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

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

Meeting notes from:

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

Meeting Date/Location:

September 6th, 2006/Holiday Inn Select — Windsor, Ontario

Facilitator: Glenn Pothier, President, GLP*i*

Meeting Purpose
This eleventh meeting of the Community Consultation Group (CCG) was focused on sharing information about the tunneling option — that is, tunnel types, construction techniques, staging, technical issues, ventilation, and so forth.

In addition, the meeting was designed to:

- Provide an overview of recent community consultation activities — and upcoming events.
- Update members on potential sites for the placement of additional air quality monitors and the status of this initiative.
- Inform members about the upcoming social impact assessment focus groups.
- Update members on the drilling program to better understand the geology of selected parts of the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA).
- Update members on the overall status of both the Canadian and U.S. initiatives.
- Provide an overview of next steps in the project, including the meetings schedule.
- Allow for public/CCG member comments and questions about issues of their choosing.

Summary of Meeting Highlights

Opening Remarks

- Glenn Pothier, the independent meeting facilitator, called the group to order, welcomed all participants, introduced project team members, and provided an overview of the meeting agenda. He also extended a 'special welcome' to new members from the Armanda Street/Spring Garden area.

Review of June 26/06 CCG Meeting Summary

- Glenn Pothier noted that the summary of the June 26th CCG meeting had been previously distributed to all CCG members. He then asked for feedback regarding any substantive errors or omissions. None were identified concerning the summary format or substance. However, there was a request to include additional potential locations for air quality monitoring stations in the meeting summary. As a point of procedure, Glenn noted that this request would be reflected in the September 6th meeting summary, but could not be accommodated in the earlier meeting minutes given that the point was not made at the June 26th session.

- As a follow-up to a question raised at the June 26th meeting, Dave Wake has confirmed for the consultant team that he had a discussion with Steve Salmons (of the Minister's Office) regarding the option of separating international truck traffic from automobile traffic. The new access road is being planned to function as an extension of Highway 401, which is a multi-lane freeway for trucks and autos, extending from Windsor to the Ontario-Quebec border. All of the options

currently under consideration by the DRIC team provide for a continuous local road system. These options also provide the benefit of separating international traffic (trucks and cars) from the local traffic, and allowing connections between the two systems, so that local traffic may utilize the new freeway if desired. These options contribute to the overall study purpose of providing for safe, secure and efficient movement of people and goods.

Public Comment

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

CCG Member Comments/Questions

- Glenn then invited CCG members to share any comments or questions with the group as a whole that would not logically fit under any of the upcoming meeting agenda items. The following were raised:

Question: What were the results of the vibration testing conducted in June/July?

Response: With your permission, we will come back to this given that vibration testing is a topic that will be discussed later in the meeting.

Comment/*Question*: Regarding the issue of governance for the new border crossing, the Minister of Transportation was recently quoted as stating that the new crossing would be under public ownership. Is this the position of the DRIC Partnership? If these decisions are already made, what's the purpose of having a CCG? Are our views ignored?

Response: The Partnership has not made any decisions regarding the ownership of the new crossing. We cannot speak for the context in which the Minister made the comment, but we stand behind the previously released governance-related statements. As noted many times, the Project Team values and takes seriously the input from CCG members.

Question: Has DRIC considered the revised DRTP engineering study?

Response: The Project Team has only seen the DRTP's latest brochure identifying a revised proposal featuring tunneling from Highway 401 to the River including placing a plaza at Highway 401. The DRTP's original proposal included a two-lane truckway, which would not provide sufficient capacity in the long-term. In order to meet the future transportation needs

of the region, the tunnel and access road would need to be six lanes and accommodate both cars and trucks. The revised DRTP proposal includes placing a plaza at Highway 401 near Provincial Road. The Project Team has had discussions with the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), which has indicated that, for reasons of safety and security, the inspection plaza should be placed as close to the border as possible. Placing a plaza at Highway 401 is likely not acceptable to CBSA — though we are not aware of any discussions between DRTP and CBSA. In addition, the original DRTP proposal had several issues related to the plaza location and freeway connection on the U.S. side. We are not aware that these issues have been addressed through the revised DRTP proposal. The Partnership has eliminated the DRTP from further consideration as part of this environmental assessment, but this does not prevent DRTP from seeking its own approvals for a new transportation facility on its rail corridor.

