between Labelle Street and Howard Avenue. These advantages are likely to attract trucks away from arterial roads as a means of getting to/from the border crossings.
Consider a service centre (gas, restaurant) and welcome centre (including welcome to Windsor/Canada signage) when finalizing plaza design.	The proposed plazas are sized to address the needs of border agencies. Although the current plaza proposals do not include service center/welcome centers, the appropriate location for such facilities will be studied once a preferred plaza site is identified.
Proximity of freeway a concern for schools eg. Oakwood Public School.	The DRIC Study Team has taken into account sensitive community features, including schools, and have made design modifications to reduce impacts to these community features as much as possible. Further study of mitigation measures will continue once a preferred access road is identified.
Consider adding a large commercial/retail centre for trucks to encourage spending in the Windsor area.	Thank you for your suggestion. Provision of commercial/retail centres catering to truck traffic is outside the purposes of this planning study. Land use decisions such as this would be considered by local municipalities.
How can the impacts from the interchanges be minimized?	The interchanges were designed to minimize impacts to the adjacent land uses and natural areas. Refinement to the interchange design were made in response to public consultation. The Study Team will continue to investigate means of further reducing impacts around interchange areas, as appropriate.
Property Impacts and Expropriation	
Concern about when homes are purchased; how will these properties be maintained/managed when they are vacant?	The maintenance and security of acquired properties will be tended to by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation.
Consider purchasing homes now due to favourable buyer market conditions.	Because options are still being studied and evaluated, the ministry is not in a position to identify exact property requirements at this time. Once the project has received Environmental Assessment approval, the ministry will actively approach homeowners and business owners to acquire property in a mutually agreeable way. In response to feedback from the community, the ministry will consider requests to purchase property from owners currently having direct access to existing Highway 3(Talbot Road) or Huron Church Road between Highway 401 and E.C. Row Expressway.
Ministry of Transportation should help displaced homeowners and businesses relocate.	The Ministry of Transportation will provide homeowners with a fair market value for their home and provide compensation for moving expenses. The Ministry will not identify relocation properties.

Comments/Questions	Response
Royal Canadian Legion is an important community feature; will it be relocated?	This decision rests with the Legion.
Full property value must be given to homeowners that will need to move plus an extra 10% (of current property value).	Compensation is based on the market value of your property or the loss in market value to your property in the case of a partial purchase. The market value is based on what similar property might be expected to sell for if sold on the open market by a willing seller to a willing buyer. There is also a provision for payment of other reasonable out-of-pocket expenses actually incurred, upon final settlement. Property values will be appraised by a real estate appraiser estimating the current market value or the compensation for your property in the local general area. After the appraisal is completed, a ministry real estate officer will present an offer of compensation. If you are not satisfied with the offer of compensation presented, there is a legislated appeal process available to you. Your rights will be fully explained to you by the ministry's real estate officer.
Local property professionals should be included in the expropriation process, in addition to those provided by the Ministry of Transportation property division.	
What assurance is there that fair market value will be given to homeowners?	
How will property values be protected for those living 100m from the proposed plaza or access road alternative (ie. Armanda St). Will the government compensate homeowners if the value decreases?	The Ministry does not compensate for any decrease in property values, nor does it seek compensation from properties where property values may increase as a result of a project.
Project Team	
Who is the DRIC Project Team? How were they selected?	The DRIC Project Team is comprised of specialists in archaeology, geotechnical services, economic and fiscal impacts, transportation planning, ecological research, landscape architecture, air quality and noise modeling, social impact assessment, and the design and development of land border crossings. URS Canada is the prime consultant leading the Canadian consultant team. The URS Canada Team was chosen through a competitive bidding process for this study.
Natural Environment	
How is the Spring Garden ANSI affected? What is the area of impact?	All alternatives avoid impacts to the lands designated as the Spring Garden ANSI. The access roads affect undesignated lands in the area of the ANSI. Details as to the extent of impact are provided in the Draft Natural Heritage Working Paper. Impacts of the Parkway alternative are being assessed and will be provided in Spring 2008.
Protect the existing tree cover at the Oakwood Bush.	The DRIC Study Team recognizes the high ecological value of the Oakwood Bush and understands that the community greatly values this natural area.
Lots of natural area alongside E.C Row Expressway/Spring Garden area. What are the impacts to this area?	The study team has identified this area as containing high value habitat and colonies/species of provincially rare and endangered species. Impacts to the five access road alternatives are documented in the Draft Natural Heritage Working Paper. Impacts of the Parkway will be presented in Spring 2008. Measures to reduce impacts to this area will also be identified. The level of impact to this area will be better understood once a preferred plaza site is identified.
Plaza Questions	
Concern with traffic backups due to U.S. customs delays.	Current delays at the border are reflective of the inspection requirements of the U.S. border agency. Future improvements to the Ambassador Bridge plaza, the new U.S. plaza associated with the DRIC project, and improved border processing procedures such as FAST and NEXUS, are anticipated to help reduce inspection times for U.S.-bound traffic.
Will Canada Customs and Border Services provide staffing for the new plaza?	In meetings with Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), they have identified they will provide staffing for the new plaza.
Concern with custom staff attitude and practices; causing unnecessary delays.	Comment noted.
Need additional customs booths/staff on both sides of the border. How many are planned as part of the plaza design?	The Canadian plaza options will accommodate 29 new inspection lanes.
Concern about truck queuing while waiting to clear customs.	Current delays at the border are reflective of the inspection requirements of the U.S. border agency. Future improvements to the Ambassador Bridge plaza, the new U.S. plaza associated with the DRIC project, and improved border processing procedures such as FAST and NEXUS, are anticipated to help reduce inspection times for U.S.-bound traffic.
Locate the plaza further away from the crossing; away from residential areas.	The DRIC Study Team has developed the locations, size and layouts of the Canadian plazas in consultation with the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), which operates all Canadian inspection plazas at border crossings, as well as the local community. CBSA has indicated that, to reduce security and monitoring concerns, the new plaza should be located within approximately 1500 metres of the border. The Study Team worked with the public to identify plaza and crossing locations in West Windsor that reduce impacts to neighbourhoods and community features as much as possible. Further opportunities for reducing project impacts will be explored in on-going consultation activities.
Concern about the lighting/noise/air quality impacts with the plaza location to nearby homes.	These impacts are considered in the analysis of the plaza alternatives. Further opportunities for reducing project impacts will be explored in on-going consultation once a preferred plaza site is identified.
What are the plaza access road impacts to the Spring Garden area?	The access road impacts in the Spring Garden area vary depending on whether the alignment to Plaza A or Plaza B/C is considered. At this time, no decisions have been made as to which plaza site is preferred. Both access road alternatives are noted as having high impacts to the Spring Garden/ Bethlehem neighbourhoods associated with having the new roadway in this area. Details are provided in a number of technical reports prepared for the study. The analysis of the Parkway alternative will be incorporated in these technical reports and made available for public review. Once a preferred access road and plaza site are identified, mitigation measures to reduce impacts will be further investigated, as appropriate.
Consider shopping opportunities as part of the plaza design.	Provisions for a duty free store have been incorporated in all plaza alternatives.
Provide the same level of mapping as shown for the access road alternatives for the plaza alternatives.	The DRIC Study Team has shown the plaza configurations for all the plaza alternatives at the recent Public Information Open House.
Crossing Questions	
Proposed crossing locations are too far apart.	The locations for the proposed bridge alternatives where developed jointly with the U.S. Team based on existing land uses and the objective of avoiding areas of known brine wells.
Crossing location in Sandwich area will impact the historic nature of the area.	The DRIC Study Team is conscious of the historic nature of Sandwich Towne and has met with area residents to discuss potential community impacts as a result of Crossing C. The DRIC Study Team is aware that a historical plan is currently being developed for Sandwich and will review the policies that have been developed for this area and will reflect the findings in the analysis of alternatives.
Consider providing separate car and truck lanes to prevent weaving.	Designated lanes will be considered for the new crossing.
Crossing A is a good location.	Comment noted.

