

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
1	7-May-09	Walid Akkary	<p>My name is Walid Akkary, I currently own and reside at the property located in Windsor at the address municipally known as 2450 Lambton St.</p> <p>Lambton street runs east to west staring at the main intersection know as Huron Church Road in Windsor, Ontario. There are 5 newer homes including my home and one small old home in the only block of Lambton Street staring from Huron Church Road.</p> <p>My home is the fifth home from the main street Huron Church Road, all 5 homes are similar in size and age and forms a quiet residential street with six neighbors. All homes are well maintained and close to each other to form a small, but yet safe, quiet and clean block.</p> <p>It was brought to my attention by some of the neighbors that the Ministry has either already purchased or in the process of negotiating towards purchasing all four properties located east of my home. If in fact this was the case my home will be the only remaining home of all the 5 newer homes in that block.</p> <p>The reason I purchased my home at 2450 Lambton St in Windsor was after careful analysis and consideration of the size of the street and the number of homes available on that street, for safety reasons and the ability to be closer to other homes with similar families and life style.</p> <p>I ask and appeal to the persons in authority and in charge of the decision making to review the future plan for Lambton Street, and if in fact the above information is correct that all consideration be given to my circumstances; and weigh fairly the impact that such a plan will bring upon my family from emotional, security and financial.</p> <p>I am willing and will look forward at your earliest convenience for a mutual meeting to discuss the issue above and for a face to face clarification of all details if the above statement is true in fact.</p> <p>I would also ask that if not all properties are being purchased that the persons in charge disclose to me and my family exactly what homes will be acquired for the DRIC project.</p>	MTO responded on June 22, 2009. Property not required.
2	8-May-09	Anthony Johnston, P.Eng.	<p>The EA for the DRIC is flawed for a very simple reason. The base comparison case is against doing nothing rather than making it better. Your response will state that it meets the requirements of the act. That merely means it is technically correct but functionally useless. Anyone who is on top of the ongoing research into sub 2.5 micron diesel fume emissions will tell you that this is a disaster waiting to happen. It was only recently that the first conclusive report came out showing a correlation to reduced life expectancy and exposure to sub 2.5 microns. I bet dollars to donuts your constituency doesn't have a ten lane super highway going through your neighbourhood. I challenge you to authentically respond to the fact that there is a huge question mark over the health effects of sub 2.5 micron diesel exhaust. I challenge you to defend the comparison against doing nothing. I live in South Windsor and commute daily and work in the automotive industry. I am not a</p>	MOE does not require response because a response to this issue has been provided previously.

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			NIMBY. I am embarrassed that this is the best that your department can do. Just rubberstamp it and go on your way. Again, I challenge you to authentically answer my questions. Good day.	
3	11-May-09	Citizens for Jobs Now	Are you aware of the Essex County Group "Citizens for Jobs Now"? My understanding is that Windsor City Council calls us the CIBPA (Canadian Italian Business Professional Association). The current group was started by CIBPA and now has grown to include every business, labour group and citizen in Essex County. Please find attached our contact information. I am certain that our group will assist members of Parliament to ensure that we the people of Essex County can go forward. The views and opinions of Eddie Francis are NOT the views and opinions of the people of Windsor nor are they acceptable to us. Please let me know what we can do to help. Thank you.	No reply required.