Comment: On the U.S. side of the DRTP project, the notion of eminent domain would take effect [enabling the rail company to condemn property]. The land uses on the U.S. side of the DRTP project contain industrial and vacant properties. You need to separate cars and trucks.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Comment/*Question*: When looking at the current plans, it appears that the area from Howard to Cousineau contains a lot of 'at grade' to 'below grade' sections (like a snake-back) that will cause increased pollution given that traffic will have to constantly gear up and down to change grades. Will you account for and assess this?

Response: We understand the community's concerns about having a road with varying grades. Our air quality and noise specialists will be looking at how the road grades affect air quality and noise levels. We are still looking at a variety of options.

Comment: On June 1st the Border Infrastructure Group had a conference at which it was stated that 75% of the DRTP corridor could be used — this would result in a tunneled access road all the way to the Ambassador Bridge. The current plaza already has permission to expand on the U.S. side. We need to know whether trucks and cars will be separated. Businesses want cars on roads. We should place the trucks in tunnels. We need to consider the community impacts on Huron Church — the number of homes and businesses affected, and the cost-benefit analysis.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: When did the Project Team last meet with the DRTP?

Response: We met with them earlier this year.

Question: Doesn't the Project Team know about the rail corridor proposal and option?

Response: As noted earlier, we know about it.

Question: When will the air quality studies be conducted on Huron Church? Where are the exact locations for the monitors? What is the length of time the studies will be conducted? When will the results be available?

Response: The upcoming presentation will answer these questions and explain how the testing will be utilized in the broader study.

Question/Comment: Was Windsor City Council presented with a new set of plans in July? If so, this is distressing to me as a CCG member who attends these meetings and expects to be consulted on something this fundamental. As quoted in the Windsor Star, Mayor Francis stated that the extension of Highway 401 would have a devastating impact on the city and would further divide the community. At a U.S. meeting, residents from Delray asked for an apology from the consultants when they were not consulted on an issue before a position was taken and a statement made; the consultant team apologized. We are trying to be heard and want to minimize the impacts on the community. We are hoping that DRIC is listening.

Response: The plans that were shown to Windsor City Council in July were the plans presented at the March PIOH (Public Information Open House) and April Workshops, with refinements based on the input the Project Team received from the public. The public asked that the plans be changed to provide additional road and trail connections to maintain linkages between certain areas. These updated plans showed the enhancements to the originals presented at PIOH3 that were recommended by the CCG and at other meetings and workshops. The access road plans will continue to be refined and improved based on comments received. This is an ongoing process. In early October, we will be showing the public ideas about how the transportation infrastructure can best blend in with the community — we will be asking for feedback on these. In November, we will be discussing the look and fit of the crossing. There will be two workshops: one held in the U.S. and the other in Canada where we will ask the public about their preferences regarding themes for and the look of the crossing. In early December we will hold our fourth PIOH. No decisions will be made then, but we will be presenting the analysis conducted to date.

Update on Consultation Activities

- Len Kozachuk (Deputy Project Manager, URS Canada) provided an overview of various consultation activities that have taken place in the recent past and that are upcoming. More specifically, he referenced the following:
    - The June 23rd and 24th Context Sensitive Solutions Workshops held at St. Clair College in Windsor to get input from the public regarding the look and feel of the crossing, plaza and access road options — and the related upcoming follow-up workshops to present potential landscaping approaches/aesthetic treatments regarding the access road and plaza, and to get public response/input. The follow-up workshops were tentatively scheduled for late September. [Note: they were actually held on Oct. 2/3, 2006.]
    - The upcoming joint bi-national workshops (one in Detroit and one in Windsor) to identify preferences for the look and fit of the bridge crossing.
    - The planned Canadian Public Information Open House #4 (tentatively scheduled for December 6 and 7 in Windsor) to present analysis conducted to date regarding the alternatives within the ACA and to gather input regarding information shown.