Comments/Questions	Response
Safety	
Concern about safety in the tunnel during an accident.	The DRIC Study Team has been discussing emergency response incidents with local emergency personnel from Windsor, LaSalle, and Essex County and has gathered their input and used their recommendations in the design modifications to the access road alternatives. The study team is also concerned about fire and life safety in long tunnels. A tunnel would be designed to incorporate all fire and life safety requirements.
Concern about safety of residents and traveling public during construction of the access road alternative.	Details of construction staging will be developed as the project proceeds. Safety of the residents and traveling public, as well as construction workers, will be considered in the development of these staging plans. The plans will be presented for public comment as work on this aspect of the project continues.
Parkway Alternative	
How will the Parkway alternative be maintained? Especially with snow and garbage removal. Who will be responsible for the maintenance? Will it be the province or the City of Windsor?	The Parkway provides for wide shoulders on both sides of the roadway to provide temporary snow storage during major snowfalls. Details concerning maintenance are not finalized, however, since the roadway portion of the Parkway will be part of the Highway 401 extension, it will be the responsibility of the Ministry of Transportation to maintain. Details regarding maintenance of the vegetated portions of the Parkway are not finalized.
What are the property acquisition costs for the Parkway Alternative?	The property requirements for the project are not yet finalized, so the total property costs are difficult to estimate during the planning stages.
What are the maintenance costs associated with the Parkway Alternative?	Maintenance costs associated with the Parkway Alternative have not yet been determined. The Study Team is assessing the Parkway to the same level of detail as the other access road alternatives.
How much will the Parkway alternative cost? Provide a comparison of the cost of the Parkway alternative and the tunnel alternative.	The cost estimate for the Parkway, completed to the same level of detail as the tunnel alternative, will be prepared over the next several months. The initial cost estimate for the Parkway is $1.5 billion, which is approximately $2 billion less than the Parkway alternative.
How much of the freeway is covered by the short tunnel sections?	The Parkway option presented at the Open Houses and Workshops in August 2007 provides 1.5 km of tunnels. At ground level, on top of the tunnels, this translates into 9.2 hectares, or 23 acres of open space.
Would like to see longer tunnel sections, especially in neighbourhood areas.	The tunnel sections of the Parkway alternative were placed to connect the various communities along Highway 3 and Huron Church Road.
Access into LaSalle does not improve with the Parkway alternative; only two lanes at Todd Lane, Howard, Huron Church Line.	Access to LaSalle is also provided via the service roads.
Add an eastbound ramp at St. Clair College.	Access from St. Clair College to the freeway is provided via the ramp west of Howard Avenue.
Todd Lane is currently overcongested; how will it improve with this option.	We understand the intersection of Todd Lane/Cabana Road/Huron Church currently operates poorly during peak travel periods. With the Parkway, the freeway will pass below Todd Lane. Traffic on the service road will be reduced. This may allow signal timing to be modified to favour east-west traffic during peak travel periods. As well, a section of Todd Lane in the area of the Parkway will be widened to four lanes in addition to designated left turn lanes. These changes may help to ease congestion on Todd Lane in the future.
Consider including the following facilities: restroom facilities on parkway, basketball courts at Cousineau, commercial land uses ie. Fred's Farm Stand, swimming pools, fencing, water features, trails, carpool lots, parking lots, parkland (trees), tennis courts, golf course. Create land uses that will help enable Windsor to be come a destination.	The community facilities suggested for the short tunnels are creative and interesting. They will be taken into consideration as the design of the Parkway continues to develop.
Parkway alternative should provide for business opportunities adjacent the service roads.	As part of the economic impact assessment for the access road alternatives, several business owners have expressed their desire to remain in the area after the access road construction is complete. Where commercial zoning exists, these businesses could potentially locate in the general vicinity of their original location. Implementing changes to zoning to accommodate additional commercial opportunities is under the control of local municipalities.
Addition of cycling trails and pedestrian paths is favoured by most; connect it to the Chrysler greenway. Concern of the use of such trails adjacent to a busy highway (air quality issues). Who would use such trails? Is it useful to the population?	The recreation trails proposed as part of the Parkway alternative can be planned to connect with existing trails already in existence in the local municipalities and are designed to be used by the general public.
Concerned with the health effects of using the recreation trails proposed on the Parkway; especially within the first 50 m of the freeway.	Changes in pollutant concentrations were observed within 50m of the right-of-way under certain worst-case conditions. Under typical conditions, changes are not noticeable.
Proposed wildlife corridors are favoured; consider controlled wildlife corridors. Short tunnels are not long enough for the wildlife passage; how are the wildlife going to find the crossings?	Linkages between the Oakwood Bush and the Spring Garden ANSI are possible with the proposed tunnel in this area. Further consideration of other wildlife corridors with the Parkway will continue.
Vegetation will help absorb pollutants and noise. Maximize the amount of green space. Not a genuine Parkway alternative; move the green spaces. Plant vegetation that is hardy and the will provide a buffer all year long. Provide a buffer with mature trees and more green space. Consider effects of salt spray on vegetation. Plant with native plantings. Plant blossom trees since Windsor vegetation blooms early in spring compared to the rest of Ontario. Signature landscaping could start a new movement in the Windsor community.	Comments noted.
Oakwood area short tunnel is not in an appropriate location; it is not in a high traffic area. A larger tunnel at Grand Marais make more sense.	The Oakwood area tunnel was chosen to provide a link between the Oakwood Bush and the Spring Garden ANSI. These natural features are held in high regard by the public and are important natural features in the Area of Continued Analysis.
Lowering of service roads below short tunnels will increase noise impacts.	The noise analysis of the Parkway alternative will consider this issue. Based on the analysis of at-grade, below-grade and tunnel alternatives, no change in noise levels greater than 5dBA is anticipated with appropriate mitigation, with any access road alternative.
Drainage and flooding a concern.	The Parkway will be designed with adequate drainage and pumping systems to accommodate major storm events. Details of the storm water management system will be developed in later design stages.
Consider placing more landscaping on top and on the retaining walls.	We appreciate your comment and will consider it as we continue to make refinements to the Parkway Alternative.
Parkway alternative will provide community connections especially if there are no physical barriers.	

