

On behalf my House colleagues, I would like to thank Chairman Gilbert and his committee members for joining us for these joint hearings. I am honored to serve with each of you.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank all those who testified before this committee.

After listening to a wealth of information from a variety of viewpoints on the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) study, I have reached the following conclusions:

- While the data demonstrates a need for an additional international crossing within the next 20-30 years in the Detroit-Windsor corridor, the DRIC team plans to have a crossing open to the public by 2013. With the cost of a new crossing being roughly \$1.3 billion to the U.S. side alone, I am not sure this is the best use of our state and federal transportation dollars when we have roads and bridges in dire need of repair today.
- It is quite clear that this DRIC study process is flawed. It was designed to steer us towards a pre-determined conclusion. In looking at the DRIC study's reports, one can see that decisions were made using value judgments, that Canada and the U.S. had a policy of eliminating possible alternatives without question of the other's motivation, and that certain NEPA guidelines were not always followed. In particular, I was concerned with the biased collection of the public data. The data collection took place on a very limited basis in southeast Michigan alone and was not a reflection of the state's opinion on an additional crossing.
- The issue of security ranks on the DRIC process study's list of reasons we need an additional crossing, but Jim Steel of FHWA stated before the committee that each crossing conducts its own security and that there is no one body on the U.S. side currently

commissioned to evaluate border security. Perhaps some of the money we're considering spending on an additional crossing should be used to secure existing crossings.

- When the mayor of the city of Detroit does not support the plan that involves and impacts his city more than any other in the state, we have cause for real concern. The mayor's characterization of a "study out of [] control" that "exacerbates the threat to the economic vitality of Detroit" should at least give pause to plans which do not include nor meet the approval of our most populous city – a city which received \$184 million in Gateway infrastructure improvements to accommodate border traffic. Now taxpayers will be forced to spend much more to accommodate border traffic to the south of the region where this money was already expended.
- While I must acknowledge MDOT's willingness to come forward and shed light on the DRIC process to date, I am deeply disappointed in the direction of this study. I am concerned that the process has been compromised by politics and am not convinced that the issue of the additional crossing's cost has been properly studied. As an elected representative, I have a responsibility to Michigan's taxpayers. As government employees, you do, too. I request a suspension of the current tunnel focus on the Delray-Sandwich corridor. At this time, I also request that MDOT take a hard look at the public dollars spent to advance a project that their own estimates demonstrate is not needed at this time. In addition, the money spent on this study and on a future additional crossing would be better spent improving our existing infrastructure. I share the same concerns as a number of my colleagues and hereby serve notice that I reserve the right to schedule further committee hearings or pursue legislative action.