- Mr. Kozachuk also noted that there is an upcoming meeting with the newly constituted School Advisory Group (which is comprised of school officials/council members from schools in and around the ACA).

- Following Mr. Kozachuk's overview as described above, CCG members offered a number of comments and questions:

  Comment: I have been to a lot of meetings and we still don't know what the decisions are regarding the route, plaza and crossing location. These are the important things. Discussing the aesthetics — colours and materials for the bridge and access roads — are a waste of time and money.

  > *Response*: The Project Team appreciates your opinion. We hold workshops on various topics to gather public input and clearly describe the session focus in the meeting notices. People can choose to attend and participate as they see fit. We want to provide every interested member of the public with an opportunity to have input into this project. There are many participants that have found the previous workshops concerning aesthetics very interesting and valuable.

  Comment/Question: The Michigan legislature stated that the U.S. DRIC Project Team couldn't conduct any more design work for this project on the American side. Aren't you in breach of Michigan law?

  > *Response*: The current language of the directive from the Michigan legislature restricts Michigan Department of Transportation from spending money on design and right-of-way work without going back to the legislature to get approval to do so. The U.S. DRIC Project Team is able to

continue with the engineering and planning work for this study. In Ontario, there are different degrees of design: there is preliminary design, which is typically part of the Environmental Assessment process, and there is detailed design, which is more specific and normally occurs after a preferred alternative is chosen.

Comment/Question: We keep hearing that you want public input. The message we are giving the Project Team is that we don't like what you are proposing — we don't like your alternatives. Can't you come up with something else? We suggest tunneling and that you separate the cars and the trucks.

Response: The Project Team has heard what the public has been saying. We started this project over 18 months ago and started with 15 different potential crossing locations along the Detroit River. We appreciate that many people are not pleased with the location of the ACA. However, we need to balance transportation needs with the needs of the community. All the data we examined suggests that the ACA is the appropriate area for the new crossing, plaza and access road. We will consider the same seven major factors in our analysis during this practical alternatives phase of the study. Once we have determined a preferred alternative, the Ontario Minister of the Environment and Canadian federal agencies will make the final decision as to whether the study was properly conducted and the conclusion rational, traceable and defendable. U.S. government authorities will also review the decision on their side.

Question: Will a poll be conducted for this project? Why not have a poll?

Response: Conducting a poll or survey and taking a vote is not a traceable exercise, nor a sufficiently rigourous means of determining a preferred alternative. The factors and considerations are too complex to try and make this a popularity contest. Our technical process for identifying a preferred alternative has been laid out and public input is an essential consideration that influences decision-making. We have created multiple ways in which any member of the community can provide input.

Question/Comment: When you considered your original 15 alternatives, did you consider tunneling for any of them? It is not fair to represent the analysis without considering tunneling — you need to go back a few steps and re-consider the original alternatives with tunneling as an option for them.

Response: The Project Team considered all illustrative connecting route alternatives as at-grade facilities to provide a common basis for analysis. Altering the profile of an illustrative access road alternative to a depressed or tunneled design is considered to be a method of mitigating impacts of that alternative, rather than a new alternative.

Question: Will the approval for the entire study occur in 2008 — for both sides of the border? Has the March 2007 date changed?

> *Response*: The Canadian study has the same timelines as the U.S. — we plan on choosing our preferred alternative in 2007. It could take up to one year to get approval if, in fact, an approval is forthcoming.

Question: When will the public find out what the preferred alternative is?

> *Response*: We will be having an open house in 2007 for the public to comment upon what the Project Team has identified as the preferred alternative. The precise date has not yet been identified.