Comments/Questions	Response
Parkway name should be changed; it is misleading in respect to health assessment; the use of the word tunnel is wrong; should be called below grade option; do not like the alternative. Should call it underpasses, not short tunnels. Parkway alternative short changes the community.	The Parkway is a new option, never fully presented to the public prior to the Public Information Open Houses of August 2007. The Parkway will allow communities on both sides of the corridor to reconnect and can provide opportunities for new trails for pedestrians and cyclists and linkages for wildlife. The access road for international traffic would be below-grade from Howard Avenue to E.C. Row Expressway, with a number of tunnels. The Parkway could address the future transportation and mobility needs of the region and improve traffic operations and safety, protect people and communities. The Parkway plan shown to the public in August is not the final access road option. We will look to the community for their input on the look and feel of the Parkway. Community input continues to be an essential part of the DRIC study process. Community input helped to lead us to the Parkway and with community input, we can make this refined option even better. Before any final decisions are made, the Parkway will be analyzed in the same level of detail as the initial five Practical Alternatives.
What alternative is being carried forward? Is it only the Parkway Alternative? If so, this is not acceptable.	Since March 2006, the DRIC Study Team has conducted detailed studies of the five alternatives for the access road. In our ongoing analysis of the five Practical Alternatives the Study Team has identified advantages and disadvantages for each option. Our decision will be based on seven major evaluation factors-Air Quality, Community and Neighbourhood Impacts, Land Use Impacts, Cultural Resource Impacts, Natural Resources Impacts, Regional Mobility, and Cost and Constructability. The Parkway Alternative was developed based on refinements to the below-grade and tunnel Practical Alternatives (Alternatives 1B and 3), and reflecting the study goals and the community input received to date. Before any final decisions are made, the Parkway Alternative will be analyzed in the same level of detail as the initial five Practical Alternatives.
Parkway alternative looks good on paper; concerned about the greenspace.	Comment noted.
Parkway alternative is not perfect, but it makes sense and is realistic. It is the best option so far.	Thank you for your support for the Parkway Alternative.
How many access points are associated with the Parkway Alternative?	Interchanges are proposed at Highway 3, Todd Lane/Cabana/Huron Church Road at E.C. Row Expressway and at the plaza connection (Malden Road if Plaza A, Ojibway Parkway if Plaza B/B1 or C). In addition, two east bound and two westbound access points between the freeway and the service road are provided.
What is the length of the tunnel sections of the Parkway Alternative? Can they be increased?	The maximum length of the tunnel sections of the Parkway alternative are approximately 240m; they cannot be increased without providing some type of mechanical ventilation.
Parkway design should mirror existing Highway 3/Huron Church Road alignment.	The Study Team has developed all access road alternatives to follow the alignment of Huron Church/Highway 3 as much as possible. To provide for improved operations and safety on the freeway, larger curves are needed in certain areas, including at the Highway 3 interchange, near Todd Lane/Cabana Road, and at Huron Church/E.C. Row Expressway.
Governance	
Who will be responsible for operating/maintaining the new crossing? Will it be privately or publicly owned?	The Partnership has indicated its commitment to protecting the public interest with public oversight of the new crossing. The Partnership is exploring various forms of collaboration and innovation with the private sector, while maintaining an appropriate level of public oversight. The Government of Canada is taking the lead role in the implementation of the bridge and inspection plaza on the Canadian side of the crossing system. Canada has indicated it intends to explore the opportunity for private-sector participation in the construction, financing, and operation of the new bridge. A public-private partnership will not affect the ownership of the new crossing and the Government of Canada remains committed to public ownership of a new bridge and inspection plaza.
What level of government will be responsible for the new freeway?	Ontario is taking the lead role in the implementation of the access road from Highway 401 to the new inspection plaza in and will be responsible for maintaining the freeway.
The entire transportation route needs to be owned by the Government of Canada; not privately owned.	The Partnership has heard that public oversight of a new crossing is important and is committed to protecting the public interest with public oversight. The Partnership is exploring various forms of collaboration and innovation with the private sector, while maintaining an appropriate level of public oversight.
How does a private/public partnership be accountable to the government?	Canada has indicated it intends to explore the opportunity for private-sector participation in the construction, financing, and operation of the new bridge. A public-private partnership will not affect the ownership of the new crossing and the Government of Canada remains committed to public ownership of a new bridge and inspection plaza.
Public ownership of the new crossing is preferred over a private ownership.	
Do not place a toll on the new freeway.	There are no plans to toll the new freeway.
General Questions	
What is the role of the City of Windsor in this process?	The Canadian Study Team recognizes the important role the City of Windsor has in the planning of a new crossing and access road. As the host municipality for the Canadian plaza and crossing, and with approximately 40% of the length of the access road within Windsor's boundaries, the concerns and suggestions raised by the City of Windsor are carefully considered by the Study Team. The City has been participating in the study as a member of the Municipal Advisory Group. In addition, presentations to City Council have been made at key milestones in the study process. The DRIC Study Team will continue to work with the City in refining the preferred alternatives and developing appropriate mitigation to lessen community impacts.
What will happen to E.C. Row Expressway as a result of this project?	E.C. Row Expressway will continue to operate as it currently does.
Concern about potential 24-hr construction; impacts to quality of life.	Details of construction staging have not yet been finalized. The Partnership has an objective of completing construction by the end of 2013. Impacts to residences and businesses will be considered in the stating of the project. Additional details will be presented for public comment over the remainder of the planning study as well as during the design stages.
What will happen to the Ambassador Bridge after a new crossing is built?	The Ambassador Bridge will continue to operate as it currently does; passenger vehicles and trucks will have the option of using the existing crossing or the new crossing.
Why can't trucks be forced to use one crossing only? Though the goal was to eliminate truck traffic from Huron Church Road.	The objectives of the DRIC Study include providing additional capacity and reasonable and secure options (i.e. redundancy) for the border transportation network. In addition, one of the goals of the DRIC study is to get truck traffic off local roads, which is accomplished with the extension of Highway 401 to a new plaza and crossing location. Providing international traffic with options for crossing the border provide for more efficient movement of people and goods.
How does "Let's get Windsor Moving" differ from DRIC?	The Let's Get Windsor Moving initiative looked at improving border transportation infrastructure within the Windsor-Essex region. The money committed to that study is entirely separate from the DRIC study; roadway improvements suggested by that study are currently underway. The $300 million dollar commitment is being utilized for roadway and other infrastructure improvements in the Windsor-Essex region.
What happened to the $300 Million commitment?	
Would like to see the consultation (minutes of meetings) undertaken with the brine well companies.	The data gathered on brine well activity in West Windsor is documented in the Deep Drilling Report available no the project website.
Will any consideration be given with respect to the School Council report that was presented to the DRIC Study Team last year?	All comments and submissions made by local groups and the general public are taken into consideration in the development, evaluation and refinement of the DRIC alternatives.
Schwartz Report was generally accepted by the City of Windsor and residents (except for the impacts to	The Project Team considered several access road alternatives for connecting Highway 401 to a new crossing in the riverfront industrial area of west Windsor, including an

