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MS. BARONDESS: Okay. I’m going to go ahead and get this meeting started. I want to welcome everybody here this afternoon, I really appreciate your coming out. I want to introduce myself, my name is Margaret Barondess. And I am the manager of the environmental area at the Michigan Department of Transportation. I will be moderating this meeting this afternoon.

Everyone should have a copy of today’s agenda. If you don’t, if you need a copy, you can raise your hand and someone will get it for you. Looks like we should be pretty well stocked up with agendas here. What I want to do to start with is add an agenda item. It’s my agenda item. I want to talk about some housekeeping, how is this meeting going to take place, what are some housekeeping sort of rules that I’m going to be using today in running the meeting.

I want to start by saying here are some paper items that you should have, everyone should have these paper items. You should have, again, a copy of the agenda. There is a blue book with a plastic white ringed binder on it that you should have. This is a book that has some details about the proposed alternatives for the study. And by the way, I should say welcome to the Detroit River
International Crossing Study. I apologize. I don’t think I mentioned that to start with. Just in case you’re at some other meeting -- thinking you’re at some other meeting. I don’t know how that would ever happen. Another thing that you should all have is a comment form. That comment form you can fill out and give it to an MDOT staff person or a team member today or on your agenda there are several other ways to submit comments over e-mail, the internet site, and also through fax. And so everyone should have a comment form.

Some of you have printouts of the second PowerPoint presentation that we’re going to be presenting today. We didn’t have enough for everyone in the room. If you have an empty seat next to you and you don’t have one of those PowerPoint printouts and you want one, please feel free to go ahead and scavage and pick up one of those. If you want to have a printout of this PowerPoint presentation or the first one that we’re going to be having today, then please let a staff or team member know and give us your business card and we’ll make sure that you get a copy of that. We’ll have to mail that to you as a follow-up to this meeting today.

I want to mention a couple of other housekeeping types of items. We do have a court reporter here today who is going to be recording the discussion that we’re going to be
having this afternoon. The reason we’re doing that is because the team would like to be able to listen and not be distracted by taking notes. And so we’re going to have a professional note taker take notes for us so we can have the proceedings from the meeting available for follow-up activities that are going to take place as an aftermath of this meeting.

I understand that there’s also some TV possibilities here. And I wanted to let everyone know. I know I saw a TV station person come in. And I know there was a plan at one time to have Grosse Ile cable E-mail taping. But I’m not sure if they’re here today. I don’t think I’ve seen them come in today. But that may be a possibility, they may be coming late. I’m not exactly sure. But I thought everyone should know that there is a possibility that you may be taped for presentation on a television news channel or a cable access E-mail show.

Before I go on, I want to spend a few minutes talking about the purpose for our meeting. If you look on your agenda, you can see that we have a purpose statement for today’s meeting. I want to give you a little more background about the scoping process. Scoping is a process, it’s an ongoing activity that’s part of NEPA. NEPA stands for the National Environmental Policy Act. This is a federal law that we have to comply with when
we’re planning projects that use federal aid. This project will potentially use federal aid so we are following the NEPA process.

As part of scoping, what we need to do is determine the framework for our future analysis of the alternatives on the proposed project, in the proposed study that we’re going to be doing. For example, right now we don’t have a lot of detailed information about the impacts that we may see from some of the various alternatives that are being proposed. What we would like to do is obtain more detailed information as we go along down the course of the study. And what we’re hoping for today is to get some feedback from the folks who are at the tables about the issues that you can see, or that you can think of, or that you might identify for us related to the proposed alternatives, the action.

We also want to hear from you about the purpose and need. We’ve laid out a purpose and need statement in the scoping document. And this is our statement of why are we here, what is it we want to do, what is our objective. And we’re looking for input on that.

We’re also looking for input on the alternatives that have been presented and ideas about impacts, whether they’re on the human environment, the natural environment, or any other types of community, neighborhood related types
of issues.

So what we are also thinking about when we go to a scoping meeting like this meeting is, how do we determine what the significant issues are as we go through the NEPA planning process? What is the -- what are the resource agencies who have jurisdiction over certain pieces of environmental legislation? What are they thinking about with respect to issue areas that we should be focusing more of our analysis on? So these are the kinds of questions that we would like to deal with today in our first scoping meeting here.

With that, what I would like to do is turn over the mike to Mr. Jim Kirschensteiner who is representing Federal Highway Administration today and have him provide you with some opening remarks. Jim.

MR. KIRSCHENSTEINER: Thanks, Margaret. First of all, on behalf of Federal Highway Administration, I would like to thank you all for coming; the federal agencies, the state agencies, the members of the local advisory groups and so on, as well as the members of the public. This is an opportunity that you all have to provide us input.

The Federal Highway Administration in this process is the lead federal agency. And a study of this scope and this magnitude, we can’t do it by ourselves. So there’s several federal agencies as well as some state agencies who
will be assisting us with that. We have several federal agencies that have signed on board with the Federal Highway Administration as cooperating agencies. And many of those agencies are here today. And in case you don’t know who those agencies are, we have the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as a cooperating agency, the Corps of Engineers as a cooperating agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. General Services Administration, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and U.S. Department of State.

A study of this magnitude requires all of those agencies to help us. We couldn’t get it done without them. The state agencies are also here to help MDOT, more or less, as a parallel. Also, the advisory councils and groups that are here provide us valuable input. You the members of the public work through the commenting process and through those council members to also provide us input.

The NEPA process, which you’ll hear a little bit more on here shortly, really has three components to it that -- I’ll start with D, the letter D like delta. It’s a discovery process. We have to discover what the significant issues are, what the stakeholders desire, what the public desires, and so on and so forth. It’s also a disclosure process.
We have to disclose what the impacts are. Something of this magnitude is going to have impacts, there’s no getting around it. Some of those impacts are going to be positive and some of those impacts may be not so positive, they may be negative. But we have to disclose whatever those impacts are.

And finally, the process will result in a decision that will be made by the federal government. One way or the other there will be a decision. Those are the three D’s in the process that we’ll be going through.

We have a presentation shortly that will go over the NEPA process itself in a little bit more detail, for those of you that are not familiar. Several of you that are with the federal and state agencies are very familiar with that process. But this scoping meeting today is really the first formal activity under the NEPA process. It sets out the steps that we’ll follow. It asks for identification of significant issues. And it kind of sets the stage for where we’re going.

It’s not the first time we’ve all gotten together, obviously. We’ve been together several other occasions. But this is the first formal step of that process. And I think probably with that, that’s about all I would like to say. And again, welcome to the meeting. And feel free to discuss what your issues are.
MS. BARONDESS: Thanks, Jim. I want to make a couple more points before we move on to introductions. One is that a lot of people call and ask a question when they come to a meeting like this, “So what’s new? What are you going to tell me today that’s new?” I’ll be honest with you, you’re not necessarily going to hear a lot of new information from the project team. A lot of this will be information that you’ve been presented before.

The difference here today from previous meetings that we’ve held is that we are here to listen to the folks who are at the tables and get their feedback. And we will take action on that feedback, we will have follow-up activities that we will be pursuing. And it will be lots of dialogue that will ensue from this meeting.

The scoping process takes many shapes and forms. We have formal activities like this meeting today. But we will also have more informal types of follow-up activities and to do items. So by the time we’re done this afternoon, I know our project study team is going to have a big to do list of things that we need to go out and take care of and work on next. So that’s really where we’re going. And this is sort of the big kickoff for our ongoing dialogue on many of the topics that Jim and I have mentioned so far.

So with that, what I would like to do is proceed with the introductions. I’d like to start with the MDOT and
project team that’s here today so you can put the name with the face for many of the people you’re going to be seeing over the next few years working on this project. So I’m going to start with the project manager Mohammed. Why don’t you go ahead and introduce yourself?

MR. ALGHURABI: Mohammed Alghurabi, I’m the project manager with the Michigan Department of Transportation.

MR. CORRADINO: I’m Joe Corradino with The Corradino Group, the consultant to the Michigan Department of Transportation.

MR. STONE: I’m Ted Stone with The Corradino Group.

MS. BEAUBOEUF: I’m Regine Beauboeuf with Parsons, a consultant on this project.

MS. AYERS: Geri Ayers, MDOT Environmental.

MR. IRWIN: I am Andy Irwin with the Michigan Department of Transportation. I am the manager of project planning section.

MS. BARONDESS: Are we missing anybody else from the MDOT and consultant project team? No? Speak now or forever hold your peace. Okay. I think that’s it for the team. What I’d like to do next is have the folks at the tables here introduce themselves. I’d like you to say -- tell us what your name is and what organization you’re representing today. So with that, Bruce, can you go ahead and start off for us? Thank you.
MR. KING: I'm Bruce King, I'm representing the City of Detroit Department of Environmental Affairs.

MR. WESTLAKE: Ken Westlake, I'm the section chief for the NEPA implementation section for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency office in Chicago.

MR. ABDALLA: My name is Del Abdalla, I am with the Federal Highway Administration. I am the environmental program manager.

MR. GRENNELL: My name is Brian Grennell and I'm an environmental review specialist for the State Historic Preservation Office.

MS. AMADOR: Hi, my name is Amy Amador, I'm here on behalf of Detroit City Council President Maryann Mahaffey.

MR. PALOMBO: Good afternoon. I'm Carmine Palombo, I'm director of transportation planning for SEMCOG. We're the metropolitan planning organization for this area.


MS. BENJAMIN: Alison Benjamin, Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision.

MS. SAVIC: Olga Savic, I'm representing State Representative Steve Tobocman 12th District, Southwest Detroit.

MS. LEONARD: Delores Leonard, Sierra Club, Environmental Justice Committee.
MS. KATZ: Lisa Katz, Detroit Regional Chamber.

MR. CERVENAK: Tom Cervenak from People’s Community
Services, Delray Neighborhood House.

MS. FRICKE: Sheri Sutherby-Fricke, City of Wyandotte.

MS. BENSON: Corki Benson, City of Wyandotte.

MR. CALLAHAN: Joe Callahan for Wayne County
Commissioner Ilona Varga, 5th District, Southwest Detroit
and the City of Lincoln Park.

MS. DUDZINSKI: Marlene Dudzinski, representing State
Representative Ed Clemente.

MS. HOSLER: Barbara Hosler with the U.S. Fish and
Wildlife Service in East Lansing.

MR. HOGREFE: Todd Hogrefe, Endangered Species
Coordinator with the Michigan Department of Natural
Resources Wildlife Division.

MR. REAUME: Dale Reaume, Grosse Ile Township.

MR. CADY: Bob Cady, City of Trenton.

MR. KOBILJAK: Kurt Kobiljak, Township of Grosse Ile
Supervisor.

MR. DURAND: I’m Tim Durand, the Mayor of Riverview
and also Chairman of the Downriver Community Conference
representing the 19 communities that comprise that
organization.

MR. DAVID: Dennis David, Mayor of Southgate and
Opponents of the Bridge At Large.
MR. MAHAR: Greg Mahar, Deputy Supervisor Brownstown Township.

MS. DINGELL: Good afternoon. Cindy Dingell, I’m here on behalf of the Wayne County Executive, Robert Ficano.

MR. COPLIN: Randy Coplin, Michigan State Police Commercial Vehicle Enforcement.


MR. KUCEL: Ken Kucel, Wayne County Department of Public Services Engineering Planning.

MR. HEISE: I’m Kurt Heise, director of the Wayne County Department of Environment and the County Drain Commissioner.

MR. ALLENSON: I’m Tom Allenson, I’m with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District.

MR. LAFRANCE: I’m Henry LaFrance, I’m with the Friends of the Detroit River.

MR. O’MALLEY: My name is Jerry O’Malley, I’m representing Congressman John Conyers.

MR. MORAN: Hi. My name is Paul Moran, and I’m substituting for Mr. Ed Nurenburg who’s representing the Southern Wayne Chamber of Commerce.


MR. HINES: I’m Adam Hines representing the Michigan
1 Department of Community Health.
2 MR. AMAYA: I'm Maria Amaya, Canadian Private Sector
3 Group.
4 MR. PETRO: Mark Petro, Private Sector Advisory Group, Canada.
5 MS. ALCOCK: Heidi Alcock, City of Detroit City
6 Planning Commission.
7 MR. GULOCH: Chris Guloch, Detroit Planning
8 Commission.
9 MR. BURNS: Robert Burns, Detroit River Keeper,
10 representing Friends of the Detroit River.
11 MR. ABRAHAM: Jose Abraham, City of Detroit,
12 Department of Public Works.
13 MR. MYERS: Josh Myers from Congressman Dingell’s
14 office.
15 MS. GOVAERE: Gail Govaere from Senator Carl Levin’s
16 office.
17 MS. D'ANGELO: Amanda D'Angelo from State Senator Ray
18 Basham’s office downriver.
19 MS. EATON: Abbey Eaton with Michigan Department of
20 Agriculture.
21 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm Alex Sanchez, I'm with the
22 Department of Environmental Quality, Land and Water
23 Management Division in Lansing.
24 MR. SILLS: I'm Robert Sills with the Michigan
Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division in Lansing.

MR. GARNEAU: Hi. I'm Alan Garneau with the U.S. Coast Guard Office of Bridge Administration.

MR. MPRAS: Good afternoon. Nicholas Mpras, United States Coast Guard, Washington DC.

MR. BLOOM: Bob Bloom, U.S. Coast Guard, Bridge Program Manager, Great Lakes District.

MR. CARLSON: Good afternoon. I'm Kurt Carlson, also with the Coast Guard, the bridge office over in Cleveland.

MR. KADAU: Gary Kadau, U.S. Steel, Great Lakes Works.

MS. BARONDESS: Have we reached everybody here at the tables? There is also someone here who I want to introduce who is a very important part of the planning study teams. We have some of our Canadian counterparts. If you could stand up, friends from Canada, are you out there? Yeah. You're in the back row. There you are. Thank you for attending our session today. These are our team members from Canada who are here to observe the scoping meeting.