Question/Comment: Can and will the DRIC unequivocally and publicly state that there has been no political influence or interference with regard to the decision to eliminate any private proposals? This answer is critical as a matter of public record as it will become a significant issue in any and all potential, and probable, lawsuits related to the DRIC's final recommendation.

> *Response*: The DRIC study is based on technical work produced by the Project Team. It is backed-up by technical analysis and has incorporated public input. There has been no political influence on the decisions made to date on this project.

Presentation on Tunneling

- Glenn Pothier introduced the next meeting component — namely a Project Team presentation on the issue of tunneling and covering such topics as: tunneling techniques and related technical issues, staging, ventilation and so forth.

- Murray Thompson (Project Manager, URS Canada) began by introducing Storer Boone, from Golder Associates, and provided a brief overview of Mr. Boone's background (over 20 years of experience, including work on bridge and tunneling projects around the world). Mr. Thompson also noted that:
    - All access road options are being fully studied and evaluated.
    - Construction staging and construction methods discussed in the tunneling presentation can also be applied to the depressed (that is, below grade) alternatives.
    - Tunneling is being examined from south of Howard Avenue to the E.C. Row/Huron Church area.
    - Highway 3 currently has a 55m wide right-of-way, and Huron Church has a 36m wide right-of-way — and that the tunnel option requires an 80m right-of-way, so additional property will have to be acquired.
    - There is a high groundwater table beneath the access road alternatives and the soil conditions are comprised of silty-clay — and that there are 20m of

silty clay soil near the river area and 35m near the Highway 401/Highway 3 area.

- Tim Sorochinsky (Project Engineer, URS Canada), then:
  - Showed typical cross-sections of parts of Highway 3 and Huron Church Road.
  - Described soil and groundwater conditions in the area.
  - Noted that there are a number of existing municipal drains and utilities that need to be taken into consideration.
  - Showed typical cross-sections of selected utilities.
  - Described the design criteria for the tunnel.

- During his part of the presentation, Mr. Boone described the different tunneling methods (bored and cut-and-cover), noting the suitability and implications of each. Bored tunnels were described as not feasible for the area given local conditions. He also noted that:
  - In order to have a properly designed bored 3-lane highway tunnel (in each direction), you need a layer of soft ground cover that is more than 25-35m in depth.
  - A bored tunnel will have surface impacts at the portals, at the locations of the ventilation buildings, and the access/egress points.
  - A cut and cover tunnel is feasible and will be taken forward for further analysis and evaluation.

- As part of his overall presentation, Mr. Storer also:
  - Showed an image of a cut and cover tunnel, and route and tunnel profiles.
  - Described different tunnel construction methods (and related staging/phasing) and said that the same technologies for constructing cut and cover tunnel walls could be used to construct the walls for the depressed roadway sections.
  - Noted that the Project Team is arranging for 23 shallow hole boreholes to be drilled along the Huron Church and Highway 3 corridor to help confirm soil conditions.

- Tim Sorochinsky then:
  - Described the structural requirements for a tunnel.
  - Discussed ventilation options — and showed examples of ventilation buildings.
  - Described potential sites for ventilation buildings.
  - Outlined ventilation building requirements to ensure compliance with regulations concerning air quality, noise and vibration.
  - Provided an example of mitigation measures concerning pedestrian plazas associated with I-696 in Michigan.
  - Described public and highway safety considerations that would need to be taken into account.

- Provided an overview of the upcoming work related to the tunneling option.

- During and following Mr. Boone's (and Mr. Sorochinsky's) presentation, CCG members offered a number of questions and comments:

  Comment: Based on information given previously, it's not clear whether you need 25-30 metres or 25-35 metres of soft ground cover — you need to update and clarify this.

  Response: [Comment noted. While the soft ground conditions for a bored tunnel are achieved at the Highway 401 terminus, the ground conditions drop down to 30m at the Grand Marais Drain and 25 m along Ojibway Parkway, thus making it not feasible for bored tunnel construction.]