Comments/Questions	Response
Ojibway). It made more sense	alternative along the Schwartz preferred alignment, a Todd Lane/Malden Road alternative, using the E.C. Row corridor with an extension of Lauzon Parkway and using a portion of the DRTP rail corridor with the E.C. Row corridor. The Area of Continued Analysis was identified on the basis of an assessment that considered the transportation and mobility benefits and the impacts to social, cultural, economic and natural features, as well as cost. The alignment passing through the Spring Garden forest and Ojibway prairie was found to have similar impacts to residences, but higher impacts to natural areas and community character/cohesion than the Huron Church/EC Row alternative. The evaluation concluded that the balance of advantages and disadvantages of the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor to access a new crossing in the Brighton Beach/Sandwich area was fundamentally better than that of the other alternatives.
Concern that the west end of Windsor will have three crossings.	We have noted your concerns.
Put the Old Sandwich Town Action Plan into the cultural reports.	The DRIC cultural experts are aware of the Old Sandwich Towne Action Plan and have reviewed the cultural discussion and recommendations and have incorporated them appropriately into their technical reports.
Tunnel experts hired by the City of Windsor said a tunnel could be constructed for a lot cheaper than DRIC reported. Please explain the difference in cost.	The tunnel experts hired by the City of Windsor are proposing a bored tunnel, four lanes in width, as opposed to the DRIC recommended cut and cover tunnel that is six lanes in width.
Determine if the existing Ambassador Bridge is structurally sound.	Comment noted.
Logical approach was taken for this study. If there is a will there is a way. Feeling is that this project is a done deal. The proposals put forth will ruin the city.	In June 2005, we presented 15 river crossing alternatives, and associated plazas and access roads for public consultation. The analysis and evaluation, carried out between June and November, concluded that access route, plaza and crossing alternatives in the Area of Continued Analysis provide a good balance of transportation service and mobility, with fewer associated community and environmental impacts, in comparison to other alternatives. This analysis was completed using 7 major factor groups and over 35 evaluation criteria. Each alternative was assessed according to how well it fit the needs of both Canada and the United States. Given the nature and extent of land uses and development along the Detroit River in Canada and the U.S., it is not possible to develop a new or expanded river crossing, plaza and connecting roads that entirely avoid impacts on local communities. The goal of the Partnership is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the extent practicable. The Area of Continued Analysis was identified on the basis of an assessment that considered the transportation and mobility benefits and the impacts to social, cultural, economic and natural features, as well as cost. The Study Team is working with the public and other stakeholders to refine the Parkway to further reduce impacts. All alternatives will be evaluated to determine the alternative that best balances the needs of the project and the objectives of reducing community effects.

AFTER WORKSHOP SESSION:

Questions/Comments	Response
Illustrative Alternatives	
Building a bypass would improve air quality in Windsor; a bypass of the city should be considered. The City of Windsor needs to be more attractive in order to attract business; therefore build a tunnel or reroute the highway to another crossing.	In June 2005, we presented 15 river crossing alternatives, and associated plazas and access roads for public consultation. The analysis and evaluation, carried out between June and November, concluded that access route, plaza and crossing alternatives in the Area of Continued Analysis provide a good balance of transportation service and mobility, with fewer associated community and environmental impacts, in comparison to other alternatives. This analysis was completed using 7 major factor groups and over 35 evaluation criteria. Each alternative was assessed according to how well it fit the needs of both Canada and the United States. Given the nature and extent of land uses and development along the Detroit River in Canada and the U.S., it is not possible to develop a new or expanded river crossing, plaza and connecting roads that entirely avoid impacts on local communities. The goal of the Partnership is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the extent practicable. The Area of Continued Analysis was identified on the basis of an assessment that considered the transportation and mobility benefits and the impacts to social, cultural, economic and natural features, as well as cost. The evaluation concluded that the balance of advantages and disadvantages of the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor to access a new crossing in the Brighton Beach/Sandwich area was fundamentally better than that of the other alternatives. Details of this assessment are included in the Generation and Assessment of Illustrative Alternatives Report, Draft November 2005, available for viewing/downloading at www.partnershipborderstudy.com. Air quality is under provincial jurisdiction, and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) is responsible for setting and enforcing air standards in the province. This is done through Ontario Regulation 419 (O.Reg.419/05) Air Pollution - Local Air Quality. This regulation sets out the standards and guidelines that facilities (stationary sources) must meet and use to get a permit to discharge emissions into the air. Environment Canada, which is a federal body, has a number of guidelines and standards that have been adopted for use by the individual provinces. The Canada-Wide Standard for Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) is one of them. This standard, which does not come into force until 2010, has been adopted by the MOE for use in assessing potential air quality impacts, and was used in the DRIC air quality assessment, in addition to the MOE's criteria for nitrogen oxides (NOx). Once the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative is selected, the analysis will be re-done using additional air pollutants, and will be compared to the relevant MOE and CWS limits. For mobile sources (vehicles), the Federal Government has implemented regulations and measures aimed at reducing vehicle emissions including gasoline and diesel sulphur regulations, new vehicle emission standards. The Ontario Government has implemented additional measures including the Drive Clean Program, the SMOG patrol, and fuel taxes.
Environmental Assessment Process	
Ministry of Health and Environment needs to be the lead for this project.	Studies of transportation improvements of the nature being proposed by DRIC are typically led by transportation ministries. The Ministries of Health and the Environment have been part of this study since in commenced in early 2005. Both ministries have reviewed and provided feedback regarding the workplans that have been developed. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment will determine whether the project is approved to proceed.
Ontario requires legislation similar to California's bill.	Comment noted. The DRIC Study is being conducted in accordance with requirements of Ontario Ministries and agencies.