Okay. With that, I think I'll move on to the presentation portion of the meeting. And then after -- following the two presentations that we have, we will have a question and answer session. And let me rephrase that a little bit to make sure I'm clear. We will have the first PowerPoint presentation and then we will have a question
and answer session on the topic in that PowerPoint. It is basically a general overview of the NEPA process and what we expect to achieve, which is good decision making. The NEPA process is all about getting to good decisions.

And so that will be our first presentation. And I will entertain questions after that. And then in our second presentation, we will talk about the scoping information that you have received in the packet here today and provide you with the most recent information we have with reference to the scoping process right now. And we expect to have a question and answer session after that also.

And then I will be passing the microphone around to everyone at the table. We want everyone at the tables today to have an opportunity to speak. So I will be sending microphones around again. And take your chance there to give us your feedback and your thoughts on the scoping document that you’ve been presented and other ideas related to the study.

Today, we will not be opening up the mike to the folks who are out there in the audience. We have some time constraints to deal with. But I wanted to let you know that please fill out your comment forms. We will be following up on those. You can give them to the MDOT -- any of the MDOT team members that we’ve identified or bring
them up to me after the meeting today. And we will be following up on those. So I encourage you to do that.

So with that, let's go ahead and start. Our first speaker today is Del Abdella. Del is a staff person from the Federal Highway Administration. He is an expert in the NEPA process and the environment. And so he is going to start us off with a short PowerPoint presentation. Thank you, Del.

PRESENTATION BY MR. ABDALLA:

Thanks, Margaret. Again, my name is Del Abdalla. I am with the Federal Highway Administration and I am the environmental program manager there. First, I would like to thank everybody for attending this meeting. And I'm going to go over the environmental procedures and policies of the Federal Highway Administration that we're working with.

And I'm going to speak about NEPA and the EIS process. NEPA is -- as Margaret said, it's the National Environmental Policy Act. The National Environmental Policy Act is a procedural law, it does not protect specific resources like if you have -- the Clean Water Act protect wetland or Clean Air Act protect air. NEPA is a kind of umbrella that goes over different laws and regulations and I'm going to go over that.
Well, EIS is Environmental Impact Statement. Some of you might be bored of this name, but maybe somebody does not hear about it before. Mainly it's for significant adverse impact. And whenever we have a significant adverse impact, the federal agency must prepare a document that is environmental impact statement to cope up (sic) with the law.

What is the NEPA objectives are? Well, first you -- as Jim said and Margaret mentioned that, you disclose the information, environmental information. Second, you try to resolve any environmental problems that you face. And the next one is NEPA fosters coordination and cooperation between different agencies. And of course, the reason for NEPA is to get the public the chance to participate in different -- in our projects. And that's why enhanced public participation or involvement is one of the objectives of NEPA.

Well, the NEPA process is -- what we usually call it is a systematic interdisciplinary and analytical approach. That means that with the NEPA process, you use different disciplines to analyze the impact of your actions. And the systematic means that you usually go with the process of -- within planning and within taking into context all the disciplines that are involved in the environmental review process.
Well, we usually have social, economic, and environmental. And a lot of times you hear that as called SEE, which is the social, economic, and environmental impact of your actions. We usually utilize this approach to get not better documents or beautiful documents, we need this to get to a better decision.

Here is the NEPA umbrella that I’m talking about. Under NEPA you have to cope up with different things. Like there is -- under NEPA, there is specific public involvement under the EIS that you have to -- as a federal agency and as a lead agency and as a co-lead agency for the state we have to cope up with the public involvement. And there is a specific thing for the EIS where we have to have a public hearing after the draft. And I’m going to go through that again. Something like the Coast Guard permits, farmland protection, we have Clean Water Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, coastal zone consistency, air quality conformity, or air quality or the law, historic preservation, Title VI, and EJ, Environmental Justice, Section 4-F which is specific for Department of Transportation that protects recreational land and historic sites, noise abatement. We have also to disclose under NEPA any compliance with any executive orders. And with us with the transportation project, we have -- for the last six years, we had T-21 which is the Transportation Equity
Act of the 21st Century. That’s a law that we have to comply with. And right now, we have that safety law— which is our new law that, again, we have to cope with.

Let’s talk about how this EIS process goes. You have to study—you have to have a problem first, define a problem that you need study for. And from this you start to kind of digging into issues. What is the issues here, what is the -- why am I doing this project? Why do I have to start this? What is the need for it? And from that, we start -- as a federal agency, we have to publish a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. And this Notice of Intent describe your action, what do you want to do? What is the -- at the time of the Notice of Intent if you know that there is a scoping meeting has to be done, you have to disclose it in the Notice of Intent. If you don’t you don’t. But kind of what is alternatives, kind of general ideas about what you know at the time of the publishing of the Notice of Intent, what is -- what’s included.

Within the Notice of Intent or -- don’t take these steps so rigid here, they go back and forth. After the Notice of Intent, the purpose and need of the project is official kind of notice of the project starting to be developed. After the purpose and need is completed, kind of, you start to have scoping. That is the stage that we
are here right now. That is one of the scoping steps is required by NEPA.

After the scoping, you need to -- what we need to do is to prepare a draft EIS, DEIS here. And that's a document that I'm going to get in and I'm going to talk about that a little bit later. After you prepare the draft EIS, the draft EIS get approved by the federal agency, the lead federal agency. And after the draft is approved, you -- as I said before, we have to hold a public hearing for the project.

After the public hearing you prepare what we call it is a Final Environmental Impact Statement, which is FEIS. And again, the -- go to the same circle where we have to approve the final EIS, Federal Highway needs to approve that. Then we issue the ROD, which is the Record of Decision for this project.

Here is the whole steps together. And now let's look at kind of the time line, what is kind of -- and you can see in this area here (indicating) this is what the time line. You can see what each step is. Like when you study the scoping, that's how much time relative to each other. You can see here how much is EIS and approve the EIS there. Here we can see the public hearing, that's how much. So you can see that preparing draft EIS takes the most time because we study a lot of issues during that time. And
final EIS still take some time, but it’s not as much --
should not take as much as a draft EIS where we kind of
study the project in detail. And the ROD take less time
than that.

Well, Jim talked about that earlier and Margaret, the
scoping process, what does that include? Include you
define the stages that we are in. We study -- you define
the study area. You develop list of the stakeholders. Who
are the stakeholders? Everybody in this room is a
stakeholder. The public is a stakeholder. Anybody
interested or affected by the project is a stakeholder. So
we need to work hard to kind of define the stakeholders.

We -- during the scoping stage, we inventory the
resources that we have. We identify ranges of alternatives
and impacts. What are our alternatives, what’s our impact.
The most important part is this zone here. You identify
what is the significant issues that everybody is going to
be concerned about. Because that’s the whole thing about
the Environmental Impact Statement is to define significant
issues. All these steps you have to do through public
involvement and agency coordination.

What does the DEIS include? Well, you can see here it
includes all reasonable alternatives. All alternatives
need to be included in the draft, reasonable alternatives.
You analyze and select the practical alternatives.
Sometimes you have a list of alternatives, you have in this case practical alternatives. You need to summarize the study reviews, consultation. Once you have done your homework here, what -- did you do any coordination with -- to comply with any environmental laws and executive orders. You need to identify -- measure to mitigate impacts. You also -- now, if this is all included in the draft EIS, again, the Federal Highway signs the title page and then we circulate for comment.

After circulation, after approving the draft EIS, we have a public hearing that has to be done. During the -- preparing the draft EIS that can go back and forth many times between Federal Highway and MDOT, and between MDOT and other source agencies to come to resolution to most of the problems that was early identified in the draft. And after we approve the draft, we get to the public hearing.

There is some requirement, legal requirement for the public hearing. You need to advertise for it, you need to hold the hearing. There's some steps, and the Michigan Department of Transportation has assessed them and has a policy, procedures that cope up with public hearing requirements.

After the public hearing, we go with our final EIS. What does a final EIS include? Well, the most important part that the final EIS include is use a preferred
alternative. You have to include that in your final. It’s just only one preferred alternative. We don’t have many alternatives, just one preferred alternative for your action. One of the items is you need to evaluate all, again, the reasonable alternative that was identified in the draft. There is different system of preparing the final EIS. I don’t need to go into it right now. But the most thing about -- important thing about final EIS is, you discuss the comments that was addressed by the public or by the resource agency or by any agencies that got ahold of the document and they made comments, written comments. We have to respond to it. One of the other things is -- summarize the public involvement will be part of the final EIS.

Also, mitigation measures and commitments for the Federal Highway and for the Michigan Department of Transportation, it is spelled out in the final EIS that relate to the preferred alternative that you chose. You need to document compliance with any environmental laws and EO’s. And that’s part of the final EIS.

You need to resolve any disagreement that came earlier with the comments. Whether it came from the resource agency or from the public, any reasonable comments you need to respond to it. And of course, final EIS go through our legal sufficiency review which means that it has to go to
our lawyers in the headquarters in some other parts of the
country to approve the document that it is legally
sufficient. Again, after signing the final, you circulate
again for comments.

Well, I’m sure most of everybody knows what the EIS
format is, I’m not going to talk about that. It’s purpose
and need, alternative, preferred, affected environment,
environmental consequences, and so forth.

Again, during the time of preparing the final EIS and
approving the final EIS there is a lot of dialogue and
discussion between different agencies and between Federal
Highway and MDOT to come to the best decision making in the
final EIS.

Well, after the time period specified in the law, we,
Federal Highway, issue a Record of Decision. And what is
that? Record of Decision means mainly why did we take
these actions and what is our commitment for mitigation is.

In summary, the agencies initiate environmental studies,
you need to consider inputs from the public, from the
resource agencies, from environmental group. We need to
study alternatives. We need to identify impact, and any
mitigation measures that need to be taken care of. And we
select the preferred alternative. I think we talk about
that, that the lead agency must sign the ROD to proceed to
the next step in the project development. Next step
meaning through the design and construction of the project
and buying right-of-way.

    Well, what does that mean? It means that we need to
follow a process. It’s a law and it’s a process that we
need to follow. The question that we need to ask ourselves
is, do the benefits outweigh the impact? That’s the hard
question. Is there any impact that we can live with or is
there any impact that we can mitigate. Or is there any
impact that we cannot live with, unacceptable.

    And here is some more information about how to get
like the Environmental Protection Agency’s website, the
Federal Highway website, and the CAQ website.

    With this specific project that we are dealing with
with the DRIC project here, we have quite a few federal
cooperating agencies. And this is -- the Federal Highway
Administration is the lead federal agency with this
project. And the other cooperating agencies are the U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. General Service
Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, the
Coast Guard, and U.S. Department of State. With the
cooperating agencies meaning that they are, as Margaret
talk about that area, it’s -- usually it’s the agency that
whether they have jurisdiction by law to have an action
with your -- what was your project or they have requirement
for some kind of review for your position. Thanks for
listening. Do you have any questions?

MS. BARONDESS: Thanks, Del. I would ask that we get
some help with microphones for questions too. Joe, I don't
know if you have some helpers out there who can help pass
around microphones if we need that. So why don't you guys
get ready here if we have any questions. Does anyone have
anything that they want to ask Del here, at the tables? Do
you have any further questions or clarifications that you'd
like him to make? Yes, we have a question down there.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Yes, this isn't directly a question
to Del, but it does relate to his presentation that he just
gave. Several times in the presentation he stressed the
importance of public input. And Senator Stabenow who has
responded to her constituents who wrote in concerned about
the southern border crossings and any of the new border
crossings that this would be a public meeting. And
therefore, we sent that letter to our constituents based on
the press release that we originally read that this would
be a public meeting and they would have opportunity for
input.

I do see that you have on here ways that they can
communicate via phone, fax, and e-mail. But I do want to
let you know that the comment form you've referred to, none
of us have that.
MS. BARONDESS: Can we make sure that the comment form is distributed, please, to everyone, please?

MS. MCCALLAHAN: To the audience, please?

MS. BARONDESS: Yes, particularly to the audience.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Oh, someone says maybe they’re in the audience but not at the table. Everyone at the table should get a comment form too. So if we could get some help to get those out to everybody that would be great.

Thank you very much for that comment. Do we have any other comments or questions? Yes, sir.

MR. MORAN: Hi, Del. On the time line on the DEIS, it shows a lot of time for the study and it looks like a small window for public comment. Will the public be — receive the DEIS in advance so they can prepare comments or questions?

MR. ABDALLA: Yes. Well, we usually — within the regulation we have 45 days after the issuance of draft EIS for the public to give comments. However, in some projects, if the project is complex, Federal Highway and MDOT sometimes they chose to expand this time period. It’s like we have other projects we expanded too, as a matter of fact, one month before the public hearing and two months after the public hearing.

MS. BARONDESS: And I’m disobeying one of my own
ground rules. I need you to identify what your name is. Could you tell us who you are so the court reporter can make sure the right comments go with the right person?

MR. MORAN: Paul Moran.

MS. BARONDESS: Great. Thank you. Go ahead, please, sir.

MR. LAFRANCE: Yes, I’m Henry LaFrance. In all the previous meetings when we talked about the results of the study, it was my understanding that there were going to be two alternatives that would come out of this. And in this presentation you said there’s only going to be one. So is there going to be one preferred alternative or is there going to be two preferred alternatives?

MR. ABDALLA: The preferred alternative, that comes in the final EIS. Right now we are early, early in the process. We are in the scoping stage. When we prepare the draft EIS, we will disclose all reasonable alternatives within the draft EIS. After the public hearing and after taking all comments in consideration, we decide the preferred -- one preferred alternative in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

MS. BARONDESS: Does that answer your question? There is only one preferred alternative. Under NEPA though we always have the “No action” alternative that we have to analyze as a baseline and compare to all the other
alternatives too. So that's an alternative you'll hear more and more about as we go through the study process.