  Question: Would you use the posts if you weren't putting a cover on to create the tunnel?

  Response: You could use them in the construction of a below-grade option.

  Question: Where would the tunnel stop/end?

  Response: It is proposed to end near Huron Church and E.C. Row Expressway. Traffic will return to grade in the area of Malden Road.

  Question: You stated that tunneling will require 80m of right-of-way — what will the work zone require in addition to the 80m?

  Response: The 80m is the right-of-way and will accommodate the work zone. Work zone dimensions will vary along the corridor — the widest work zone will be approximately 40m. The work zone requirements may increase given potential enhanced regulations for worker safety in construction zones. The requirements are constantly changing based on Ministry of Labour requirements.

  Comment: We want a tunnel. Businesses on Huron Church are suffering from the truck traffic. If you tunnel only to E.C. Row Expressway, you are hurting businesses that exist along Huron Church Road from E.C. Row Expressway to the Ambassador Bridge.

  Response: The purpose of the project is to provide for the safe and efficient movement of traffic. Connections to and from the access road and the Huron Church corridor north of E.C. Row will be provided. Business impacts to operations located on Huron Church Road between the E.C. Row Expressway and the Ambassador Bridge will be considered in the Economic Impact Assessment being conducted by our economic

specialists. We understand that these businesses serve both the west end residents and tourist traffic.

Question: Is the tunnel going to be a truck route?

Response: The tunnel will accommodate both car and truck traffic. If motorists wish to exit the tunnel, they can do so at St. Clair College and continue on the surface route. Access to the Ambassador Bridge will also be maintained.

Question: In terms of the cut and cover tunnel option, would it not be better to make the "roof" of the tunnel thicker?

Response: The roof will be designed to ensure the proper structural tolerances. From a geotechnical perspective, we would place and compact granular materials on top and then pave or landscape this area. A tunnel roof closer to the surface creates issues with accommodating drainage and utilities.

Comment/Question: At the last CCG meeting, you stated that the access road boring program would be conducted under a different scope from that planned for the crossing locations. Why not incorporate them under the same program to ensure cost effectiveness? Also, if a bored tunnel is not feasible, I have yet to see any technical analysis that proves this. I would like to know why it has been taken off the table before you have drilled a single hole. Don't make a decision before you have all of the data.

Response: There are two distinctly different drilling programs planned: the program down at the riverfront will be drilling up to depths of 500m to test bedrock conditions. Along the approach corridor, we are applying a conventional geotechnical program with shallower boreholes (up to 30m deep). Technical analysis of a bored tunnel begins with a feasibility study — this can be done before you have the drilling data. Golder Associates has gathered subsurface data from all areas of Windsor and have reviewed reports from the MTO from the 1970s — the firm is familiar with the ground conditions in this area in terms of strength, depth, etc. The DRIC drilling program will make sure that the data is available for critical points along the corridor.

Comment/Question: I would like to see a full report concerning the feasibility of the bored tunnel approach. Will you make the technical data available?

Response: When it is completed, the Project Team will make it available.

Comment/Question: I am concerned that the tunneling option is not being treated seriously and that you are just paying lip service to it. If there is a tunnel, will it be

six lanes below and six lanes above? If this is constructed, can you restrict it to trucks only? Can you place a sign saying trucks only? The trucks only option will help alleviate business concerns.

Response: The Project Team is seriously studying the cut and cover tunnel option as well as the depressed and at-grade options. We will assess the strengths and weaknesses of all these options and present the information to the public. There would be six traffic lanes (three in each direction) in the tunnel. The number of lanes on the service road — above a tunnel — is not determined, but will likely be at least four lanes (two in each direction). We are planning an access road that will provide a sufficient number of lanes to accommodate mixed traffic. This would not preclude MTO from restricting the tunnel to trucks at some point in the future.

Question: Can we assume that the tunnel ventilation will use scrubbers?