4	20-May-09	Henry Harwood (Huron Estates Home Owners Association)	<p>I am a retired teacher living in Huron Estates right beside the proposed DRIC Parkway, a member of the Huron Estates Home Owners Association, composed of over 210 households. I am very upset with the inadequate environmental and health protections offered by the DRIC project. If we are going to build such a massive and important access route to Canada which won't be redone for the next 100 – 150 years, and so close to communities, it's important to do it right.</p> <p>The DRIC proposal and Environmental Assessment has received a failing grade from several quarters including two members of the Ministry's own analysis team who have pointed out serious flaws and distortions with "findings" in DRIC's EA Report. One concluded that, either "the impacts to air quality are much worse than the description (in the Report) suggests or they are downplaying environmental concerns." And further, "The Ontario Medical Association continues to assert that poor air quality results in thousands of premature deaths in Ontario each year. This should not be downplayed in the interest of improving regional mobility." as the DRIC team asserts.</p> <p>Most importantly, it has poor or no protection for human health. Another scientist, a regulatory toxicologist for the standards development branch of the Ministry of the Environment, has cited "numerous inconsistencies and errors" in the DRIC EA. This critique states that "several known pollutants, some considered human carcinogens, from diesel emissions were among those not measured by DRIC." Other criticisms include the fact that the DRIC health study fails to consider the impact on users of the Parkway's green space and trails, fails to measure the indoor exposure for nearby residents and schoolchildren, and that the DRIC team used outdated and incorrect standards to measure health risks for several toxins, including formaldehyde and sulphur dioxide. The Parkway will be too dangerous for recreational use.</p> <p>DRIC has no serious or effective plans to prevent damage or to clean up pollutants. There is no proper tunnelling. There are no fans or venting for directing, no filters or scrubbers (chemical washes) for cleaning diesel and car exhaust (such as</p>	<p>As noted in the MOE Review, MTO has responded to all the comments that were raised about the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA). An amended HHRA report (March 31 2009) was prepared, in response to discussions with MOE. There are no errors in the calculations provided in the HHRA. Appropriate standards were used to determine exposures to chemicals such as formaldehyde and sulphur dioxide. Chemicals associated with vehicle tailpipe emissions and vehicular movements on roads were considered in the selection of Chemicals of Concern (COCs). A detailed discussion of all the chemicals considered and the rationale for dropping chemicals from further consideration was also provided, therefore all potential pollutants were considered in the health evaluation. Indoor air exposure was not considered, and an explanation is provided in the updated HHRA. The evaluation considered that individuals would be exposed to the maximum air concentrations at a given location (outdoors) such as schools, daycares, residences and homes for the aged for 24 hours a day, every day for their lifetime. This is very conservative given that the indoor air concentrations would be lower and thus exposures would be lower. Additional calculations and discussion were provided for recreational users of the trails on the green space in the updated Risk Assessment document (March 31, 2009). While the concentrations within these green spaces are higher than concentrations in the residential receptor locations, background concentrations still account for a substantial fraction of the exposure. No adverse effects are predicted as a result of exposure within the right-of-way.</p> <p>While many tunnels worldwide employ mechanical ventilation techniques due to their length and requirement of maintaining in-tunnel air quality, few of these have air cleaning systems. Where air cleaning systems have been used, Electrostatic Precipitators (ESPs) have typically been installed primarily to control in-tunnel visibility. These tunnel cleaning systems only typically treat a small amount (between 10-20%) of the in-tunnel air and do not treat the balance.</p> <p>Comprehensive reviews on the use of air pollution controls in tunnels have been conducted by regulatory agencies in Australia. They have generally concluded that</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			benzene, a known carcinogen), and no plans for clean-up of traffic sloughage (such as asbestos on the roadway from brake linings). It is time public bodies and private industry began cleaning up after themselves. We demand better health and environmental protections than this. The ministry of the Environment, at this point, has assessed the DRIC EA as "adequate". We strongly object and disagree. "Adequate" is not good enough when human health and human lives are at stake. Our assessment from studying the deficiencies of this DRIC proposal is that it borders on being criminally negligent.	<p>although the technologies for tunnel air pollutant removal exist, their use is not warranted. This is primarily due to the fact that dispersion techniques are effective at reducing air pollutant concentrations such that ambient air quality criteria are met. In addition, there is no evidence to support that the use of such systems would result in an improvement in Ambient Air Quality.</p> <p>Recent and on-going improvements in vehicle emission control technologies and fuels will combine to substantially reduce the emissions from transportation sources.</p> <p>MTO is committed to best management practices in roadway maintenance which include road sweeping and washing as appropriate.</p>