Other questions? Yes, ma'am, you have a question down there. Could you tell us who you are, please?

MS. LEONARD: Delores Leonard, Sierra Club. At the March 29 LAC meeting held in Southgate, a question was asked about a health impact analysis as a part of the border crossing study. Now, you've mentioned this evening about environmental as being one of the three impacts. At that same meeting in March, the statement -- the response to the question about a health impact, the response was that the Federal Highway Administration and MDOT have indicated a health risk assessment would not be conducted based on current regulations. Can you speak to that?

MS. BARONDESS: I would like Jim Kirschensteiner to handle that question. Jim, can you do that for us?

MR. KIRSCHENSTEINER: I'll try to tackle that. Right now, the Federal Highway Administration's position is, is that we're not prepared to do health risk assessments on a project by project basis. There was a court suit, as you know, out in Nevada that was ruled in favor of Federal Highway Administration to not do health risk assessments case by case, project by project. However, as the study progresses, we are going to work hand in hand with EPA, U.S. EPA and if the standards are set and there's
methodologies, adequate methodologies to pursue that during
the life of the study, we will do that. However, at this
point in time we’re not prepared to do that.

MS. LEONARD: Then could you tell me what -- to what
extent your environmental impact process you plan to
incorporate or use? There were three things here,
Environmental Impact Statement that were on the screen,
social, economic, and environmental. So what will be
included in environmental?

MS. BARONDESS: When we talk about environmental, we
talk about lots of different environmental factors that we
look at. For example, we do look at noise impacts of the
project. There are noise studies that are done. We also
do look at air quality and whether the project will have a
negative or positive effect on certain air quality
conditions. We also look at natural environmental concerns
under the category of environmental. What impacts will
there be to wetlands, to water quality, for example. We
also look at what impact there will be to endangered
species, including plant and animal communities. So the
environmental when we say that word, it’s quite a broad
spectrum of areas of expertise that we’ll be drawing upon
to look into impacts of the various alternatives and
compare those impacts of those various alternatives. Do
you have -- I guess I’m going to kind of ask you a question
too. Do you have a particular area -- I think you've already expressed some interest in the topic of health risk assessment. Do you have any other areas that you'd like to point out as particular topics of interest today?

MS. LEONARD: Later, yes. But right now, health. Because I live in a community that is already polluted. I live in Southwest Detroit, Fort and Schaefer. And if a bridge comes through our community, what about -- when you think about -- we call it cancer alley. When you think about the health and the people who will possibly still be there if a bridge comes through, what happens to the people who are left sitting, standing, living in a bedroom community?

MS. BARONDESS: Okay. Are there any other questions right now? I want to thank you for your questions and comments. And you'll have another chance too when we go around the tables to talk about those. Bob?

MR. SILLS: Thank you. I want to follow up on Delores' comment and question. Just to get a little clarification, Jim, as you pointed out Federal Highway will work with EPA to evaluate the adequacy or availability of models and tools to do risk assessment. If EPA has recommended emission models, air dispersion models to estimate ambient air concentrations and recommend health protective benchmark levels beyond the national ambient air
quality standards -- but with regard to the air toxics and
diesel, if the EPA makes those recommendations, will
Federal Highway then follow those recommendations and do
that assessment? Or at what point would you decide not to
follow that recommendation?

MR. KIRSCHENSTEINER: Okay. Thanks, Bob. What
Federal Highway’s position has been is that we will use the
proven methodologies that are out there today. But we
really can’t and we really don’t want to advance the state
of the art per se in terms of using a project to do
research. However, I know our office in Washington has
been working very closely with the U.S. Federal Highway --
or with the U.S. EPA at the national level to decide on
what kind of methodologies to use. And we will take the
lead from whatever direction is derived at at the
Washington level. What we don’t want to do here at the
local level is to set national policy. And we don’t think
that it’s in the prerogative of a project to establish
national policies. But if there is a model, a methodology,
state of the art, and standard that comes down from all
that deliberation at the national level, we will follow
that. And we’ve always committed to following that whether
it’s on this project or some other project. If there is
something out there that, you know, sets the standard then
we will do that.
MS. BARONDESS: Thank you, Jim. What I want to do is get back to the agenda. I want to take one more question right now. And I want to tell everyone here that I'm sure that we'll have more discussion on this particular topic and other topics. I want to get on to the next presentation and then I want to make sure we have a chance for everyone to speak today. So one more question, and I think there was someone down here who had a hand up. Can you identify yourself, please?

MR. CALLAHAN: My name is Joe Callahan from Wayne County Commissioner Ilona Varga's office. I'm kind of miffed right now. You're saying that you have no standards for health assessment, yet you are going to protect fish, fowl, water, noise. It is -- I can't understand how you could even think of going ahead without a health risk assessment. It doesn't make sense. The money should be stopped here and now until we get the perimeters to have that. It's the only thing that I can see -- I mean, I don't know if everybody agrees with me, but I do know a few people do. This process should be stopped until we get those perimeters. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Sorry. I've been turning my button on and off here and losing my mike for a few minutes. But I want to thank you. Let's move on to the next presentation right now. And Mohammed, I think you're going to start us
off with that. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MR. ALGHURABI:

Good evening. How is everybody doing? I’m going to just start off the presentation and I’ll turn it over to Joe to finish it up.

I would like to say that the first slide when it comes up, it’s to just reiterate the fact that it’s a partnership. I think Margaret introduced or pointed to the back of the room where our Canadian friends, our partners, they are here in the room. And there are -- for this study, there are four different agencies in two different countries. You’ve heard this before, but I want to make sure everyone knows it’s an international project. It includes the federal level on both countries and the provincial and the state on the U.S. side. And so therefore, it is something that started back in 2000. And that partnership is looking for ways to find better border crossing ways or I should say improve or expand the current situation and the Detroit frontier.

The next slide I think I will touch on is something really important. You asked us -- you the local advisory council -- you wanted us at the July meeting to look at the governance. I think if I remember correctly, Barbara or maybe Gail -- I’m pointing to people; forgive me -- but I
just -- I know from Senator Levin or I think a couple folks asked for, can you come up with a statement that deals with governance. And we do have a statement, you see it right there on the slide. And also you have a copy. And if you don’t have a copy, let us know, we’ll make sure you get a copy. In essence, what it says -- the key word here is -- I’d like to point out the -- obviously the four agencies that I just mentioned, they’re committed to come up with a solution providing additional border crossing capacity southwest Ontario and southeast Michigan. And the idea here is to emphasize that it has to be subject to appropriate public oversight.

So having that said, that we are looking for the different ways. I think the next step that we are -- the partnership is looking very closely, there are several ways you can come up with a variety of governance methodology. And you see in front of you examples of governance. You can see the first example deals with public ownership. But there are other examples like the concession agreement. And obviously this will generate some questions. And we welcome those questions. I think in the meantime, we just want to assure you that we’re looking at these different ways to deal with the governance situation. But we know it will be public oversight.

The next slide deals with the cooperating agencies.
And without further adieu, I think that's been discussed, who are the cooperating agencies. And at this point I'm just going to turn it over to Joe to continue with the presentation. Thank you.

PRESENTATION BY MR. CORRADINO:

Thank you, Mohammed. I will deal with the process, and I'll also discuss some of the issues about the study area. Many of you have heard this before, but it will frame it out in a consistent format so that we can discuss these issues as we proceed through the rest of the day and on the project. The purpose of the project is to provide additional -- for the safe and secure movement of people and goods across this border. And that is intended to support the economies of both countries as well as the Province of Ontario and the State of Michigan. And it's also to support the mobility needs of both national and civil defense.

In addressing the economic issues in the study that was called the Planning, Needs, and Feasibility Study that preceded the current environmental analysis work, there was an analysis done of economic issues. And in that analysis, it demonstrated that if by 2030 additional capacity is not provided in the Detroit River area, generally speaking from Belle Isle to the Grosse Ile-Downriver area, that the
cumulative loss in employment over 30 years would be in the neighborhood of 80,000 jobs in the United States, 25,000 in Michigan, and about 10,000 of those in the SEMCOG, Essex County area. In Ontario, the job loss is forecast to be over 50,000. And in -- throughout Canada as a whole it was forecast to be 70,000 jobs.

So the analysis that was done from an economic standpoint indicated in this simple example that the border crossing capacity, if it weren't addressed, would have those kinds of economic consequences in terms of jobs. And you can see also on this slide the consequences in terms of economic effect on an annual basis being in the tens of billions of dollars. So that's framed out, if you will, on one side, the issue of economic analysis leading up to the work that's being done in this study.

The issue about national defense, civil defense was also a key issue in the purpose -- is a key issue in the purpose and needs statement. And it's clear that the crossing or the expanded or improved crossing capacity must be developed with Homeland Security in clear focus.

Exactly how that plays out is a function of not only the structure, the tunnel, where it's located, how it's built and designed, what are the plaza locations, what are near the plaza locations, what kind of effects the plazas have on the community, what kind of effects do nearby facilities
have on the plaza and the crossing. All of that must be addressed. But the fact is, that all border crossing components must be done in concert with Homeland Security. And the cooperating agency in this process is the Department of Homeland Security.

And last but not least, the Detroit River crossing is expressly recognized in the federal laws of the United States as providing a key component in the support of national defense and civil defense.

And so what we’re trying to do here has -- in a purpose, has a two-pronged effect that has been part of the record of this project for about four years. The need for the project is expressed in these four statements. Simply stated, the improved or new capacity must deal with issues like connectivity with the remainder of the system, capacity surely, processing capabilities. That’s particularly relevant at the plaza connections, and last but not least, the reasonable and secure options.

In the capacity, connectivity, and processing area, there have been a number of questions about is there a need. From the governance statement, the four governments that form the partnership believe there is a need. But in order to address that, not only was the work done in the feasibility study, but it was updated using 2004 data, not 2000 data because of the events that have occurred since
2000. So that there is a clear focus on what trends have occurred and what are their implications for the long range 30-year, 2035 future that’s our target year of this project.

And generally speaking, using that 20 -- 2004 data, the models were then updated from the planning needs and feasibility study to say what would happen by the year 2035. And this is a chart that a number of you have seen before. But what has been done in this analysis, which deals with a number of activities and a number of transportation modes, local trucks, international trucks, automobiles, how they have been changing in terms of their travel across the borders in the Detroit River area in the last several years, and what’s likely to occur in the future, for example, if the economy were not to be stable or bad -- what would happen if, for example, there was an issue as it relates to intermodal traffic that would divert from the Detroit River area truck or automobile traffic. And what would be the case if there were possible diversion to, in a significant way, the Blue Water Bridge.

And all of those forecasts were used to develop this summary chart. And it generally says these trends have occurred for a number of years. And looking at these trends and looking at what may happen in all these risk categories -- and this is a simple chart that says what is
the bottom line. The forecast is bounded by a number of operations, but the end result is that the dotted line is considered the most reasonable forecast. And it indicates that for all practical purposes, by about 2022, the combined border crossing capacity in the Detroit River area, that’s the tunnel as well as the bridge, the Detroit-Windsor Tunnel as well as the Ambassador Bridge, will be at capacity. The horizon for our work is 30 years. And so the planning process, obviously, back in here has begun.

If you look pessimistically at the low range forecast based on a number of factors -- and this isn’t a straight line adjustment. They’ve done detailed work, if you will, tweaking all of these different risk factors. The long range -- low range, rather, forecast is that about 2033, the capacity of these crossings would be reached.

Now, obviously they also looked at what if there were aggressive forecasting, what were -- if there were positive trends. And the analysis indicates that what would happen is that in 2015, the facilities would reach their capacity.

Now, the fact of the matter is, that line that I keep referring to is the absolute capacity of the facility, the breakdown capacity. And long before then you began to reach a level of traffic that is extremely difficult to manage. And so we’re not looking at an optimistic forecast or a rosy forecast or one that effectively gilds the lily.
The analysis has tried to take into account even the breakdown condition with gridlock that would occur throughout the system of the border crossings across the Detroit River.

And so we looked at, through this analysis, the different components of the system. I just was looking at the crossings themselves, but clearly you have access facilities, you have processing facilities, and you have them on both sides of the border. And I won’t go into detail, we’ll talk about this I’m sure in the Q and A. But each of the components has a different forecast at which conditions would be reached that an adjustment would need to be made.

For example, processing facilities could be very well reached in five to ten years. Processing facilities are often adjusted on a regular basis. That is not the case when you reach the capacity of a bridge or tunnel, it’s not as quick to make these adjustments relatively speaking.

And so while these components break down at different times, each has a planning period in advance and an implementation period that is different.

And again, when you’re talking about the bridge/tunnel that exists in the river crossing you’re talking about in the near term 2015, in the long term 2033, the implementation and study process requires the government to
look at those issues now.

Last thing in terms of need is reasonable and secure options. A number of you have brought up issues that we have to analyze. If we are putting a plaza or a crossing of some type near a facility like a chemical plant, a major manufacturing facility, a transfer or distribution center for hazardous material, what does that mean to the plaza or the tunnel in terms of it as an alternative. By the same token, what does the operation of a plaza or a bridge or a tunnel mean to the neighborhood, mean to the commercial activities. And those kinds of give and take issues, those kinds of pluses and minuses are to be analyzed at every level of our analysis to come up with a project -- in the end, a preferred project if the government acts that meets the purpose and need.

To initialize our work, there were a number of groups that were formed and are ongoing that effectively allow the discussion to go almost month to month if not more frequently as it relates to what products are being developed. And many of you are a part of the local advisory council. Other government organizations at the technical level are part of the LAG, if you will. And then there are both public and private sector advisory groups from the auto industry, the trucking industry, that are involved as well.
And our process is scheduled to have a number of communication events. The last one in terms of public meetings was held in late June. The next formal activity in the future is the decision on what is the short list of alternatives, eliminating some illustrative and keeping the rest for practical. And the scoping event, as you can see today, is ongoing. And that’s our work for the opening up of the project on a formal basis.