Response: If it is determined that the tunnel ventilation exhaust must be treated to comply with emission standards, various techniques for meeting the emission standards, including the use of scrubbers, will be investigated.

Comment: From a regular cross-border commuter perspective, I don't want to have to stay on the surface and deal with traffic lights. I don't want the tunnel restricted to only trucks — I want cars to have the option of using a faster route to cross the border. If the tunnel is 6km long, there needs to be some signage that will warn drivers if there is a slowdown or an issue within the tunnel so that they could take an alternative route.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Question: You said that you need an 80m right-of-way on Talbot Road. What is the current right-of-way on Talbot Road?

Response: The current right-of-way on Talbot Road is generally 55 m.

Question: Will you need property from along Talbot Road?

Response: Yes.

Question: Have you designed the tunnel to have an exit at the halfway point, before the crossing?

Response: Yes, there will be an entrance/exit for vehicles at St. Clair College and one at E.C. Row.

Comment: My concern has to do with what is right for the City of Windsor. If we allow vehicles in the tunnel, they will not see how beautiful Windsor is and won't

stop and spend time here. There needs to be an option for travelers to remain on the surface and get to view Windsor.

> *Response*: Motorists would have a choice as to whether they want to travel to the border in a tunnel, or if they wish to take the surface route.

Question: My home is 100 feet from the Grand Marais Drain — will it have to be acquired? If you have an existing 55m right-of-way, and you need 80m, will all the property be taken on the right side?

> *Response*: There are a number of things that can be done with the drain and we will be evaluating the impacts of taking property on one side of the roadway versus the other. However, it is not possible to maintain both sides of the road — some additional property will be required in the area of the drain.

Question: In light of the recent tragedy with the tunnel accident in Boston, I would like to know what the safest method is for tunnel construction.

> *Response*: The accident with the Boston tunnel resulted from the improper installation of ceiling tiles, which were in place for aesthetic purposes. It was not part of the tunnel structure itself.

Question: What is the life expectancy of a tunnel?

> *Response*: 80-100 years.

Question: How will dust be contained during construction — is it sprayed with water?

> *Response*: The Ministry [MTO] has a number of provisions in its contract to control dust during construction, such as spraying the work zone with water. There are methods for mitigating this issue.

Question: If the tunnel surfaces at E.C. Row, what is the length of the access road? This may be an issue for Spring Garden and Armanda Street residents.

> *Response*: The tunnel will end at E.C. Row and it will surface to an at-grade road. There will be a bridge over Malden Road.

Question: Can you extend the tunnel further?

> *Response*: We will certainly consider it.

Comment/Question: If you construct a tunnel, you will adhere to air quality and noise regulations as described in the presentation. How will both noise and air quality be controlled with the at-grade and depressed options?

> *Response*: There are different rules for controlling emissions when dealing with the tunneling option. What is unique about the tunneling option is that the stack emissions are different than those emitted from the open road. However, even with the open road options (depressed and at-grade), changes in air quality will also be assessed against government standards.

Question: What is the timeline for construction of a cut and cover tunnel?

> *Response*: A 6km cut and cover tunnel will involve several years of construction — typically a 4-5 year construction period. This does not mean that construction will occur for 4-5 years in front of a single home — the location of the construction will shift over time.

Question: What would happen to all the excavated soil — how will it be removed from the construction site and will trucks be driving out with the soil 24/7?

> *Response*: The contractor will identify a suitable location for the disposal of the excavated soil. The timing of the construction activity will adhere to local bylaws, unless a special exemption is granted.

Question: During the construction time period, how feasible is it to funnel traffic into half the lanes available to cross the border?

> *Response*: The commitment is to keep open and maintain the same number of lanes as is available today while the highway is under construction.

Question: I need clarification: I understand that you are looking at what you think might work given EA regulations, social impacts and so on. Is part of this job to set the design standards — are you designing the access roads or tunnel option so that a contractor can bid on it?

> *Response*: Once the project has environmental assessment approval, the next phase will be to complete detailed design of the access road, plaza and crossing. Contractors bid on contract packages prepared during this detailed design stage.