5	20-May-09	Melody Fitzpatrick (Brew)	<p>I can see and hear the 12,000 trucks a day en route to the Ambassador Bridge from my home. If the design stays as it is now, this corridor soon will become a superhighway right beside our homes! The Huron Estates section of this parkway design is quite unacceptable! We want quality solutions. Here are some serious problems we have spotted:</p> <p># 1 It does not protect our distance from it. There are 10 lanes of traffic right next to our backyards, above grade from Pulford to over Turkey Creek, with no buffer zones, no berms, only a "proposed noise wall". We want this section under the Grand Marais Drain, below grade and covered.</p> <p>#2 It does not protect our air quality. There is no capture or treatment of diesel exhaust, a major health hazard. We want venting, filters or scrubbers, and greenery to clean up the exhaust pollutants.</p> <p>#3 It does not protect our natural environment and land use. It does not protect the value of our homes and neighbourhood. We want longer, wider covered sections with real usable parkland on this supposed "Parkway".</p> <p>The health, property value, and quality of life of Huron Estates residents will be damaged forever unless something is done to find better solutions. We want action. We want better protections.</p>	<p>To clarify the elevation of the proposed freeway in this area, from approximately 0.2 km north of Turkey Creek to approximately 0.3 km south of Turkey Creek, the proposed freeway will be "shallow below-grade" where the top of pavement is between 0 m and 4 m below existing ground level. The freeway crosses above Turkey Creek while remaining as far below existing ground level as possible. Tunnelling below Turkey Creek in this area was considered by the study team. While it would be possible to do so, the construction costs would increase considerably. Furthermore, risk of schedule impacts and construction cost escalation would increase because of the very poor soil conditions in the area. Special measures would have to be taken to ensure the stability of the adjacent ground (including the travelled portion of Huron Church Road) during construction. The study team concluded that, although possible, tunnelling beneath Turkey Creek would not provide significant additional benefit to the community and therefore would not warrant the increased cost and risk.</p> <p>In the Huron Estates area, the edge of the proposed six-lane freeway will be situated between 80 m and 90 m (approximately) from the rear property lines of the nearest remaining houses. This buffer area, proposed as part of the Recommended Plan, will allow for implementation of various landscaping features as well as effective noise attenuation features such as berms and/or noise barriers adjacent to the freeway. The noise modeling undertaken as part of this study shows that implementation of these features will be successful in mitigating noise impacts of the proposed roadways.</p> <p>Specific treatments for noise berms and/or barriers, as well as the urban design and landscape features within the green space areas will be designed in consultation with affected communities during future design stages.</p> <p>Over the course of the DRIC study, analysis of the practical access road alternatives showed that, effectively, there would be no difference in air quality between the below-grade alternatives (including the Parkway) and the end-to-end tunnel alternative (which consists of considerably more tunneling than The Windsor-Essex Parkway) beyond 100 metres from the roadway, and only minor</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>differences between 50 and 100 metres from the roadway.</p> <p>While many tunnels worldwide employ mechanical ventilation techniques due to their length and requirement of maintaining in-tunnel air quality, few of these have air cleaning systems. Where air cleaning systems have been used, Electrostatic Precipitators (ESPs) have typically been installed primarily to control in-tunnel visibility. These tunnel cleaning systems only typically treat a small amount (between 10-20%) of the in-tunnel air and do not treat the balance.</p> <p>Comprehensive reviews on the use of air pollution controls in tunnels have been conducted by regulatory agencies in Australia. They have generally concluded that although the technologies for tunnel air pollutant removal exist, their use is not warranted. This is primarily due to the fact that dispersion techniques are effective at reducing air pollutant concentrations such that ambient air quality criteria are met. In addition, there is no evidence to support that the use of such systems would result in an improvement in Ambient Air Quality.</p> <p>Recent and on-going improvements in vehicle emission control technologies and fuels will combine to substantially reduce the emissions from transportation sources.</p> <p>MTO is committed to best management practices in roadway maintenance which include road sweeping and washing as appropriate.</p> <p>The tunnels proposed as part of The Windsor-Essex Parkway are strategically located to safely connect communities and to provide connections for wildlife. Each tunnel location and length has been carefully considered to provide the maximum benefit to the adjacent neighbourhoods while adhering to certain physical constraints.</p> <p>Constructing tunnels longer than those proposed in the Windsor-Essex Parkway would not provide additional improvements in air quality. Longer tunnels of the GreenLink proposal could result in increased emissions near tunnel portals because emissions that would otherwise be dispersed over a larger area would now be concentrated at the portals.</p> <p>The DRIC study team concluded that the Windsor-Essex Parkway achieves all of the benefits that might be provided by the GreenLink concept, at a significantly lower cost.</p>