Study should follow the precautionary principle.	One of the outcomes of the DRIC study and environmental assessment is to evaluate all reasonable alternatives and determine the Environmentally and Technically Preferred Alternative. This involves determining which alternative provides the best balance between reducing environmental impacts and meeting the regional transportation and mobility needs. As such, the precautionary principle is being followed.
Canadian Environmental Assessment Act-read the Executive Summary of the act including the definition of the environment; Section 4 of the Act; other government agencies need to be engaged.	The DRIC Study is being undertaken through a coordinated federal-provincial Environmental Assessment (EA) process. Both governments have agreed to coordinate their respective EA processes as outlined in the Canada-Ontario Agreement on EA Cooperation (November 2004). The federal EA process was initiated early in the study planning stages in order to maximize opportunities for coordination with the provincial EA process. Federal departments have provided input into the development of the Work Plans developed for each of the various disciplines required for this study, as part of the coordinated process.
Study is not consulting agencies. The Ministry of Health should be more involved.	
Risk that this process is being carried on too long; it should be continued and completed as soon as possible.	The Partnership is working as quickly as possible to complete the environmental assessment and technical analysis while providing adequate opportunities for public consultation.
Statement made by the public that Michigan/U.S. is deciding where the route should go; feeling that Ontario is being pressured to chose this route.	The development of the Area of Continued Analysis, as well as the locations of the practical crossing and plaza alternatives was a cooperative decision made by the DRIC Partnership. The decision as to the preferred crossing location will also be a joint decision of the Partnership.
Residents of Windsor and the County are seen as most important. Impacts to the community needs to be considered more.	Community impacts are one of seven evaluation factors that have been part of the evaluation process for each of the alternatives developed for this study. Meetings with various community groups and individuals have taken place and will continue to take place in order to better understand the needs and issues of the community regarding this study.
Why don't we have votes? How does the Environmental Assessment process work?	This international transportation improvement project will require approvals from governments on both sides of the border. The DRIC Partnership has developed a coordinated process that will enable the joint selection of a recommended river crossing location that meets the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (OEAA), the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA), and the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in an effective and efficient manner. Decision-making as to alternatives to be carried forward and the selection of the preferred alternative is based on: • Government legislation and guidelines • Existing land use and municipal policy • Technical considerations • Issues and concerns identified during consultation • Study Team expertise. The evaluation of alternatives is based on seven factors. Public input is an important aspect of this study.
Air Quality	
Air monitoring stations are not properly located.	Two air quality monitoring stations were established for the purposes of the DRIC study and have been in place for approximately one year. The air quality stations were specifically located to determine the current levels of air pollutants in the immediate vicinity of the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor. The locations were chosen based on recommendations from the DRIC Community Consultation Group (CCG) as well as technical requirements (such as access to power, and unobstructed air flow). There are also two other air quality monitoring stations in the west Windsor area that provide relevant data for this study.
Concerned with the statement that emissions will be reduced due to improvements in technology-diesel formulas will remain unchanged. Bio-diesel is still using 80%of diesel fuels.	The statements that air quality improvements are anticipated as new fuels and engine technologies are brought into greater use primarily reflect the reductions in fuel sulphur content (in both gasoline and diesel), rather than the adoption of bio-diesel. The allowable limits for sulphur in both diesel and gasoline have recently changed (2006-2007) and were incorporated into the analysis. As of June 2006, the maximum regulated limit of sulphur in on-road diesel fuel was reduced by 97% from 500 mg/kg to 15 mg/kg. These reductions were necessary for Canadian sulphur levels in on-road fuels to be consistent with U.S. levels, and to ensure that advanced emission control technologies on newer engines would be effective. As of January 1, 2007, additional standards for heavy-duty engines came into effect. These standards reduce NO_x and particulate matter emissions by 60% and 90% respectively over existing levels, and require the incorporation of additional emission control technologies on these newer engines to effect those reductions. Recent developments, such as alternative fuels like bio-diesel, and hybrid engines (which have no emissions when operating under electric power), are not reflected in our analysis. These types of fuels and engines would further help to lower vehicle emissions in the corridor.
Statement that transportation sources are not significant; truck emissions are not being monitored.	The technical analysis undertaken for this study found that air quality in the Windsor/Essex County area is more heavily influenced by pollutants from transboundary sources (i.e. Ohio Valley and Michigan) and other sources than by transportation. During typical conditions, non-transportation sources comprise approximately 56 percent of the total concentration of particulate matter in the Windsor area. During a smog event, this contribution increases to over 80 percent, as polluted air flows into the region from upwind sources in the U.S. Our statements reflect that even with expected improvements in fuels and technologies, air quality is likely to remain a concern for the Windsor/Essex County area. Reductions in pollutants from non-transportation sources will have a greater improvement on local air quality. As for the monitoring of truck emissions, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment requires heavy-duty diesel trucks registered in Ontario to be tested annually under the Drive Clean program, and meet emission limits. Vehicles registered in other provinces and in the U.S. are generally subject to similar programs. Also, as part of this study, two air quality monitoring stations have been established in the Huron Church/Highway 3 corridor. The findings to date are presented in the Air Quality Monitoring Reports available for viewing/downloading at the project website. The data gathered from these monitoring stations are being used to validate the inputs used in the predictive modeling of future air quality conditions in the corridor.
In favour of an end-to-end tunnel; air in tunnel is acceptable to breathe.	Our technical analysis has determined that air quality will be better no matter which type of roadway is built in the Huron Church Road/Highway 3 corridor. Based on anticipated changes to engine technologies and fuels in both Canada and the U.S., preliminary estimates are that annual emissions of NOx from road related transportation sources in Windsor will be reduced from approximately 4,000 tonnes in 2004 to 500 tonnes in 2035. These changes will occur over time as the vehicle fleet is replaced. Based on these projected decreases, cars and trucks will likely contribute less than 10 per cent of the total regional NOx emissions. As well, the tailpipe fraction of PM2.5 emissions is currently a maximum of 30 per cent of the total road based PM2.5 emissions from the corridor. By 2015, this