Comment: There is a very large bored tunnel being constructed near Niagara Falls for power generation — it is being bored through bedrock.

> *Response*: The Sir Adam Beck Tunnel is a water storage tunnel being constructed near Niagara Falls. It is bored through shale bedrock — there are no soft ground conditions in that area.

Project Update

- Glenn Pothier noted that it was time to move into the 'project update' component of the meeting — and he described a variety of agenda items to be covered.

- Len Kozachuk then provided an update on air quality monitoring noting that:
    - Two candidate sites have been identified for monitors along the access route: one at Mt. Carmel School and the second at the Public Health Laboratory on Huron Church Road (and that the Project Team is waiting to get final approval to place the monitoring stations at these two locations).
    - The sites will monitor nitrogen oxides, PM2.5 and conduct discrete modeling of benzene and formaldehyde.
    - The sites will monitor weather conditions and correlate them with traffic data for a 12-month period.
    - The data derived from the two new air quality stations will be used in conjunction with the other two stations in the city.

- This update was followed by a number of questions and comments:

  Question: How will you be using the air quality data?

  > *Response*: The Project Team will be looking at the data from all of Windsor's air quality testing locations and data from other studies. The Project Team will be developing an ambient condition model to determine what air quality will be like in 2035. We will be assessing what any changes in concentrations will be and relate the data back to the existing condition.

  Comment/Question: The Project Team will be coming up with their preferred alternative next year. You will not have the information from the new monitoring stations by then. How can you choose an option before having the data from the new monitors?

  > *Response*: The data gathered from the air quality monitoring stations will be used to confirm or improve the data we currently have on the existing or baseline condition. Air quality is one of the seven important factors that will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives. The Project Team will be using computerized air dispersion models to predict future air quality conditions for each of the practical alternatives. The models will take into account factors such as future traffic volumes, changing fuel standards, and new vehicle emissions standards. We will be comparing the changes in pollutant concentrations resulting from the alternatives. This comparison is

not primarily dependent on the data being collected by the monitoring stations.

Comment/Question: By the year 2035 there should be cleaner fuel and new pollution devices on trucks — the air coming out of the trucks will be better than that coming in! Given that there will be virtually no air pollution from vehicles and you likely won't have a problem with this in the future, why are you monitoring air quality at all?

Response: We expect that vehicle emissions will be substantially improved by 2035. However, we can't assume zero emissions. We need to do the air quality-related technical work that can inform wise decision-making. The community expects this of the Project Team.

Question: If monitoring shows that air quality is at the maximum or exceeding the standards, would that factor alone cause tunnels to be the preferred alternative?

Response: The short answer is no. There are a number of other factors that have to be considered. Air quality is an important factor, but one among many.

Question: Are you modeling air quality at the potential plaza locations — and how will you account for delays at the border? Where is the plaza-related air quality data coming from?

Response: We are using the same model for the plazas as for the rest of the connecting route. The traffic data used to model air quality impacts includes a breakdown of both cars and trucks entering and exiting Canada, which gives us an indication of which vehicles will be routed to each plaza booth. The plaza designer (Stantec) provided Project Team with information regarding how quickly vehicles are inspected, and generally how many vehicles wait in line at each booth under typical conditions. We are assuming that these vehicles are idling in the queue. We know the average length of time it takes to get vehicles inspected. We also know how many booths are open, based on traffic volumes, and how this varies hour to hour. All of these factors have been considered and incorporated in the modeling to give the most accurate result possible.

Question: Why not monitor air quality at the plaza that exists?

Response: CBSA has started to look at this and we understand that they will share data if and when it becomes available.

Question: What are the results of the vibration testing?

Response: The vibration testing occurred along Highway 3 and the Huron Church corridor. All vibration levels fell within the guidelines — except at the Ambassador Bridge, where it was at the detectable level.