What are the study area issues? An overview, if you will, and the process. We’ve generally defined three key areas that we’ve tried to analyze as initializing the project. The Downriver area is in green, a central area which includes two subsections near the bridge and farther downriver, and then the Belle Isle area. We did that based on some preliminary work in the planning needs and feasibility study.

What happened in looking at the data for the area -- and you have in your booklet a number of issues about population and about employment. Here is just a set of data for 2000. If you reviewed the data, you’ll see that trends in population in all three areas are declined. And if you look at the minority population, you’ll see that there is also a decline in most areas. And it is those kinds of characteristics as a sample that we’re looking at in looking at direct and indirect effects.
We’re also looking at what is called key populations from an ancestral standpoint. Any population that in the SEMCOG region is at least two percent will be analyzed in our process.

Quickly a review of from south to north from downriver up, we are in the general area of Hennepin Point and Grosse Ile looking to the U.S. side. Pennsylvania Road is in the center. Further downriver our option is called King Road that we’re analyzing. And you can see we’re obviously dealing with a very major and tightly knit population that could be affected by any crossing, particularly a plaza or a connecting roadway. Likewise, Hennepin Point in this area has certain characteristics environmentally. Further down, Grosse Ile, another area of sensitive population and sensitive environmental issues.

Moving up river, if you will, we’ve got both the Ambassador Bridge and Detroit-Windsor Tunnel. But the characteristics of this area are also very tightly knit in terms of residential, lots of industry, and a number of commercial activities that dot through the area. The social, economic, and cultural issues are as important in one area as to the other, but oftentimes change as we move from one area to another. Again, environmentally dealing with places like Zug Island, I-75 over the Rouge River, a number of parks, and the Detroit River in and of itself
trying to connect somewhere in these areas between the United States and Canada. And at Belle Isle, clearly we’ve got issues not only with this airport, we’ve got four major airports in the area, but we’ve got crossings as we look from the Detroit River and Canada into the United States with the Bud plant, the Daimler-Chrysler plant, and the populations in the area.

Quickly, the alternatives, a number of bridges. Some bridges will have spans, main spans longer than the other. Crossing of the river in the southern downriver area is much, much longer, three to four miles, compared to crossings in the central area of a mile or so, even less. The kinds of bridges that we’re looking at, more so in the next phase than in the illustrative alternatives, are illustrated by the slides in your packet.

And we also did an analysis of tunnels, but we’re not going to blast or mine a tunnel in this area. We did do a detailed analysis of whether we could bore a tunnel in the soft ground above the rock or through the rock. Or could we cut a trench in the rock, drop a tunnel in -- from a barge, if you will, assemble it, and then cover it. If we bored a tunnel, obviously we have to consider the width of it. We’re considering that the crossing will be three lanes in each direction for 30 years and beyond. And that has an implication particularly for tunnels. We don’t
believe we can do a bored tunnel in the rock in any area. We don’t believe we can do a submerged tunnel. Not because of the physical engineering aspects but because of environmental issues stirring up the surface of the river and creating habitat and other environmental characteristics that are not acceptable. The soft ground tunnel is marginal both in the central area, as well as in the Belle Isle area largely because it will be difficult to get enough cover of the bore. And we’re looking at that issue in detail as we move forward.

We have 14 plazas as we move up the river; about five in what we call the Downriver area, about eight in the central area, and one in the Belle Isle area. We have a concept. We have not done and will not be able to design the plaza until further work and the short listing occurs. But we have consulted with the General Services Administration, Customs, and Border Protection, as well as the Department of Homeland Security.

So we came up with 14 plaza locations, tried to be in areas that we could affect least with a plaza. And then we had to connect it to a freeway. And we did that by virtue of an analysis that began with a model and allowed us then to use a number of field inventory data as well as issues dealing with socioeconomic characteristics to come up with 19, if you will, distinct paths in the area; 19 distinct
paths. The fact is that these can be combined with plazas so that we have to do a number of analyses in four or five dozen ways so that we can do due diligence to what the impacts are.

And then with our Canadian partners, we also had to figure out how to cross the river. While there are 14 plazas and about 19 distinct routes, without all the combinations and permutations, we have the equivalent of 15 river crossings. And here are just a few. These are in the southern area, the Downriver area, affecting, if you will, Grosse Ile, Hennepin Point, Fighting Island. Each one of these is being analyzed in detail for an illustrative alternatives analysis. A number of other characteristics that -- alternatives that we're looking at in this area are, again, mostly bridges until we get up to about the central area and particularly north of Zug Island. And here are the lists that you, I know, have seen before. But they're in your packet and we'll discuss those more as we go forward.

The second part of the central area includes that around the Detroit Windsor Tunnel as well as the Ambassador Bridge. And here are a number of plazas that we have in that area. And last but not least, the one that serves the northern part of the study area, the crossing over the tip of Belle Isle, but connecting both Canada and the U.S. with
plazas on each side of the border.

Our analysis is being done in partnership with our Canadian consultants and technical team members. The objective is to look at plazas, connecting routes, border crossings, so that in the end, the most practical list of end to end alternatives, U.S. to Canada, can be defined. That is to occur by the end of November, the very beginning of December. So this listing will be reduced by some significant measure so that a handful of practical alternatives will go forward.

We are looking at these broad issues from dealing with air quality, the natural as well as the cultural environment. We're looking at issues that deal with the neighborhood. We're looking at consistency with what the communities dream about, think about formally and informally for their future in their planning documents. We're also looking at how mobility is affected by these alternatives, particularly end to end as well as to construct the building. The citizens -- almost 900 citizens participated in the evaluation putting weights, if you will, on those factors. And those weights and the technical team's weights will be provided publicly by the middle of the month of September.

To wrap up, our work is not unlike what Del Abdalla described with our beginning of the purpose and need and
the updating of that, the extension into the illustrative alternatives. Work is ongoing now. Conclusion by the end of the year with a preliminary recommendation. A final recommendation on the short list no later than March of 2006. The short list goes through the detailed work that comes into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to be done by the end of 2007 with a public hearing at the beginning of -- I'm sorry -- by the end of 2006 with a public hearing at the beginning of 2007, and a preferred alternative for public consumption by the middle of 2007, and the wrap-up of the FEIS and the Record of Decision by the end of 2007.

I went fast because they told me to go fast. I'm getting notes here. And so with that, I'm going to apologize for speaking faster than I usually do and turn it back to Margaret. Oh, and the partnership makes the decision, those governments that we talked about at the beginning of the slide show.

MS. BARONDESS: Joe, thank you so much for being a good listener and going quickly. The reason I had Joe go fairly quickly through that presentation is because I want to make sure we have enough time to get to everyone at the tables here today. And we got started a little late because we were having some problems with the microphones. So in order to keep us on track, I'm going to go ahead and
get us started. And I would like to start up here at this
table with respect to comments and questions, follow-up
items that we need to go through here. And we will go
ahead and kick that off. Thank you.

MR. BLOOM: This is Bob Bloom, I’m still here. On
page 21 you have represented a plaza at the existing
Ambassador Bridge. Does what’s illustrated here represent
the plaza that’s already been approved and construction is
underway or does this represent something above and beyond
what’s already been approved?

MR. CORRADINO: The plaza that is, I believe, in the
slide packet -- is that what you’re referring to?

MR. BLOOM: Yes, on page 21.

MR. CORRADINO: Yeah, that is the plaza that was
included in the permit application for a companion span to
the Ambassador Bridge. It is the footprint that we
developed out of that that I believe is 160 acres or so.
It is not the existing plaza obviously, nor is it the plaza
that is part of the approved gateway project. It is bigger
than that. And our objective is to come up with a fair
representation of what could happen in 30 years and to
measure the maximum impacts.

MR. BLOOM: Okay. Then to go on, there have been
proposals by the Ambassador Bridge folks to put a dual
structure in. Is what’s represented here -- would that be
what would be required of them if they get a permit from
the Coast Guard to put a dual bridge in?

MR. CORRADINO: I'm not speaking for the Ambassador
Bridge. This is what I understand from the permit, that
that span and that proposal -- the second span and that
proposal are compatible. The second span will be handled
by that plaza.

MS. BARONDESS: I think there are probably other
federal agencies that would weigh in on that discussion
too. Next?

MR. SILLS: Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Oh, can you tell us who you are,
please?

MR. SILLS: I'm Robert Sills with the Michigan
Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division.
The DEQ has some pretty serious concerns about air quality
in this area. We have concerns about the impact that this
project might have on that air quality. We don't know how
those concerns can be addressed without doing some pretty
extensive ambient air impact analysis of the alternatives
compared to the "No action" alternatives. We're not
looking for an evaluation that would declare a pass or
fail. We're not looking for an analysis that would
necessarily answer all questions and concerns to the
community with regard to air quality.
But we would like the Federal Highway Administration to please work with your people in Washington that do make these decisions and please work with EPA on their recommendations. The DEQ, as you know, doesn't have authority over such decisions. But we have strong concerns and would encourage you very soon, not later, but very soon work with these people that are the decision makers and see how far we can push the envelope to get more analysis done. Look at what your Canadian counterparts are doing with regard to their ambient air impact analysis and see if there can be some consistency there at a higher level than what I think you're headed for right now. So I just wanted to make that statement. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you, Bob.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm Alex Sanchez with the DEQ, Land and Water Management Division. And in reviewing the scoping document, our staff has come up with some brief comments with respect to the river crossings, the potential three crossings. And starting with the downriver crossing, the southern one, the river there is 3.25 miles wide so obviously there would be some piers, bridge piers in the river that likely appear on Gross Ile.

At the northern tip of Grosse Ile there are some environmental contamination issues there due to waste disposal in that area. Also on that island there are some
poor soil conditions which would need to be addressed during your process here. Also, there are some high quality coastal wetlands near or along Point Hennepin there. And also there are some sediments in the river that are contaminated as well.

Now, talking inland on the inland portion with respect to the bridge crossing, there are significant areas of wetlands along the alignment there which would have to be looked into and considered. And also there have been identified as lake plane prairie areas as well and these would need to be protected to the extent possible.

MS. BARONDESS: Alex, let me make sure I understand. You're talking still about the inland alternatives in the southern portion of the project study area?

MR. SANCHEZ: Yes; correct.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MR. SANCHEZ: In moving on to the central crossing, the river is narrower there in some portions. So there may be some floodway issues that may possibly need to be considered there with a crossing. And also there are some identified contaminated sediments as well in the river. And it's -- we understand that there are some sturgeon spawning areas along this area which is -- this species is a threatened species, the sturgeon. And in that area, general area, there is the Chicken Bone Reef. So we're not
sure if the crossing would potentially impact that or not. And we understand that that’s the location of a native mussel, which it’s either threatened or endangered species.

And finally, the northern crossing along the Belle Isle area, this area has some last -- it’s known as remaining last bottom land forested area along the river there, the Detroit River; high quality wetlands. It hosts the pumpkin ash, which is a threatened tree species, that’s the pumpkin ash tree. And also there’s -- the Eastern fox snake, which is a state threatened species, has been identified on that island there.

So those are some quick initial comments that we have on this scoping document.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much, Alex. Can we pass the mike along?

MS. D’ANGELO: Hi, I’m Amanda D’Angelo from State Senator Ray Basham’s office. And he apologizes. He was unable to be here today because the senate is in session today trying to pass the budget.

On his behalf, I’d like to relay a couple comments; that his primary objective still remains that a new crossing not be privately owned, and that local elected officials in the communities have a say in this integral decision process. He does recognize that an additional international crossing could be a great benefit to this
region. But he does still adamantly feel that a crossing does not belong in a bedroom community. And he opposes all of the sites in the downriver region. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you. Make sure you tell us who you are.

MS. FRICKE: Sheri Fricke, Councilwoman, City of Wyandotte. Looking at the site plans and the routes in the illustrative alternatives, I'd just like to add -- some information included that there were residential areas, some of those did not include them. The S-5 routes 1, 2, and 3 are heavily residential. So I would like that noted. As for route 1, what needs to be included is a place of worship, senior citizen home, and schools. Under S-1 route -- well, under the plaza, I believe -- the plaza is located in Wyandotte but it talks about the active quarry is not included in this analysis. Is it just not included in the photo or is it not included in the actual analysis of this? Because that needs to be addressed.

MR. CORRADINO: It is not included in the plaza site, it is included in the analysis of the plaza. The analysis includes the effect of the quarry on the plaza or the crossing as well as vice versa.

MS. FRICKE: Okay. I'm not certain of this, but I think there's some litigation going on there. I wouldn't know. Mayor Durand would know more than I would. Then on
S-2, assessing travel demand you have on there, what does that mean?

MR. CORRADINO: It's the traffic of all types that would use a crossing that would be associated with routes including of plaza S-2 that's connected to several routes. So travel demand is two words that say traffic.

MS. FRICKE: All right. And then on S-3, it's quoted on there, “With few if any structures.” That is also a heavily residential area where the route is taking. I would like that noted. And also again, there's schools, small businesses, commercial, industrial, and wildlife. So some of the descriptions show these things, some do not. And I just wanted to make sure they're included.

MR. CORRADINO: Yes, ma'am. These are illustrative descriptions, but the detailed analysis is trying to catch up to everything that you've talked about.

MS. FRICKE: All right. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: And we will record your information and make sure that we incorporate that into our own analysis.

MR. CERVENAK: Hello, I'm Tom Cervenak, the Peoples Community Services Delray Neighborhood House. I wanted to comment on the plaza C-3 Delray west. The obvious issue is the size of the plaza relative to other sizes. This is designated as 206 acres. The other plazas range in size
from 38 acres, I think, to about 170 acres, and the average
looking at around 80. My question is, why would this
particular neighborhood which is poor and low income be
targeted with a plaza size about three times the average?
And I think that’s a real question that needs to be
addressed.