	fraction will be reduced to less than 10 per cent of the total PM2.5 emissions, because of the combined effect of cleaner fuels and because free flow traffic conditions on a freeway eliminates braking, idling and acceleration at traffic signals. Even with the expected improvements to fuels and technologies, air quality is likely to remain a concern for the Windsor/Essex County area. Our analysis found that air quality in the Windsor/Essex County area is heavily influenced by pollutants from transboundary sources (i.e. Ohio Valley and Michigan) and other sources than by transportation. During typical conditions, these sources comprise approximately 56 per cent of the total concentration of particulate matter in the Windsor area. During a smog event, this contribution increases to over 80 per cent, as polluted air flows into the region from upwind sources in the U.S. Reductions in pollutants from non-transportation sources will have a greater improvement on local air quality. Among the access road alternatives considered to date for this study, our analysis has determined that is little difference to air quality between the alternatives. Air dispersion modelling of air quality impacts of the Practical Alternatives indicates that there are slight differences between a tunnel, at-grade and a below-grade access road within 50 - 100 m (164 - 328 ft) from the right-of-way (ROW). Below-grade alternatives result in a reduction in maximum predicted PM2.5 and NOx concentrations in the vicinity of the ROW, in comparison to at-grade alternatives. For example, within 50 m (164 ft) from the ROW, below-grade sections show slightly lower predicted concentrations of PM2.5 and NOx than at-grade sections. At approximately 100 m (328 ft) and beyond, there is no discernible difference between at-grade and below-grade alternatives. Within 50 m (164 ft) of the ROW, the end-to-end tunnel alternative results in lower maximum predicted concentrations of PM2.5 compared to at-grade and below-grade alternatives. At 100 m (328 ft) from the ROW, there is little difference between the alternatives in terms of maximum predicted PM2.5 concentrations. At 250 m (820 ft) from the ROW there is no difference between any of the alternatives in terms of PM2.5 concentrations. The end-to-end tunnel alternative results in increases in the maximum predicted 1-hour and 24-hour NOx concentrations in the vicinity of the ROW, compared to at-grade and below-grade options. These increases are also indicated over a broader area in comparison to the at-grade and below-grade options. This reflects the effect of the tunnel entrance and exit portals, in addition to the dispersion characteristics of the exhaust stacks at the ventilation buildings.
Tunnel in Sarnia cleans diesel fumes.	Our research into the use and effectiveness of air filter/cleaning technologies currently in use in tunnels in North America and around the world found that the Sarnia rail tunnel has no pollution control devices installed on the ventilation equipment in use at this facility.
Need to implement health studies and collect baseline data before improvements are implemented.	The air quality impact assessment undertaken for this study incorporates federal and provincial air quality criteria and standards, which are developed in consideration of potential effects on human health. The air quality impact assessment presents the results for each of the access road alternatives in terms of changes to air quality under future traffic conditions as compared to a future "no build" scenario. Existing MOE air quality monitoring stations ion the Windsor area will provide on-going monitoring of local air quality.
Air pollution comes from other sources besides traffic-related sources.	The DRIC study team in conducting the air quality analysis has determined that air quality in the Windsor area is impacted by transboundary air flows stemming from non-transportation sources found in the Ohio Valley and Michigan. These sources typically comprise over 50% of the pollutant concentrations in the Windsor-Essex area.
Present health impacts data with your analysis.	The air quality impact assessment undertaken for this study incorporates federal and provincial air quality criteria and standards, which are developed in consideration of potential effects on human health. The air quality impact assessment presents the results for each of the access road alternatives in terms of changes in air quality under future traffic conditions as compared to a future “no build” scenario. As part of the assessment of impacts of the Technically and Environmentally Preferred Alternative, a human health risk assessment will be conducted. The results will be part of the study results.
Emissions from the tunnel need to be analyzed as treated with scrubbers and other technologies.	The tunnel alternative did not consider scrubbers because we first need to understand what the impacts are before mitigation (applying scrubbers and other technologies into the model). The analysis indicates a drop in the emissions from the road which suggests that scrubbers are not necessary.
Assumption of improved technology will improve emission will realistically take a longer period of time than stated by the Study Team.	Our assessment has estimated changes in emissions based on current and known changes to air quality criteria, as well as historic fleet turnover rates.
Why will technology improve for diesel emissions and not for tunnel technology?	Many of the emission standards that gasoline and diesel vehicles will have to meet in the future have already been incorporated into regulations. With respect to tunnel exhaust technology, technological improvements in air cleaning systems will be driven by worldwide demand for such systems. At present there is relatively little demand for them since use of tunnel ventilation buildings with exhaust stacks generally results in sufficient air pollutant dispersion such that air cleaning is not required. It is possible that technological advances could occur in the future that result in a more effective system; however, it is not possible, nor appropriate, to consider systems that don't yet exist in our air quality impact assessment.
Do not believe that air cannot be purified in the tunnel.	Comment noted.
Noise	
A three dBA is a doubling of existing noise levels; 5 dBA increase is 140% increase in noise.	A change in noise levels of 3 dBA is barely perceptible to the human ear. A change in noise levels of 10 dBA is considered to be a doubling of the noise level as perceived by the receptor.
Tunneling	
Tunneling will be least costly and safer in the long run.	The DRIC Study Team has been discussing emergency response incidents with local emergency personnel from Windsor, LaSalle, and Essex County and has gathered their input and used their recommendations in the design modifications to the access road alternatives. Maintenance costs associated with the tunnel alternative were determined to be higher than with the at-grade or below-grade alternatives because there is more structural features to maintain with a tunnel then with the other alternatives.
Tunnel cost is not a factor given the importance of the goods moving through the area/economic value of the region.	The tunnel alternative was analyzed in the same manner as the other alternatives, using the seven evaluation factor criteria developed with public input at the beginning of this study. Cost and Constructability was one of the factors used in the evaluation. The cost of the end-to-end tunnel was found to be three to six times more expensive than the other alternatives under consideration, representing a difference of between $2.5 and $3 billion. These costs are reflective of both the increased effort and materials needed to construct an end-to-end tunnel as well as the increased construction risks and complexities. We have always said