- Len Kozachuk then provided updates on:
  - The deep borehole program — noting that drilling will begin soon.
  - The economic assessment — noting that meetings are being conducted with businesses on Huron Church to ask about their operations and explore how a new crossing will affect them.
  - The natural environment work — noting that field personnel are conducting investigations and collecting data.
  - Air quality and noise — noting that assessments are in progress in both of these areas.
  - The social impact assessment — noting that households in the ACA are being invited to focus groups to discuss community and access impacts, and potential means of mitigating them.

- Mohammed Alghurabi (Michigan Department of Transportation) provided a brief status update on the U.S. companion study. More specifically, he noted that the U.S. Project Team has held 12 different workshops similar to those being arranged on the Canadian side to discuss context sensitive elements and to determine the look, fit and type of theme the community would like for the new plaza and crossing. He also noted that the U.S. Project Team has a similar program for deep drilling near the river — and that presently, the U.S. team is securing the necessary property owner permissions to access certain areas.

- Len Kozachuk then reminded the group about the upcoming collaboration between the Canadian and U.S. Project teams regarding the joint bi-national crossing workshops — one in Detroit (Nov. 2nd) and one in Windsor (Nov. 15th) — to identify preferences for the look and fit of the bridge crossing. More details are to be provided at the next CCG meeting.

- These updates were followed by a few CCG member questions/comments:

  Question: Has the U.S. authorized a crossing area — is there an approved American crossing site?

  Response: The U.S. team is working in tandem with the Canadian team to determine where the crossing will land. No decision on a crossing has been made on the U.S. side.

  Comment: There is a huge misunderstanding among the public. People need to know that URS is the consulting group conducting the environmental assessment. They are not the final decision-makers. The decision-makers for this project are the MP's and MPP's. People need to put pressure on the government. Let URS

know and let the government know you do not want this new crossing in Windsor.

Response: [Comment noted.]

Open Forum/Public Comment

- Glenn Pothier asked whether the Project Team had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No issues were raised.

- Glenn Pothier then asked whether CCG members had any further business to add to the meeting agenda. No issues were raised.

- Glenn Pothier then asked if any comments/questions were forthcoming from observers at this time. There were none.

Next Steps

- Len Kozachuk noted that the next CCG meeting is scheduled for October 26th and that the meeting agenda will be distributed in advance — one agenda item will include the upcoming crossing workshop. Mr. Kozachuk also noted that the project teams are discussing a combined LAC/CCG meeting in November, similar to the one held earlier this year at the Ciaciaro Club (with the location likely to be in Detroit, possibly on Nov. 29th). More information on this will be forthcoming as it is available.

Closing Remarks

- Glenn Pothier thanked the group for their attendance and participation.

- The meeting was formally adjourned (having run from approximately 6:35 to 9:40 p.m.).

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

CCG Members and Public Observers:
Pierre Quenneville
Denise Ausman
Paul Ausman
Tedd Szalay
Chris Paley-Symons
Lois Findlay
Jim Martin
Kevin O'Neil
Les Chaif
Elizabeth Havelock
George Sterling
Shirley Sterling
Clara Deck
Terry Kennedy
Win Stebbing
Ingrid Rose
Jeff O'Brien
Alice Di Caro
Al Teshuba
Bill Marshall
Mary Ann Cuderman
Jaye Lacerte
Joyce Breault
Albert Biever
Mark Butler
Don Patterson
Anna Lynn Meloche
James White
Ed Arditti
Ed Oleksiuk
E. R.
L.
Mike Duchene
Jim Gerassimou
Louanne Sharp
Lucy Malizia
Jim Doig
Alan McKinnon
Moe Haas
June Thibert
Bob Thibert
Bill Youdelis

Partnership:
Roger Ward, Joel Foster and Kevin DeVos — Ontario Ministry of Transportation

Consultant Team:
Murray Thompson, Len Kozachuk, Tim Sorochinsky, Irene Hauzar — URS; Audrey Steele — LGL Limited; Storer Boone — Golder Associates.