



November 29, 2005

Sean O'Dell
Executive Director, Windsor Gateway Project
Transport Canada
Place de Ville, Tower C, 27th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N5

Detroit River International Crossing
Preliminary Statement of Requirements for the CBSA Port of Entry

Dear Mr. O'Dell:

The purpose of this letter is to provide the Canada Border Services Agency's (CBSA's) preliminary statement of requirement (SOR(P)) for port of entry installations in the context of the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) study. The intent is to define CBSA's needs in terms of a generic facility and land requirement to examine goods and people entering Canada as a component for inclusion in the analysis of the practical alternatives in the next phase of the DRIC study. In addition, we provide the Agency's views on related issues that have arisen in our discussions of the study and the Windsor Gateway in general.

As you know, the CBSA's mandate is to facilitate the movement of legitimate persons and goods into Canada, interdict the entry of those that are inadmissible, and enforce the relevant border program legislation. In addition, CBSA controls exports from Canada for compliance with Canadian legislation and international obligations. In general, cars and trucks entering Canada report at a first point of entry where a primary inspection is conducted. Then, they proceed from the Primary Inspection Line (PIL) either directly to their destination in Canada or to the customs office for further processing and possibly a thorough examination. The outcome of this secondary processing can be the release of the goods and people, the denial of entry to undesirable individuals or goods, or the arrest of offenders.

The SOR(P) is based on the following: first, the space requirements are viewed on a 30-year planning horizon with a maximum traffic forecast of 2,000 Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE) per peak hour traffic. The traffic mix consists of approximately 1/4 commercial and 3/4 passenger vehicles. The new crossing will incorporate a dedicated lane for trusted-traveller programs such as Free and Secure Trade (FAST) and NEXUS as well as dedicated highway lanes to and from the crossing.

.../2

Second, the secondary inspection facility must be adjacent to the PIL. As you know, the commercial secondary inspection for the Ambassador Bridge is located approximately 4 km away from the port of entry. There have been significant security problems with this arrangement, which are unacceptable from an operational perspective. In addition, it jeopardizes our ability to discharge that part of our mandate that puts the impetus on us to provide integrated border services that enhance national security and public safety. In our view it is an essential operational requirement for the secondary inspection areas to be located immediately adjacent to the primary inspection areas. However, at constrained locations, it may be possible to locate certain administrative or support functions off-site.

Finally, the port of entry should be organized in a linear fashion, with parallel flows of commercial and passenger vehicles after primary inspection to promote smooth traffic flow through the port. Commercial and passenger vehicle traffic paths should not cross each other and the co-mingling of cleared and un-cleared traffic must not be possible.

At the front of our facilities is the PIL, followed by sufficient space to safely egress and proceed either to designated parking for secondary inspection or to final destination in Canada. Next in line is the secondary inspection facility, which precedes the exit point before rejoining the highway to Canada's interior.

Given that this will be a toll crossing, provisions of several legislations in Canada will obligate the crossing's owner to provide, at no cost to her Majesty, adequate spaces for CBSA to examine people and goods seeking entry into Canada. As the owner of the POE facilities, the crossing's owner could develop and implement an appropriate facility development strategy to add facilities incrementally to meet increasing demand over the planning horizon as long as sufficient land is acquired or reserved in the procurement phase of the crossing project to construct the facilities necessary to accommodate the long-term requirements.

The project should incorporate appropriate separation and or shielding between the port of entry and adjacent land uses. This is required to mitigate the impact of noise and lighting emanating from the port on adjacent land users. The actual separation and shielding should be a function of the sensitivity of the adjacent land use. The land required for this has been excluded from the port's land requirement described below.

Although there are some similarities in the border management approaches of the US Customs and Border Protection (US CBP) and the CBSA, there are significant differences in policies, procedures and processes.

Consequently, our facility requirements may differ significantly and should not be used to extrapolate the US CBP's needs. The facility space requirements for the CBSA port of entry are summarized in the attached table. Approximately 15.5 hectares of land will be necessary (250m by 620m) to accommodate the facility.

It is essential that the port of entry be located as close as practical to the point of entry into Canada. Although it is possible to construct and monitor a sterile corridor, the risk of breaching the sterility increases with the length of the corridor, and with the number of overpasses, underpasses, and of emergency access points necessary for police, fire, and ambulance interventions. Further, the longer the corridor, the longer the intervention time to deal with a security issue. Our view is that, sterile corridors longer than 1 to 2 km are not practical and should be avoided.

The perimeter of the port must be secured for two reasons. First, as a traffic safety measure, to prevent pedestrian access to heavy traffic circulation within the port. Second, from a security perspective, to prevent the co-mingling with un-cleared traffic within the port, to prevent the flight of inadmissible persons, and to contain incidents that may occur within the port. This is normally accomplished with a standard chain link fence.

I hope that you will find this information useful. Should you wish to discuss this matter further you can contact me at (613) 941-7905.

Yours truly,



Claude Béland
Director General
Infrastructure and Environmental
Operations

Attachment

c.c.: Pete DiPonio, Regional Director General, Windsor/St. Clair
Cathy Munro, Director General, Operations Branch
Martin Mündel, A/Director, Cabinet Portfolio Affairs

Table 1 Summary – CBSA Port of Entry Preliminary Statement of Requirements: Detroit River International Crossing Study

	Building Areas (m²-useable)	Paved Areas (m²) (parking, circulation, standing areas)
Traffic (Passenger Vehicles)		
Primary Inspection Lanes (17)	736	11,506
Secondary Examination	85	1,687
General Parking		4,511
Office and ancillary space	1,691	
Sub-Total	2,512	17,704
Commercial Inspection		
Primary Inspection Lanes (9)	496	9,573
General Parking		10,486
Office and ancillary space	1,830	
Commercial Inspection	3,821	3,676
Outbound Inspection	28	911
Bus Processing	243	208
Sub-Total	6,417	24,854
General Circulation (allow 200%)		102,973
TOTAL	8,929	145,531
TOTAL Building + Paved Areas		154,460 (15.5 ha)