	that we are focussed on pursuing the solution that best balances impacts and benefits. The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction.
Tunnels should start at Walker Road, right to I-75 in the United States, under the river. Create a plaza for trucks, and a plaza for cars.	Your suggestion has been noted. In November 2005, the DRIC Study Team evaluated constructing a tunnel underneath the Detroit River and determined that it was not feasible given the depth of the bedrock and current standard practices for building underwater tunnels. The DRIC Study Team has met extensively with the Canada Border Services Agency in discussing the future customs and inspection plaza. The size and layout of the proposed plazas will accommodate future car and truck volumes, while allowing for streaming of car and truck traffic on the plaza and the crossing.
Reconsider the tunnel option.	The results of the analysis do not support further investigation of an end-to-end tunnelled access road (Alternative 3). This conclusion is based on the results of the analysis of Practical Alternatives, including: • All of the access road alternatives will address the future transportation and mobility needs of the region, which was one of the primary objectives for the project. Providing a freeway will separate international and local traffic, reduce the likelihood of international traffic infiltrating other local roads to access the border and eliminate the need for the international truck traffic to stop and start up at the many traffic signals. This will greatly improve operations and safety for all motorists in this area. • The end-to-end tunnel alternative was found to offer no real advantages in terms of reducing impacts to properties, land use, natural features or cultural features. • While an end-to-end tunnel alternative offers some advantages to air quality in the immediate corridor through lower particulate concentrations compared to the do-nothing alternative, through improvements to fuels and technology all the alternatives provide this same benefit to some degree. • The benefits offered by an end-to-end tunnel in reducing particulate concentrations are offset somewhat by increases in concentrations of gaseous pollutants emitted over a larger area beyond the access road corridor from the ventilation buildings and these cannot be captured with current pollution control technology. • The cost of the end-to-end tunnel was found to be three to six times more expensive than the other alternatives under consideration, representing a difference of between $2.5 and $3 billion. These costs are reflective of both the increased effort and materials needed to construct an end-to-end tunnel as well as the increased construction risks and complexities. • We have always said that we are focussed on pursuing the solution that best balances impacts and benefits. The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction.
An impromptu poll was taken in which the question “Who is in favour of a tunnel” was asked. 60-70 percent of the room raised their hand.	Decision-making as to alternatives to be carried forward and the selection of the preferred alternative is based on: • Government legislation and guidelines • Existing land use and municipal policy • Technical considerations • Issues and concerns identified during consultation • Study Team expertise
A tunnel structure supporting the cross street connections will be more structurally sound. Concern about freezing/thawing/freezing and its effects on the structural integrity of the short tunnel structures. Suggestion was made to tunnel the entire route instead. What is the life expectancy of the short tunnels? Suggestion to implement retaining walls instead to maximize the landscaping proposed above the short tunnels.	The design of the crossing road structures and tunnel sections would follow similar requirements for life cycle. The effects of freezing and thawing are not expected to be a problem, but the design standards for these structures used in Ontario accounts for these issues. The locations of retaining walls will be finalized as the design of the preferred alternative is completed. The comment that landscaped areas should be maximized is noted.
What is the depth of the tunnel versus below grade?	Typically, the below grade option is approximately 3-5 m shallower than the tunnel.
Cost	
What is the cost of the other alternatives? Tunneling requires no expropriation.	The cost of the end-to-end tunnel was found to be three to six times more expensive than the other alternatives under consideration, representing a difference of between $2.5 and $3 billion. These costs are reflective of both the increased effort and materials needed to construct an end-to-end tunnel as well as the increased construction risks and complexities. We have always said that we are focussed on pursuing the solution that best balances impacts and benefits. The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction. The tunnel alternative has been determined to be a cut and cover tunnel construction, which will require that property be taken during the construction phase in order to keep traffic moving on Huron Church Road.
Cost should not be the issue in the decision (any cost is worth it in terms of reducing impacts to the community).	The Study Team is working with the community to find the solution that provides the best balance of transportation benefits and reducing community impacts. We recognize that taxpayers expect our public funds to be spent wisely, and governments to make responsible fiscal decisions. Cost is only one of seven important factors we are considering throughout the EA process.
Cost is irrelevant when considering improved air quality.	
Cost/benefit analysis of the tunnel needs to be undertaken; Windsor is a hub for North America; need to invest as much as possible for the best solution. Reexamine cost/benefit analysis with the tunneling option.	Cost is one of seven evaluation factors that the Study Team has considered for all the access road alternatives. The Border Transportation Partnership is working with the community to find the solution that provides the best balance of transportation benefits with community impacts. We recognize that taxpayers expect our public funds to be spent wisely, and governments to make responsible fiscal decisions. Cost is only one of seven important factors we are considering throughout the EA process.
The solution that is required for Canadian trade; the money generated from trade should more than cover the cost of the tunnel. Cost should not be an issue. This project is needed for trade with Canada.	Cost is one of seven evaluation factors that the Study Team has considered for all the access road alternatives. The Border Transportation Partnership is working with the community to find the solution that provides the best balance of transportation benefits with community impacts. We recognize that taxpayers expect our public funds to be spent wisely, and governments to make responsible fiscal decisions. Cost is only one of seven important factors we are considering throughout the EA process.