Again, the issue that I raised previously is the whole
environmental justice issue. There is a concern that
issues may be -- the decision may be made on a dollar and
cents decision. And because home values are lower in this
area, the people in this area have a disadvantage.
Certainly, the comments that were made earlier about the
health assessment, this is something that is absolutely
needed. The Delray area has been inundated with pollution
for 100 years. Anything else added would certainly set it
over the edge.

As a matter of fact, I might add that if this
particular plaza was accepted as designated would
essentially spell the entire end of the Delray
neighborhood.

A couple of other items I wanted to touch on was the
issue of mining. In our area, I know it was mentioned one
time that there was going to be some looking at the mining.
But this is a very important issue for us. The salt mines
underneath us blast every day at a certain time. And it
is -- I've been in a small Michigan earthquake, and it's far beyond anything like that. It sounds more like thunder clapping. And the whole question about the safety of the bridge piers, how safe would they be from destruction if this mining which has been going on for 100 years would obviously continue?

The final item I wanted to bring up is something that I've never heard mentioned. And you know, we've certainly talked about redundancy in the event of a terrorist attack. One of the worst case scenarios, but it's not something that is out of the realm of possibility, is a terrorist getting ahold of some nuclear material and using it as a dirty bomb, which is a conventional explosive that would be exploding out into the air radioactive material. Well, perhaps a conventional explosion could take out the Ambassador Bridge. But a dirty bomb would not only take out the bridge, but would spread radioactive material in a much wider area. And so it's my belief that we really need to look at that issue, how far would the radioactive material go beyond the attack and where would it be spread as far as with the wind. So it appears to me that I think we need to be looking at building a redundancy as far as possible from other crossings. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MS. BENSON: My name is Corki Benson from the City of
Wyandotte. I listen to the comments from the residents that come into my office all week, listen to the comments of the people that live in the 2,000 homes that I represent in my neighborhood association. And I’ve read the scoping document along with all the other documents provided to this group. The one constant seems to be the lack of reference to the human and personal issues involved in this study. The population is discussed but not the families. The households are counted, but not the homes.

Quantum had absolutely no personal feelings. It only recognized the brick and the mortar in the schools, the hospitals, and churches. Quantum recognized the cemeteries, the parks, the utility facilities, and the historical sites. Quantum did not acknowledge the small neighborhood business establishments that support many of the families in all of our communities. I guess I’m always looking for the missing human touch, which is probably why I’m not doing any official bridge study.

The evaluation factors in these reports consider things like the noise impact that Joe mentioned on the sensitive receptors and the intrusion of a plaza or a road on a disposal site. What about honorable mention for these impacts on the homes and the families as a real factor that needs to be studied? I find it ironic that even the culture, the history, the water, and the wildlife are
protected by many, many U.S. and Canadian laws that are constantly referred to in these studies. I agree that the word “household” and “population” are politically correct terms for government reports, but they’re very cold words to my residents. In my opinion, it’s no wonder that the reports to date do not indicate any fatal flaws. Maybe those reports don’t indicate fatal flaws because they passed over the human factor. I hope the homes and the families that should be the number one factor in this bridge study will not be encompassed in this evaluation like the cost factor mentioned in page 41, and noted in the scoping document as an afterthought to the study process.

Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MS. LEONARD: Delores Leonard, Sierra Club, Environmental Justice. I have a written statement, but before I read it I want to go back and talk about -- while you speak of environmental impact of wildlife and the noise, I want to speak about environmental justice, the impact of your decision upon low income people and people of color. And, yes, I looked at your table that said the minority population was decreasing. I read data, and if -- you do not have a comparison, you only have one table. So that you’re not able to compare from year to year. And so that’s not an accurate presentation. My prepared
statement:

How important is the evaluation form that appears in the blue book -- now, everyone knows what I'm talking about, the blue book -- the blue book in assisting the decision making body --

MS. BARONDESS: Excuse me. Can you put your microphone just a little closer to your mouth? That's great. Thank you.

MS. LEONARD: The decision making body -- let me begin again. How important is the evaluation form that appears in the blue book in assisting the decision making body in formulating its ultimate choice for bridge location? How important is the public's input in the completion of that form in the decision process? I have communicated to Mr. Alghurabi via several e-mails that the evaluation forms were not valid. Not valid because the word 'Draft' appears at the top of the form. Also, I indicated the process that was used in completing the form was flawed. The public was not told to complete and return the forms. In reading the public meeting printed notes -- public meeting printed notes of June 27, 28, 29, and 30, no such directions were stated to the public. At the June 20 LAC meeting that I attended held at Southwestern High School, the blue book was presented. The meeting followed the same process as that for the public meetings the following week. Questions
were raised relative to the scoring process. At no time was it stated during the LAC meeting that the public was to complete the form and that there was a due date. It was merely stated that the public also, in the next week -- that they would receive the same materials as the LAC. There was a PowerPoint presentation, then there was a pause and then there were questions. And then we went back to the presentation. And at no point in time we were ever told that the public should complete and return a questionnaire, the questionnaire that had the word "Draft." The first time I was aware that the public was to return the questionnaire was at a July 20 meeting when Steve Tobocman, representative 12th District, appeared with the form that had a due date. "Draft" was still at the top and it said, "Please return by July 31st." Any time I see something that says "Draft" I know it’s not final, it’s in working process. And I did not question that. I didn’t realize until after we had left the meeting that that form still had the word “Draft.” The form itself was a part of the blue book. Most of those public meetings were attended by senior citizens. Unless they were specifically told to tear the page out of the book and to submit that copy or to have the page copied and submit that copy, people were not properly informed and instructed. Now, throughout my communications with Mr. Alghurabi, he was very cordial and
courteous. He permitted me to express my concerns. I even
spoke with him via telephone. But he held fast to that
July 30 deadline date. Therefore, my community did not
have an opportunity to express their opinions about those
factors that evidently will be used because that was stated
tonight. That form is a decision making form, still in the
draft process.

MR. ALGHURABI: Ms. Leonard, I have the utmost respect
for our communication and what we have discussed and what
we said. And I'm -- not by any means want to be
disrespectful or not agreeing with you or what you've said.
But I just want to respond to a couple points, just from
the standpoint of the form. Yes, you are absolutely
correct the form is important. And I just want to say that
we've tried multiple ways to get the forms in the hands of
people. And again, I want to state very objective by
saying that there were ways that we made them available at
the meetings. And other ways we send them electronically.
In other ways, we brought extra copies and said, “If you
need extra copies we'll make them available to you.” I've
communicated to your office multiple times. I've tried in
every possible way, if the deadline -- yes, it was July
31st, but if there's something I could do personally to
come and pick them up from your office. And those that
I've worked with from other parts, they can witness that.
But that’s not the point. The point is we’ve received over 900 forms, just for the record.

“Draft” — everything we do before the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is really in a draft form. Because the Draft Environmental Impact Statement documents, that’s the first document that gets out and published in the hands of the public. So if it says “Draft” that’s just — everything we do is work in progress. If you give us comments, we really want to address it. If you tell us what’s going on or you want to add something, we try to take that under consideration.

So these are just food for thought. I respect everything you said and I appreciate everything you said and I’ll continue to work with you in every possible way to make this better. And thank you for your comments.

MS. BARONDESS: Do you have more for us tonight?

MS. LEONARD: Do I have anything further?

MR. BARONDESS: Yes, I just want to make sure.

MS. LEONARD: Yes, I do but it’s not going to make a difference.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MS. SAVIC: My name is Olga Savic and I work with State Representative Steve Tobocman who’s also in session right now in Lansing. We will be submitting written comments regarding the scoping document and the purpose and
need. But I did want to touch on a few things today. First of all, we absolutely agree there has to be a health impact study because human health is just as important as any other environmental concern. And I really hope that the Federal Highway Administration and EPA can find a way to measure the impact of air toxics, known air toxics and their cancer causing probabilities on the people who will be affected by more trucks coming into their community. So I want to just echo those concerns.

Related to the purpose and need, I’m very concerned about the economic data that is being used to forecast truck totals. And particularly with states revenue estimating conference, state treasurer coming out and saying there was a 26 percent decline in manufacturing in Michigan just in the last year. So I hope that the study process will continue to evaluate that data and -- kind of what are the realistic economic assumptions that we’re using to calculate truck demand and what the truck trips are going to be and to actually take a different tact in terms of thinking of purpose and need.

In the LAC meetings we’ve talked over and over again about how we’re only looking at highway miles and moving trucks over the border. But regional transportation and national transportation is a lot more than just trucks. And we’ve just gone through a multimillion dollar study of
an intermodal freight terminal in Detroit. And I don’t
fully understand why we’re not looking at all the other
modes of moving freight and why we aren’t using this study
as an opportunity to do something different, to create a
more robust regional transportation system as opposed to
just looking at trucks. I think that it’s much too narrow.

We’re going to be submitting comments about the
evaluation of the illustrative alternatives and that
process and just hope that the partnership looks at --
takes a really deep approach to looking at these factors as
they use them, and echoing some of the comments that Mrs.
Leonard made regarding the weighting system. So we’ll be
submitting those.

But the last thing that I wanted to say was that
regardless of where a location is picked, if it’s
determined that a new border crossing is needed along the
Detroit River, that the partnership does two things. One
is that the discussion of governance is a public
discussion, not one that goes on behind closed doors.
Because it’s extremely important that the impacts and the
way that a border crossing doesn’t just get built and then
we walk away from it. It becomes a thing of its own. And
there’s lots of impacts that go on for many years. And the
public oversight in the discussion about how that should be
managed should be a public one.
And then also that the border partnership include a community benefits agreement in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. And that the -- must have, no matter where the location is chosen. Because regardless of where a bridge or tunnel goes, the community that hosts, you know, what’s a national or regional economic driver should have some community benefits. And they should be at the table to decide what those community benefits are and how they can be implemented. So we’ll be submitting written comments too.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MS. BENJAMIN: My name is Alison Benjamin. I work for Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision.

MS. BARONDESS: Alison, can you make sure you put the microphone real close? Thank you.

MS. BENJAMIN: Yes, I sure will. And I certainly echo many of the comments from both MDEQ and other concerned citizens from the region about the health effects and air quality issues that will result from such a large transportation infrastructure project wherever it’s located.

And I guess I’m going to be pretty specific in terms of we have 16 months to do this draft EIS. And I would like to be certain that the modeling and the research that is done is of the highest quality and in such a format that...
it can be used if at some point there is a change in the
highway administration’s decision on a health study. Can
we do the modeling now in the numbers and the format that
could translate into a health study easily, so that we're
not stuck with, you know, this date isn't going to fit into
anything we do? So particularly we want to get that
modeling done for areas around the plaza, within the plaza,
surrounding the plaza, within the neighborhoods, and
regionally.

Because we all know how the air goes from the U.S.
over to Canada. And both sides working on this project
should be concerned about the cumulative effects of this
project and the total burden on whatever community becomes
the host. And I would like to request that PM2.5, the
criteria pollutants and toxics all be analyzed to the
tiniest degree it can be for this project, and that we not
rely on improvements and regulations for diesel engines and
diesel fuel that are coming on down the pike because I
think we know that existing trucks will be still on the
roads whenever this project is completed and built. So we
want the best data on how it’s going to apply to all the
residents and all the families that have been described so
eloquently by other people at this table. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MS. KAVANAUGH: I’m Karen Kavanaugh with the Southwest
Detroit Business Association. First I’d like to say that the SDBA does support this study. As flawed as it may be at the present time, we do think that a study is required in order to make a decision on, number one, whether another border crossing is needed and where it is best located. Without that, there’s no rational basis to have any discussion about the next border crossing. And for those of us in Southwest Detroit, that means then that perhaps a private entity will make the decision on when and where another border crossing occurs.

We will also be submitting written comments on the scoping document; just want to reiterate a couple of things. We support all of the comments that have been made about the impact on air quality. But one of the things we’d like to say is that we’d like to back up and understand better what the context is today. One of the issues that we have in Southwest Detroit is that we already are a transportation hub and we already have a number of industrial point sources. And what’s very hard for those of us who are not well versed in this area is to really understand what is the existing context, what do point sources add, what do mobile sources add, what are the best practices today to mitigate those impacts, and then look at what is the burden.

We have -- you know, it’s very difficult to understand
what that impact does, even if you do all of the studies.
And we don’t know and don’t well understand what the
existing context is. So whatever this study can do to help
us understand that would be very helpful, and in
particular, the impacts of the border crossing today.

Also, we are very much in support of public ownership
of the next border crossing. And we believe that that
discussion ought to be a transparent one. The decision for
what -- whatever decision is made ought to be well
documented and it also ought to include public input.
Again, wherever the border crossing, if it is needed, is
located, the purpose and need statement should be expanded
to require that the host communities' economy is also
improved and enhanced. Because the lion's share of the
benefits will accrue to the state and to the region and may
not be such a bad thing. But the host community must be
made whole.

The other comment that we'd like to make -- again,
we're happy to see that the -- on page 21, that there is
the new expanded Ambassador Bridge plaza included in this
analysis. Because that means that we’ll at least get some
data on what that impact of that plaza will be. But we do
believe, as we've said before, that all agencies that have
jurisdiction over this process should issue a moratorium
that no permits or any other action is taken that would
promote one crossing over another until this study is complete. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MR. PALOMBO: Carmine Palombo with SEMCOG. We also will be submitting some written comments for the record. Just a couple things in the essence of time. Many of the comments that we would make have already been discussed so I won’t go over those. But two things that haven’t been mentioned I think that we’ll be looking at. One is the impact of the crossing on the existing infrastructure to insure that whatever gets built and wherever it gets built will not have a detrimental impact on existing traffic patterns or the investments that have already been made. And there has been a significant number of investments been made in southeast Michigan over the last couple -- especially over the last couple of years in trying to get our system up to par. So this would be very important that we don’t degrade to any extent the existing system.