Design of Transportation Alternatives	
Current terminus of Highway 401 with Highway 3 is dangerous, roadway curve is too short, too many traffic lights.	The DRIC design team examined issues such as those you have mentioned and have designed the new terminus of Highway 401 and Highway 3 to improve the roadway alignment.
Need a direct route from Highway 401 to the crossing.	The DRIC study has proposed a direct freeway route from Highway 401 to a new crossing; it removes 18 sets of stop lights and brings both cars and trucks to a new customs and inspection plaza and a new crossing between Windsor and Detroit.
What is the depth of the below grade roadway?	The below grade roadway is approximately 5 to 7 metres below grade.
What is the depth of the cut and cover tunnel?	The cut and cover tunnel is approximately 7 to 10 metres below grade.
Exit from Labelle to Ambassador Bridge needs to be looked at in more detail (ie number of lanes)	Comment noted. These roadway connections will continue to be reviewed.
Access to Labelle should be below grade or tunneled.	
Need direct access to St. Clair College.	Access to St. Clair College is provided by the service road; nearby access to the freeway is provided in both directions.
Two areas that are at grade (Grand Marais ditch and Malden (Spring Garden area) should have higher sound walls and larger berms.	The Study Team will continue to identify impacts in these areas and propose appropriate mitigation to reduce any impacts, where practicable.
Property Impacts and Expropriation	
Property values next to the Parkway Alternative will be worthless; should consider buying them out.	Comment noted. The property to be acquired will reflect the requirements of the project.
Plaza	
There is a lack of representation of the Spring Garden Area including Armanda and Labelle Streets. Need to show a graphic showing a connection to Plaza A. Public needs to be better informed. Impacts relating to the Spring Garden area and Plaza A are not shown. Question centres on lighting, control of the City of WIndsor regarding the plaza options, and removal of vegetation during construction of the plaza.	Comment noted. The drawings presented at the Open Houses depict what the possible roadway alignments and plaza connections could be in this area. We will develop additional visual aids to provide residents with a better understanding of the alternative.
Plaza A has a large effect on Spring Garden area; concern that traffic will queue in the residential area.	Your concerns have been noted. We are currently evaluating plaza and crossing combinations and will recommend the one that provides the least amount of impact according to the seven evaluation factors that comprise this study. Given the nature and extent of land uses and development along the Detroit River in Canada and the U.S., it is not possible to develop a new or expanded river crossing, plaza and connecting roads that entirely avoid impacts on local communities. The goal of the Partnership is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the extent practicable.
Plaza B has the least impacts.	
Plaza C impacts Sandwich Town.	
Customs on both sides of the border is seen as the largest problem with delays in processing vehicles; customs plazas need to be sized appropriately. The current Detroit-Windsor tunnel can only accommodate a certain number of cars because of ventilation; cars waiting in the tunnel are held captive.	The DRIC Study Team has met with the Canada Border Services Agency and have discussed the plaza requirements required to meet projected traffic that will utilize this crossing. The results of these discussions have been incorporated in the proposed plaza alternatives.
Parkway Alternative	
How will the Parkway address air quality problems related to the stop/starting during peak congestion periods?	The Parkway features a freeway that will enable international traffic to avoid eight stop lights on Huron Church/Highway 3 and therefore reduce the starting and stopping of traffic.
Do not agree that Parkway concept improves the quality of life of Windsor residents.	We have noted your comment.
Parkway is a fancy word for expressway.	
Parkway is a non-starter.	
What percentage of the parkway is covered?	The percentage of the freeway that is covered by tunnel with the Parkway alternative is 20 percent.
The parkway option is a huge improvement over the existing conditions. Use barriers and berms to create the best solution possible	We have taken note of your comment.
General	
Where are the representatives of the Canadian Federal government, and also the U.S. Government? Why are they not in attendance at these workshop sessions?	Representatives from the Canadian federal government and the U.S. government try to attend important meetings such as this and are usually in attendance. If you have a concern to be expressed to these partners, please feel free to provide via the project website or by submitting a comment sheet.
President Bush at the recent North American summit stated that the new crossing should not be touched.	At the recent Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America Summit held August 20-21 in Montebello, Canada, the following was stated regarding the Windsor-Detroit border: Canada and the US will maintain a high priority on the development of enhanced capacity of the border crossing infrastructure in the Detroit-Windsor region, the world's busiest land crossing.
The boundary line as shown on the plans is incorrect for the towns of LaSalle and Tecumseh (should be in the middle of the road).	We have examined our boundary lines as shown on the plans, and have confirmed that they are correct as shown.
Social features/community impact factor does not include air quality.	Air quality discussions, analysis and data are shown on pages 23-27 of the PIOH#5 handouts.
Examples in Detroit show how to not implement other solutions other than tunnel.	The DRIC Study Team has considered numerous examples of roadway configurations in the development of the practical alternatives. The new access road will reflect best practices in design and construction.
Money spent on "vacation" routes to the north need to be spent here.	Comment noted.
Route needs to be implemented now to accommodate trade.	The DRIC Study Team is working as fast as possible to complete the environmental assessment while providing adequate opportunities for consultation.
Proposed improvements is the best thing to happen to Windsor; it will promote increased trade.	Comments noted.
No consideration is given to the truck driver; an extension of Highway 401 is needed immediately.	

Fear is that environmentalists will stall the project.	
Request to have a public meeting centered on the topic of governance; who will own the new crossing, what proportion will be in public ownership?	Public oversight, and protecting the public interest is paramount to the Border Transportation Partnership. The priority is to make sure that the Detroit River border crossings are secure, efficient, and well managed. Work is ongoing on both sides of the border to examine potential governance, public oversight, and ownership models for our border crossings. The options being considered include government ownership, various forms of collaboration with the private sector, and the creation of an authority. The request for a meeting on this topic will be forwarded to the Partnership.
Would like to see a solution that is livable for the adjacent residents.	Features of the Parkway include: • People-friendly spaces including wider bridges to allow communities on both sides of the corridor to connect • New trails for pedestrians and cyclists • Linkages for wildlife • Landscaped buffer zones • Entrance points for local traffic • Reduced impact of international traffic on neighbourhoods • Opportunities to create a signature gateway and warm welcome into Windsor, Ontario and Canada
Greater consideration and input is required from the community with regard to the potential impacts from this project.	The DRIC Study Team has held over 150 meeting with members of the public, agencies, interest groups and have heard various comments and suggestions. We continually seek input from the public through our website, hotline number, public information open houses, workshops, Community Consultation Group, and other meetings.
Canadian economy is growing and the Windsor-Detroit crossings will be utilized by trucks. Estimated forecast is less than 10 years that 38,000 trucks will use the route and create significant pollution with the Parkway concept. Need better pollution control; pollution has no boundaries, it travels to other regions.	Traffic projections for the DRIC Study are that 28,000 trucks per day will use the border crossings, not 38,000. The Parkway is a below-grade roadway with separate service road and tunnel sections. The results of the air quality assessment are that there is no noticeable difference in air quality among the alternatives (at-grade, below-grade).
Building a tunnel is not worth it in Windsor. The route is established, do need to get rid of it.	Your comment is noted.

For further information, contact:

Mr. Roger Ward, Senior Project Manager
Ministry of Transportation
Border Initiatives Implementation Group
659 Exeter Road, 2nd Floor
London, Ontario N6E 1L3
Toll Free: 1-800-265-6072 ext. 4586
e-mail: detroit.river@ontario.ca

Mr. Len Kozachuk, P.Eng., Deputy Project Manager
URS Canada Inc.
75 Commerce Valley Drive East
Markham, Ontario L3T 7N9
Tel: (905) 882-3540, Fax: (905) 882-4399Tel: (519) 873-4586, Fax: (519) 873-4789 Toll Free: 1-800-900-2649
e-mail: info@partnershipborderstudy.com

Ministry of Transportation
Border Initiatives Implementation Group Office
949 McDougall Street, Suite 200
Windsor, Ontario N9A 1L9
Tel: (519) 973-7367, Fax: (519) 973-7327

Detroit River International Crossing
Windsor Project Office
2465 McDougall Avenue, Suite 100
Windsor, Ontario N8X 3N9
Tel: (519) 969-9696, Fax: (519) 969-5012

Visit the project website at www.partnershipborderstudy.com