And secondly, just to continue to recognize, I think it’s very difficult -- you have a very difficult challenge in front of you that essentially only analyzing here on our side of the border one side of the project. There is another side of the project. There are impacts that are on the other side of the border that would have a potential impact on what happens on this side. So hopefully at some
point, these two are going to join together and we’ll be able to identify the impact -- total impact of an alternative not just on our side but on the other side. Because of the fact that there could be an impact on the other side of the border that could impact what happens on our side in terms of how an alternative will score.

So I think you have a very difficult process of trying to mesh those two and we’ll be waiting to review how you do it. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much.

MS. AMADOR: Hi, Amy Amador on behalf of Detroit City Council President Maryann Mahaffey’s office. I will be brief. I’m going to read a couple comments that the council president has.

“The border crossing alternatives proposed in the Detroit River International Crossing study that directly impact Detroit would have harmful implications for Detroit neighborhoods, commercial districts, and the health and safety of Detroiters. The alternatives would, in some cases, destroy neighborhoods, decimate commercial districts, and increase the environmental and economic burden transportation has on Detroit residents.”

Some of the additional comments are:

“A new border crossing should only be built if the
certainty of the need for such a crossing exists and continues to exist. All potential sites for border crossing and freeway connection should be studied to determine their impacts on the surrounding residential communities, local businesses, local economy, air quality, environmental justice, safety, local planning, cultural assets, and noise. Mitigation of these impacts is a must. Permitting for a new border crossing should be delayed until the DRIC study has been completed. Residential communities already suffering from the impacts of a border crossing should not have their burden increased by the creation of another border crossing. Sites for plaza locations or freeway connections should minimize the impact to commercial and residential areas. The burden of the border crossing should be shared equally by the respective sides of the border. It is unfair to burden only the U.S. side with the responsibilities for customs processing and toll booths. Vehicles leaving a border crossing should connect directly to the freeway system and not using neighborhood streets.”

Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MR. WESTLAKE: This is Ken Westlake from the
Environmental Protection Agency in Chicago. We obviously recognize the critical importance of having adequate, safe, and efficient border capacity for movement of people and goods that’s essential to the economies of this metropolitan area as well as to the two countries involved. We’re a cooperating agency as you’ve pointed out because we want to cooperate effectively and be a constructive player in all of this. We signed the streamlining agreement that includes a concurrence point for scoping including concurrence on analytical techniques. And we’d like to suggest that we make more progress on that subject before completion of the screening process for the various alternatives so that we have a game plan in place for evaluating alternatives that all parties to the agreement can live with.

In particular we’re looking at air quality analysis. I think it’s appropriately highlighted as a key factor. You’ve heard from the public today and other agencies the importance of that. You’ve included some relevant factors to date which is good, such as evaluating all the criteria, pollutants, and six air toxics in doing carbon monoxide hot spot analysis. We’d like to see that go further to concentrate on diesel emissions, particularly from trucks because of the concentrated emissions that can be expected at plazas and access roads.
Similar to the comments we recently submitted to Federal Highway and MDOT on the draft EIS for the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal, we think localized impact analysis for PM2.5, the so-called fine particulates especially diesel emissions, is essential. We know that Metro Detroit is a non-attainment area for fine particulates and there’s particularly high readings in some of the Southwest Detroit, lower Rouge Valley monitors. And we know MDEQ is going to be very challenged to put together a state implementation plan to achieve the fine particulate standards by 2010 given the existing air quality and sources in the area as well as the potential impacts from this project, DIFT, and other contemplated projects.

We’re eager to engage in some further discussions with MDEQ, with the transportation agencies, with other affected stakeholders so that we can reach a consensus and lay a good foundation for this project to be well analyzed and defensible in its outcome.

Just a couple observations. We’re pleased that the scoping document adds the component not just of the potential crossing locations, but the linkages to the freeway networks on both sides of the border. I think that’s an essential part of looking at the project in totality that we’re glad to see. And we’re certainly interested in more discussion on how the U.S. environmental
evaluation process is going to be integrated with what happens on the Canadian side. So thanks.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you, Ken.

MR. KING: Hello, I’m Bruce King with the City of Detroit. And I’m going to be submitting some written comments also. But I also would like to go over a few with you.

You indicate on air quality the burden analysis. Previously the burden analysis is based on national emission standard source trends. The source trend for southeast Michigan differs from the national trend. I’d like to make sure that MDOT looks at that closely. You can identify that in the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality’s air -- annual air quality report.

Additionally, the burden analysis treats the emissions source as a point source. However, this is not the case with the transportation project. Those point sources are the plazas and the network that connect to the highways. The emission source in this case are trucks and other vehicles. Since they are capable of movement outside the prescribed areas you intend to perform the burden analysis, your analysis will not provide a meaningful representation of the air quality impact from this project for the affected communities. I think you need to expand your burden analysis to the communities.
As indicated in the scoping document, southeast Michigan is classified as non-attainment for PM2.5 and the eight-hour ozone standard. EPA clean diesel engine regulations and the clean air interstate rule will not solve the long-term effects of these emissions. Southeast Michigan to date has to take additional corrective actions to meet the standards and the compliance requirements of the Clean Air Act. To interject between six million trucks and 20 million cars into a specific area by 2030 will have a significant restriction and stress our ability to meet the Clean Air Act standards. The DEIS must incorporate real meaningful mitigating measures to reducing the impact this crossing will have on southeast Michigan.

By suggesting that the crossing be located within a heavily populated urbanized area will not only adversely impact on this region’s air quality but also adversely impact on the health of the residents living within the designated area. There are scientific approved health risk modeling protocols available today that MDOT should undertake to identify all impact to populations. NEPA does not require a regulated protocol to be used to do a health risk analysis. It only requires that a scientifically recognized protocol analysis be used in the process. Those are available, MDOT should look for those and identify that and use that for a health risk analysis.
Relating to the project community, neighborhood characteristics, this project would have a significant adverse impact on communities. That's stated on page 37 of the scoping document. MDOT's solution to this is to acquire these properties and relocate those affected populations. By building the necessary infrastructure to accommodate the movement of trucks and other vehicles, MDOT basically constructs a barrier that separates and destroys the neighborhoods. Thus, MDOT must not only work closely with other state agencies and the communities, they must work hand in hand with community transportation planning and development department to ensure that the project will only impact a very limited number of neighborhoods.

Maintaining consistency with the local planning, MDOT must use the current planning information available from each unit of government affected by this project. One example is the location of the crossing at Belle Isle conflicts with recent and ongoing residential developments being constructed where the plaza is proposed. You need to look closely at all the planning and work with those departments.

On the area of protecting the natural environment, because of the sensitive habitats along both the shoreline and within the Blue Heron lagoon at Belle Isle, a crossing at this location would be very destructive. The surface
water off the bridge would be contaminated with oils and other vehicle related fluids. And for this to enter the Belle Isle ecosystem is totally unacceptable. MDOT must pay particular attention to any natural environmental studies conducted at this location for final crossing determination. Additionally, MDOT must establish the impact that this project will have relating to air deposition on pollutants into the Detroit River and what long-term effects it will have on our Great Lakes.

MDOT must work with the local units of governments and traffic management department staff to address and identify any adverse impacts that this project would create with the movement of trucks and cars through the urbanized area prior to entering the highway network system. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you. Okay. I just want to take a time check real quick. It is 6:30, but we started late because we had some audio problems. So we're going to continue on. I expect that the meeting probably will end sometime around 7:00 o'clock. So I just wanted to let you all know where we were with the schedule. And I think -- oh, you want to speak? I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off. But let's go ahead. And with the time check, go ahead.

MS. HOWZE: Okay. I'm Fran Howze with Messiah Housing. And I have to echo the gentleman's comments prior
to me. The only other thing that I could say about this is that I'm very concerned about the fact that there's a lot of hard items in this scope of information that you have provided to us. I think it's a decent study, but I still think that you need to touch on the most soft piece, which is the human piece that I think everybody has echoed from the city to the state government counterparts that have spoke prior to me.

The concern that I have is that, being near Belle Isle and all of our strategic planning as our organization is related to the development and it's right at Jefferson and the Boulevard, that would impact everything that's going on in that area. And going along the corridor of Jefferson, it would impact everything that's going along the commercial.

So I think you need to take a little harder look at the economic aspects of what's going to impact on Detroit. Already there has been enough going on with the children in that community of the environment and not having the outcomes that is needed to be accessible to parks and things of that sort.

So I cannot imagine that you will not look closer at the quality of air distribution that will be impacted in that neighborhood as well as the other part of the environment in which they live in right now when it comes
to putting thousands of trucks and other types of modes of vehicles in this area.

And also, the opportunity to have an open forum for the public to be a part of your agenda when -- the outcome of the findings of this project.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much. Okay. Let's go to the other side of the room here. The upper level, we'll start there and move around toward the back.

MR. PETRO: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Mark Petro and I'm with the private sector advisory group from the Canadian side. I do have a couple of concerns I'd like to voice here this afternoon. And I think there has been some fairly good feedback here that I've heard in the last half hour.

First of all, I'd like to start off with a comment in regards to this document on page six where it talks about capacity.

MS. BARONDESS: Could you -- excuse me. I'm wondering if you could be more specific about what document that is? I saw you hold it up, but I'm not sure which one it is.

MR. PETRO: That is your scoping information, PowerPoint that was provided.

MS. BARONDESS: Okay. It's the PowerPoint.

MR. PETRO: Yes. And on page six of that document it talks about future capacity needs showing the bridge and
the tunnel. It suggests that U.S. border processing has still got five to ten years. That’s at gridlock now. I mean, during the mornings coming into the States, they block the traffic off because they can’t process quickly enough. So we are at capacity. In the afternoons we have a similar problem going in reverse and traffic is backed up on Jefferson Avenue trying to get through. So in that document and when people talk about, “Well, we’ve got so many years to get ahead of some of these problems,” we’re there now. And this is happening regularly.

In respect to some of the gridlock that we have as well, if we take a look at I-75 backing up on Porter Street, if we take a look at what’s happening over in Windsor a couple weeks ago when we had the U.S. Customs’ computers shut down, we had again the same kind of situation very close to what we had on September the 11th. So these things are happening and they’re happening with fair frequency.

And we need to address some of these things now. And there are some things that MDOT can do and needs to do. And we need to take a look at alternative truck routes. We need to get some of those trucks off I-75 perhaps at Clark Street to minimize some of the backups that are occurring. Because the regular traffic, car traffic, simply can’t get around all those trucks. And we’re asking for some
serious, serious problems.

We’ve got some other issues too that I think need to be addressed. And I’m a little bit concerned that some of the thinking that’s going on in the planning on this is really, really conventional. There’s not a lot of thinking outside the box. If we look at where you’ve placed the plazas on these proposals, they’re all literally at the doorstep of the bridge. With the technology we’ve got coming on, with the concerns that people are voicing here tonight about some of the neighborhoods, I think we’ve got to look at possibly sterile truckways, some of the technology that we have and perhaps moving some of these areas.

If we take a look at Delray, for example, I can certainly understand the concerns of breaking up neighborhoods. And Delray is perhaps a good example. But perhaps an alternate somewhere closer to the Rouge plant might be a real alternative, but it’s got to be a sterile truckway.

So I think there’s still alternatives there. And without getting too involved in trying to drag this study out any longer than it needs to go, I think there’s some thinking that needs to change. And I think we need to look outside the box. Thank you. I think we’ve also got to tie in some of the rail issues. And Delray junction is
probably one of the worst bottlenecks that we have in southwestern Michigan. It affects train traffic all over the place. And it’s something that whether it’s a flyover or -- another alternative needs to be looked at.

Also, in respect to monitoring air quality, this issue has been largely glossed over especially on the Canadian side. We need to get some additional monitoring in at the customs plazas. That means all four plazas on both sides we need to monitor diesel particulate and diesel emissions, sulphur dioxide, nitrous oxides, and particulate. These are real issues that I don’t see being addressed at this point in the study or the scope and I certainly hope they will be. Thank you.

MS. ALCOCK: Heidi Alcock from the City of Detroit City Planning Commission. Most of our concerns have been raised and we will be submitting extensive comments in writing.

I think one of our overarching concerns is the effect of this project on current and future development projects. Each of these corridors and some more than others, honestly, have many, many projects that are either planned or are actually breaking ground and happening, and in some cases, have already happened. And these alternatives would really impact those projects. In many cases, federal funds have been spent on those projects. And I think that needs
to be accounted for.

Another general comment that we have is that at a time when our tax base and general fund revenue is at a crisis state, it is very hard to imagine the acquisition of viable businesses, industry, and certainly residences. We're also concerned because some pretty important community institutions and places of worship and educational facilities would be impacted under a couple of the scenarios.

So we will provide comments with specific concerns around each corridor. But we just, for the record, wanted to say that. I think the other thing that our office would like to say today is that we really encourage the federal agencies to acknowledge this study and to avoid issuing permits for projects that proceed outside of the framework of this study. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MS. DUDZINSKI: I'm representing State Representative Ed Clemente from the 14th District. And as you know, a number of these crossings go either through his district or into almost every community he represents. He is very sorry he could not be here, he's in session today in Lansing. He is very concerned about the health impact on a crossing in any of these communities. They're all trying very hard to improve, rebuild, and they've all come a very
long way.

He has also been meeting with his Canadian counterparts. He’s had a number of meetings with officials on the other side of the river. And they also have similar concerns about a new crossing and where it might be located. The citizens on the other side also feel the same way according to what he’s heard.

He’s also studying other various sources of information regarding the need for another bridge and the impact that may have on the communities. So he has been working very hard on these issues and wants to be sure that he has all of the relevant information available. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Before you pass the mike, could you please give us your name?

MS. DUDZINSKI: Marlene Dudzinski.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you, Marlene.

MS. HOSLER: I’m Barbara Hosler with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And we are in the process of preparing written comments to you on the scoping information that was sent to us. And I know that you’re already aware of many of our concerns, fisheries, migratory birds, endangered species, and the Detroit River International Wildlife Refuge.

I had a specific question about the scoping
information that was sent. At the -- I believe the last agency meeting we had in one of the PowerPoint presentations, putting a pier on Mud Island, which is part of the refuge, was shown as a feasible alternative -- not alternative, but potentially could go there. And I didn’t see that in -- illustrated in the scoping information. So I’m wondering if that is no longer being considered? It’s not feasible any longer, you dropped it, or if it is actually still being considered in the --

MR. CORRADINO: I believe we’re still looking at a pier. We’re refining each of the crossings with our Canadian partners to be more prescriptive about pier locations. That was an early proposal and we’re trying to refine those as we go through the illustrative alternatives. We’re still refining those. And it’s likely that there will be a pier there, but we’re refining that.

MS. HOSLER: And second question, are you preparing a draft 4-F evaluation?

MR. CORRADINO: Likely, yes. I mean, we’ll have to get to the alternatives. But the placement of the project at this point has park land impacts and frequent instances. And therefore a draft 4-F would be part of what we would do.

MS. HOSLER: But no work has started on that yet?

MR. CORRADINO: Oh, no; no. Our objective would be to
look at park lands, public park lands, 4-F, 6-F, and define those for illustrative alternatives analysis. And then those final alternatives will be part of the definition of a 4-F for the DEIS. So we have to get to the final short list by the end of the year before we start drafting those documents.

MS. BARONDESS: And that would be with respect to the practical alternatives with respect to looking at the detailed analysis of 4-F properties. And also 4-F does apply to historic properties as well as parks and recreational facilities too. So we’ll be looking at that in a very detailed fashion with the practical alternatives phase too.

Anyone else here? Sure, go ahead. Regine has a question for you, Barb Hosler. If you could pass this back to Barb for a minute.

MS. BEAUBOEUF: Barb, you asked the question about the pier on Mud Island. Is there any special concern with the pier at that location?

MS. HOSLER: Well, yes. That’s part of the international wildlife refuge. So that would be a concern to us that it would change the character of the refuge.

MS. BARONDESS: And that would also be a 4-F property; is that correct?

MS. HOSLER: Yes.

MS. BARONDESS: Recognized under Department of
Transportation law as a 4-F protected property?

MS. HOSLER: Right. And because it's actually part of the refuge, that would trigger probably a NEPA requirement on our part also.

MS. BARONDESS: I see. Okay. Thank you. Next?

MR. HOGREFE: My name is Todd Hogrefe with the DNR. The reason my agency is seated here at the table today is to ensure that the natural resources of the river corridor, especially threatened and endangered species, are protected. For those of you who might otherwise not know, Act 451 of 1994, part 365 regulates and restricts impacts -- adverse impacts to all state listed threatened and endangered species. So for that reason, priority for the DNR is to see that this study adequately considers and addresses potential impacts to those listed species.

Now, for the past 30 years, we have records of at least 16 listed species in the vicinity of this project. Granted, a lot of those records are fairly old so some of those species may no longer occur there. And some of the impact areas for the proposed alternatives may already be paved or covered with concrete so obviously there wouldn't be T and E species concerns there.

But in the areas where potential habitat remains, the DNR would require surveys for listed species in those areas. So to coordinate that, I encourage the action
agencies to contact me to get clarity on what would be
required and then to discuss what the next steps should be.

MR. REAUME: Dale Reaume, Grosse Ile Township. I have
a few comments on the project purpose. On slide number
three of page three of the handout it identifies some
statistics on the cost of not addressing the congestion.
And it does not identify the source and date of the data.
I would suggest that that be considered. As I understand
in previous discussions that it was a 1995 study or the
data from that time. And a lot has changed in ten years.
And for that reason, I know myself and a lot of folks
believe that the travel demand forecast is also believed to
be outdated.

There’s a reference to a 1995 federal law that
recognized this Detroit River crossing. And I think it
would make sense to identify what that law is. I’ve been
to almost all of these meetings and either I don’t recall
or I don’t know how specific our discussions have taken
place on that matter. And I think it would make sense. As
I understand it, the study that identified the need of this
crossing did not address the Ambassador Bridge expansion or
the jobs tunnel.

And the last comment I would make or question is,
public hearing matter. Once a preferred site is selected,
will there be public hearings in a specific community or is
this decision final or how will that process unwind when it comes to that time?

MS. BARONDESS: According to the process, when we make an announcement on a preferred alternative -- and really the documentation for that is the Final Environmental Impact Statement. That is not the last action in the clearance process. The final action that is basically the stamp of approval to go into design and construction of a new facility is the Record of Decision. So the answer is yes, there is time for response to an announcement on a preferred alternative following that announcement. Now, there is no official public hearing requirement. And we’ve handled that public involvement discussion in many different ways. And I expect that the -- your group, the LAC and the LAG will be advising the study team on how that discussion should take place when we are planning that certain activity. Does that answer your question? Okay. Yes, go ahead.

MR. BLOOM: Without the mike, I think you can hear me.

MS. BARONDESS: Wait, Bob. No; no, you’ve got to have the microphone. You’ve got to be on board here.

MR. BLOOM: When they’re all done and they have their ROD, it’s not all over yet. Because then they have to make application for a Coast Guard bridge permit to construct. And with that application comes all these environmental
documentation that supposedly addresses everything properly and it’s cut and dried. But it’s not cut and dried until we put our public notice out for 30 days, receive comments that you can still address to us environmental concerns that may not have come up before. We then, after a 30 day period, will go through a study process within the Coast Guard with all the comments we receive. We then, in this case, would send our findings of fact to Mr. Mpras in Washington with our recommendations. They prepare a Record of Decision. That is the final say for the project whether it’s going to be a go or not. What we’re here tonight talking about or hearing about is the environmental process. But we’re not talking about the structure going in yet.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much, Bob, for reminding us of the permit requirements that we have with the Coast Guard. I appreciate that. And let’s keep going here. Who’s next?

MR. CADY: Bob Cady, City of Trenton. Just for clarification, S-1 and S-2 are in the City of Trenton, not Wyandotte as you show. And if you go through this, you’ll see a lot of your plazas you have the towns misrepresented on here.

And I don’t know how it’s affected a lot of you in your communities, but I know we spent a lot of time and
effort in Trenton trying to help market and redevelop those sites S-1 and S-2, and it’s been a real struggle since this study started to try to get any development going in our town. It just has really killed us. Not only the development aspect of it, but just marketing and selling any real estate right now has been tough. That’s the only comment I have on this. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MR. KOBILJAK: Kurt Kobiljak, township supervisor, Grosse Ile. I don’t have any problems with you answering these questions shortly and succinctly. I’m looking at a letter that’s dated August 15th, 2004 from Gloria Jeffs indicating that MDOT and FHWA will not conduct a health risk assessment as part of this project. And just for clarification, I’ve been to all these meetings and it seems like it ebbs and flows. Right now, are you performing or are you not performing a health assessment? Just straight up yes or no?

MS. BARONDESS: Not at this time. We are not performing a health risk assessment for this study.

MR. KOBILJAK: Secondarily, obviously the Canadians are conducting an EIS as well. They’re going to go through their same process over there. What happens if their process or their result is different from our result in the United States? What happens then?
MS. BARONDESS: When you say “result,” do you mean a decision about location?

MR. KOBILJAK: Correct.

MS. BARONDESS: There is a joint effort to make sure that there is a joint decision here. And that’s why we have the partnership. The goal here is an end to end solution. And that’s the objective that we’re reaching for. We both have environmental requirements on both sides of the border that we need to work with. But in the end, when you talk about decision making, the partnership making a decision, that means that it is a joint decision about the location of any new facility.

MR. KOBILJAK: And if either side disagrees with the other side, then nothing occurs?

MS. BARONDESS We will go through dispute resolution. We will follow up to make sure we’ve covered all the bases, that type of thing. But ultimately, I guess, if we’re at an impasse internationally, I would say that’s a serious problem for progress. One more comment here from FHWA.

MR. KIRSCHENSTEINER: One of the very first things we did was to look at the U.S. laws and the Canadian laws. And what we found was, they’re really not that much different. The process might be a little bit different, the language might be a little bit different. But when you look at the basic things that are done on both sides of the
river, it’s very, very, very similar. And the partnership was formed so that when we looked at this crossing, it was an end to end solution. That means it connects to the interstate on our side and it connects to the 401 on their side in some fashion. So we’re coordinating very, very closely with the Canadians on the entire study.

MR. KOBILJAK: Joe, this is a question for you. Your graph on page five of the slide presentation is the travel demand versus capacity. We’ve seen it and I think we’ve all ridiculed it from day one, just because of its self-serving nature. I think what would be helpful for us is that maybe with -- before the next meeting that you provide us the data as to how you came up with that graph in light of the fact that, you know, in the last 30 years the numbers are gradual to say the least. And then all of a sudden, now that the study is in place, you’re showing that the numbers will double over the next 30 years. So I would like to see the breakdown. Because if you reviewed the quotients that you used, whether it be two cars to three cars per truck, I think your quotient that you used was inflated to create this graph. And so I would like to see the data, not just for 2005 forward, but I want to see the data from 1970 all the way back and all the way forward. Because I think this graph that you keep on showing us isn’t realistic.
MR. CORRADINO: The report that will back up the travel demand, that graph, is intended to be released by the middle of September.

MR. KOBILJAK: Mid September? Mohammed, is that true?

MR. ALGHURABI: That’s correct.

MS. BARONDESS: That is true. I quote Mohammed, he said, “That is correct.”

MR. KOBILJAK: Last, but not least, and maybe this is for Joe as well. But on behalf of the residents of Grosse Ile, you have this great illustrative alternatives, you show how these routes are going to affect the areas. You stop at the water though. And for some reason I think you need to do a better job of showing the impact of any type of crossing over the water and over other residential homes on Grosse Ile. You stop on the shoreline. But I think that’s disingenuous. So I think these maps, when you produce them and present them to the public, you need to do a better job. That’s all I have.

MR. MAHAR: Good evening. I’m Greg Mahar, deputy supervisor from Brownstown, Michigan. And basically just a few comments. I’ve attended many of these hearings at this particular time. And two of the routes that cut through our community, King Road and Pennsylvania Road, I don’t know if you’ve had an opportunity to actually go down there or somebody is doing these graphs for you. But I was
building authority chairman. We built a six million dollar brand new police station on King Road, which you slice in half. I don’t know where Ford Motor Company is at this evening, but Ford Motor Company has got a major, major company over on Pennsylvania. And somebody might want to let those employees know they might be losing their jobs. I don’t think the governor would be too happy with that.

But these are serious issues. We already get calls from people calling our assessing office now who are thinking, “Should I buy a house in Brownstown? I hear there’s a bridge coming through.” The effect of all these rumors and what you’re doing, I think it’s a travesty at times through all of our communities. We’re struggling to do our tax base. The state has cut us some revenue sharing. Where are we supposed to get the money, how are we supposed to do these things? And now we’re worried about losing things that we thought were brand new communities moving in. It’s terribly upsetting to a lot of our people, especially our seniors. We have a senior complex which is right off King Road. Did you ever try sitting on a phone and talking to seniors 24 hours a day and answering their comments? It’s hard to get through because they’re very, very concerned about where they’re going to live and if they will have a home.

So please be very careful. And I hope you’ll make the
right decision. I just don't think it's right for downriver. Thank you.

MS. DINGELL: Cindy Dingell, Office of the County Executive. I'm going to make my comments real brief here. First, of all, just a minor housekeeping issue for some members in the audience. I have a letter here that says that, “Please bring your parking slips to the meeting for validation to cover any parking fees.” These people are coming into the building including some of the members here and they're being told that they're not going to be validated because they didn't park on Cobo roof. The letter says nothing of that nature, so I hope you'll rectify that and take care of the people that have come tonight. Secondly, --

MR. ALGHURABI: Cindy, may I say that if you have a slip -- and we tried to address it already. If you have a parking -- if you paid for parking, let us know. We're going to reimburse you right here right now. So if you parked at Cobo roof, great, we gave you a pass. But if you parked anywhere else, just tell us, come to us before you leave, please don't leave. We will pay for your parking.

MS. DINGELL: Mohammed, thank you. I appreciate that because I got chomped on for that.

MR. ALGHURABI: I apologize.

MS. DINGELL: That's okay. The second piece is, we've
talked about the health issues that were raised tonight. And obviously I know you have to work under NEPA and EIS and the policy that’s been set by those two pieces. And they don’t address the health issues. That is really unfortunate. But you know what? If we have to interpret the policy, I guess that’s fine. But maybe we need to go to our policy makers and have them start opening that up and looking -- and put in a piece to look at these health concerns. Because that is very, very critical.

My third piece, in this document here, the blue document, page four, S-4, the system you identify there -- and I’ve said this before -- you have Detroit wastewater treatment plant. That is not a Detroit wastewater treatment plant, that is a Wayne County Downriver wastewater treatment facility. We get all the calls and complaints on it, so that’s our facility. And that services 13 communities in the downriver area. The last piece -- well, we do our best, but we do get the complaints.

The last piece I want to mention too, in the end when the final decision comes down and you pick whatever is going to be this option, and I understand it’s going to be a smoke-filled back room according to an article I just read, and certain people will be in that room, is it possible that you may come out with two options?
MS. BARONDESS: Could you be more specific about two options? Like what are you thinking about it?

MS. DINGELL: Well, let’s say for instance you decide that they can go ahead and proceed with the Ambassador Bridge to expand that. Will there be another option besides that?

MR. CORRADINO: The objective is to solve the border crossing capacity. If that’s expanding by virtue of a second span for the Ambassador Bridge, it is expected that that will be a preferred solution. If it’s not that and the governance paper that you just read goes forward, it will be a crossing in another location. They’re long-term solutions, long-term solutions. There are intermediate steps that will occur about plazas and other potential issues. But in terms of the long-range need, it’s likely that there will be an adoption of a preferred solution for the long range. Interim steps will be complementing that. But there will likely be one preferred solution as Del indicated for the long range.

MR. COPLIN: Randy Coplin, Michigan State Police. I’m the assistant division commander for commercial vehicle enforcement. As a parent and citizen of Michigan, I’m glad to see people are concerned about public safety or public health issues. But as a State Police commander, I’m tasked with the responsibility of protecting the citizens of
Michigan in many different ways.

I see there is a Homeland Security segment or component in the PowerPoint presentation that was put up earlier. But only one agency seems to be supplying comments and that’s DHS. There’s a lot of agencies, including State Police, who have a Homeland Security responsibility. There’s TSA, Federal Highway, U.S. DOT, FMCSA, and all of our safety traffic partners here who have to deal with the backups every day and how do we address this in an appropriate manner?

MR. ALGHURABI: I just want to assure you that we are working with Eileen Pfeiffer. You probably know who she is. And she’s our security officer with the State of Michigan. And I know she works with you very closely. And I am working very closely with her in making sure that -- as a matter of fact, she’s trying to solicit some comments and getting your feedback to us to this document and to the criteria that we put forth for the evaluation. So I just -- I don’t know if that helps.

MR. COPLIN: And that helps. I just want to -- I made that statement because it just said DHS. And I know MDOT and State Police are actively involved every day. One of the things I noticed too with one of the plazas, and somebody already made this statement, we’re building plazas on the doorsteps of the river. What we’d like to see is
areas in which we can address safe trucks entering the State of Michigan. We have to police the fatal accidents in Jackson County, Berrien County, far away from the border. And they could be crossing here at Detroit and what are we going to do to ensure that the people out of the state or the Detroit area are in a safe motoring public environment?

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you. Next?

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Barbara McCallahan from the Office of U.S. Senator Debbie Stabenow. I would like to sort of reiterate on the Grosse Ile Township supervisor’s concerns and request for in-depth data that supports page five of Joe’s PowerPoint demonstration. It’s very curious to me that all of a sudden in 2005 after a decline since incidents in 2000 and 2001, that suddenly border traffic expands so greatly.

And one of the things, I don’t know if it has been taken into account because we have yet to see it, is there are several Homeland Security initiatives that we in the Congress have recently passed. And there is a lot of concern over what impact they will have in the reduction of actual crossings occurring, both commercial and passenger. The Detroit Chamber recently hosted an event where we had people from the State Department and Homeland Security discussing initiatives such as real ID, Western Hemisphere
Trade Initiative, commonly known as passports at the border, and how that is going to impact. So if those have not been included or if you have an opportunity as this is a living, breathing process and we go on to look at that data as these initiatives come online, that that may help to give an even more complete picture.

And I have one question, Mohammed. We're not doing the health risk assessment on this side. But do I remember from a previous LAC meeting that there is one being done in Canada, that their process does require that?

MR. ALGHURABI: I think you're correct.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Thank you. Bob, I have a question for you, when you were talking about the Coast Guard permitting process. And you were -- I want to make sure that I understood what you were saying. Is that, processes that are required within this NEPA constraint here, once it comes to Coast Guard for permitting, other requirements can be assessed or made at that time. Is that a point where a health risk assessment could be made or we're past it at that point?

MR. BLOOM: No, we're a cooperating agency with this whole environmental process. We would be negligent if we allowed anything to come forward environmentally as a report to our office when they make application and see that it's deficient. We should have done our homework.
before it gets to us as a cooperating agency.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Environmentally within current NEPA, which does not include health assessment?

MR. BLOOM: Right; right. If it’s not a law, not a regulation, not a policy, we’re not going to make up our own. And once it comes to us, we take that document and it becomes our document under Coast Guard. And then we go out with our -- like I said before, with our process for public notice or for navigation, any other comments that come up. But I would hope that anybody who does have any concerns about the environment, they don’t hold off thinking well, they’re going to skirt all these people in here and wait for us to get the document and get our public notice and then comment back on us and start ragging on us about something they should have brought up now. Because then we’ll blow it off.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Which is why I wanted to clarify that. Thank you. And a couple of just comments for you, for all of you here today. I really want to thank you for bringing an official reporter in to record this meeting. We have had a number of problems in the past with comments being misstated or abbreviated or not correctly attributed. So I greatly appreciate that. Will there be a transcript made available to LAC members?

MS. BARONDESS: Yes.
MS. MCCALLAHAN: Thank you. And in a final, just suggestion -- I'm always good for those, Mohammed -- when you do put out the notices of meetings, if you could just please be very, very specific if the public will be allowed to publicly comment at the meeting. Because I misinterpreted the way that the notice was sent out. And therefore, when we responded to constituents' -- because we like to let them know every opportunity available to them to communicate their concerns -- it appeared that there would be a public comment period within this agenda. And so if you could just make it very specific that the public will be allowed to address the microphone or not allowed, I would appreciate it.

MR. ALGHURABI: Duly noted.

MS. MCCALLAHAN: Thank you.

MR. KUCEL: Hi, Ken Kucel, Wayne County Engineering. A question first off. The plaza to freeway connections, are those proposed to be free flow freeway segments?

MS. BARONDESS: Yes.

MR. KUCEL: And I would assume those would be MDOT juris?

MS. BARONDESS: That's correct.

MR. KUCEL: As far as that goes, I assume all the relative environmental analyses, noise, traffic impacts, that will be part of the study?
MS. BARONDESS: That’s correct.

MR. KUCEL: The segment B in the alternatives shown in green, are those to be free flow or are those to be surface roads?

MS. BARONDESS: Joe? I’m not exactly sure where segment B in green is.

MR. CORRADINO: King Road?

MR. KUCEL: It’s a page five in the illustrative alternatives booklet.

MR. CORRADINO: It’s our concept now that the connection from the plaza to the I-75 is a free flow facility. Beyond that, if it goes to I-275 it’s a free flow facility.

MR. KUCEL: Thank you.

MR. HEISE: Good evening. I’m Kurt Heise, director of the Wayne County Department of Environment and the Wayne County Drain Commissioner as well. Our office operates the downriver wastewater treatment plant as pointed out by Cindy Dingell. That is not a Detroit facility. And that is -- I’m referring to the illustrative alternatives book. Turning again to that book, as I look out at the proposed downriver projects, I would tell you from a variety of environmental perspectives that I would be opposed to all of them.

I would also borrow off of what Mr. Sanchez said from
the DEQ’s perspective. And I would share many of the -- if not all, of the concerns that you raised. Also due to the fact that this is an international wildlife refuge and that cannot be overlooked. Significant hurdles that you would have to face if you were going to do any major construction in that area.

Getting back again to the book, the illustrative alternatives book, as we look at the Wyandotte site, the ATOFINA Chemical Company West, this is on page four and five, the facility to the northwest which is the downriver wastewater treatment plant is essentially fully utilized at this point. The land is fully utilized. And as you point out, to the south is the ATOFINA Chemical Plant. So you are clearly landlocked between two heavy industrial facilities, neither of which I don’t -- are going anywhere soon.

On top of that, due to the EPA’s recent pronouncements on the issue of wastewater blending, there is a very likely possibility that Wayne County and the 13 downriver communities may have to spend upwards of 300 to 400 million dollars to essentially double the size of the current wastewater treatment plant. We currently have no alternatives but to go outside the current boundaries. So any further work in that area would be very detrimental in order for us to comply with the EPA water regulations.
Also, the ATOFINA Chemical facility also has, for us, serious access and security issues, and also the impact on electric utilities. Our wastewater plant currently relies on the City of Wyandotte. And we have experienced -- through no fault of the cities, but we have experienced blackouts for both lightning strikes and also in 2003 when we had the nationwide blackout. And any other burden on the existing electrical infrastructure in that area, we would have to be very concerned about. If our pumps go out, the plant will not function and the basements for about a quarter of a million people will begin flooding with sewage. So that’s a problem.

Turning to page eight, we have the City of Ecorse locations. The site that you have listed as S-5 would eliminate the City of Lincoln Park’s storm water retention basin. That is towards the southern portion of the proposed S-5 location. So I would say that you have to reevaluate that site and also confer with the City of Lincoln Park.

We also have the Ecorse Creek which drains right by this area. We are currently doing our own study for a flood mitigation plan of Ecorse Creek. This may result in a project upwards of 100 million dollars, which may involve the straightening, widening, deepening, and possible channelization of the Ecorse Creek beginning at this
location and moving westward into the City of Dearborn Heights and into Romulus. So there is a great deal of work planned for this area. And you would need to better coordinate that with us.

Environmentally, we also have the downriver linked greenways project. We have greenways projects proposed by the City of Ecorse in this area and also Lincoln Park and Allen Park. None of these have been taken into consideration and I can tell you from firsthand experience, the walkways all involve Ecorse Creek and many of the areas cited as plazas on your map.

Furthermore, going back to the Ecorse location, alternative S-5 segment B, which is one of the escape routes to I-75 or I-94 -- it's the route to I-94 through the City of Allen Park. It also impacts a -- one of the few remaining green areas in the City of Allen Park, which we are looking at as a possible site for an environmentally friendly retention basin as part of our Ecorse Creek flood mitigation plan.

Furthermore, in order to evaluate any of the plans for the downriver communities, you would also have to coordinate with the watershed management plans which are now underway as part of the phase two storm water process. All of the communities downriver are going through that process right now with an eye towards obtaining a storm
water permit by the early part of next year. So I would think that there would be some severe conflict between the non-point source pollution initiatives of the communities and whatever plans are underway here.

In short, we will have some prepared statements in a formal letter at a later point. But clearly none of the downriver alternatives are acceptable to the Department of Environment for a variety of reasons. Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MR. LAFRANCE: Hello, I’m Henry LaFrance with the Friends of the Detroit River and we will provide a written response. But there are a few comments I’d like to make. The first has to do with the health impact study. I’ve read through the letters that explain why we’re not doing it, I’ve looked at all the traffic data. I’ve looked at hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of pages of studies on impacts of vehicular traffic to individuals. And I find it rather appalling that our representatives of our government will decide that because they can’t figure out what standards they’re going to use, they are just not going to do the damn study. I think that’s ridiculous. I think that’s just an awful, awful oversight and that should not be done. If they could figure out how to do it in Juarez, we should be able to figure out how to do it here.

The second problem I have is, a lot of these slides
that you’ve presented us with numbers that explain why we need this bridge are truly misrepresenting what the real situation is. On page three you talk about the number of jobs we’d lose. We could save more jobs in Michigan if we could figure out how to cut the cost of health care than we could by adding a bridge.

Finally, I mean I look at this traffic demand crossing thing. I requested the information that you had to do this slide. I’ve looked at the stuff you’ve provided me. There is no explanation as for why the traffic all of a sudden dropped in 1999. And there’s no explanation as to why all of a sudden between 2004 and the future, all of a sudden we’re going to have this rapid increase in traffic. I think you need to explain these better, you need to provide better data. And I really hope that when we actually see the final document, we’re not going to get one that says “Preliminary, for discussion purposes only.” Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Paul Moran. Just one last comment as it relates to the health risk assessment. It takes years and years for downriver as well as Detroit to make any incremental gains as it relates to air quality and the quality of life for the public. And not doing a thorough review in this process can set those gains back just in one day. So you need to consider that in terms of -- and I
hope one of the cooperating agencies request that study.

Thank you.

MS. BARONDESS: Thank you very much. What I want to do now is a short wrap-up. One of our objectives here today was to have the study team -- binational study team listen to your comments that you’ve given us. I felt that, first of all, the turnout was great. The diversity of perspectives that we had here today was impressive. I thought the comments were well thought out. They were -- people had done their homework, done their reading. You came prepared and I congratulate you for that.

We are extremely grateful for your presence here today. I want to let you know that it is very important -- these types of listening sessions where we get input from this diversity of groups are extremely critical to this study and the progress of the study. All the issues that you’ve raised today will be considered and evaluated as part of this study.

Where we are today is early, very early in the study process. Many of the topics that you’ve raised today are complex topics from an analysis standpoint. What you’ve given us is direction on where we need to go next in the study to try to tackle these complex topics as best we can using state of the art techniques, technology. You’ve given us lots of advice. I started out by saying that I’m
sure by the end of tonight we’re going to have a huge “To
do” list and I believe that to be the case.

    So with respect to what we’ve accomplished here
tonight, I think that this has been a very successful
scoping meeting. And I just want to thank everyone again
for what -- your participation here.

    Now, I want to make one final sort of housekeeping
coment that I think is very important. I heard a lot of
people say that they’re going to provide written comments.
I would urge you to do that as soon as possible. I think
you’ve probably heard in a number of forums here that this
study has a very aggressive schedule, which is a good thing
I think from a decision making process. It also becomes
very difficult for a study team when they’re dealing with
complex topics that they have to provide analysis and
feedback and answer questions to folks like yourself on.
So we need your comments, your written comments as soon as
possible. If you can -- we haven’t published a deadline or
anything. But I’m going to ask you tonight if you can
please provide those by the end of September or earlier
that would be much appreciated.

    And with that, I’m going to go ahead and wrap up the
meeting. And again, I will reiterate the parking
situation. If you didn’t park on the roof of Cobo Hall,
come and see Mohammed and he’ll take care of you. Thank
you everybody. Have a good night.

(Proceedings concluded at approximately 7:22 p.m.)
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