6	25-May-09	Pat and Domenic Marvelli	<p>When the decision was made to address the border issue, DRIC asked the community directly affected for their input, as well as inviting interested parties to come up with a plan so that together, we could develop the best possible solution that would serve the city, the county and businesses alike.</p> <p>My husband and I attended the open houses that DRIC hosted believing that our opinions counted. I am sure that the City of Windsor thought the same; especially</p>	<p>In the human health risk assessment, residential receptors were evaluated, since they represent the most exposed individuals along the roadway. These receptors are assumed to be exposed to the maximum air concentrations for 24 hours a day, 7 days per week for a 75-year lifetime. Recreational users will be exposed for a much shorter time and are thus encompassed by the residential receptors.</p> <p>Additional calculations and discussion for recreational users of trails in the green</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			<p>since our municipal tax dollars were spent hiring the best team to develop a solution, which would satisfy both the residents of the city and county as well as the business community.</p> <p>Well the City of Windsor responded with the GreenLink Windsor solution, which we support. We would like to know why GreenLink was never considered or included in the assessment process. We believe that this is a blatant violation of DRIC's commitment to this community. Why not make this gateway to Canada a project worthy of world recognition instead of a cheap solution! I believe that you owe it to the citizens of Windsor to consider the benefits of GreenLink and to measure it against your solution to come up with one that puts the community and our neighbourhoods and the health and well being of this populace first.</p> <p>To Sandra Puppattello and Dwight Duncan - shame on you for supporting a plan that sidestepped DRIC's commitment to this community. By their own admission (City Council Meeting May 26, 2008) DRIC did not evaluate GreenLink. You were elected to represent the citizens of your constituency and instead you represent Toronto! You support a cheap solution that fails to take into consideration the health and well-being of those who put you in power. You had the audacity to insinuate that fighting for a better solution was prolonging unemployment in Windsor. "Get the shovels in the ground", is what you as well as our Premier is saying. Sure, lets put those shovels in the ground before the dummies in Windsor realize that their health is at risk. If you are so confident that the DRIC's solution is by far the best for this community, then why not do an environmental assessment of GreenLink? What are you afraid of?</p> <p>The parkway design makes me wonder, who will want to walk, jog or bike the trails or push a stroller along a stretch of greenery polluted by the thousands of trucks that pass by on a daily basis. No amount of green space can clean the carcinogens that are airborne from the diesel exhaust that will come from the underpasses (which DRIC chooses to call tunnels) only meters away. The future for Ontario is to invest in research and development using cutting edge technology and innovative ideas. This project is anything but that! We deserve better!</p>	<p>space were provided in the updated Human Health Risk Assessment Document (31 March 2009). While the concentrations within these green spaces are higher than concentrations in the residential receptor locations, background concentrations still account for a substantial fraction of the exposure, and no adverse effects are predicted as a result of exposure within the right-of-way.</p> <p>The <i>DRIC EA TOR (May 2004)</i> does not require the team to assess alternatives generated by external stakeholders. However, the DRIC study team was able to use the information gained through the analysis of the six practical alternatives, including the Parkway, to understand the benefits and impacts of the GreenLink concept. The study team listened to input from various stakeholders in making refinements to the Parkway alternative. Thus, the Windsor-Essex Parkway is the culmination of all of the analysis, evaluation and consultation carried out over the course of many years. Both the GreenLinkWindsor and The Parkway included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A six-lane below-grade freeway with separate service roads for local traffic; • Tunnelled sections in key locations to link communities; • Hundreds of acres of green space, with new spaces for community features; • Walking and biking trails which allow pedestrians and cyclists to travel from E.C. Row Expressway to Howard Avenue without ever crossing paths with a vehicle; • Air quality and noise improvements by eliminating stop and go truck traffic and getting trucks off local streets; • The same general layout of roadways and interchanges; • Nearly identical property requirements with buffer areas between the roadway and the adjacent community; and, • An opportunity to create a signature gateway welcoming travellers to Canada, Ontario and Windsor and Essex County. <p>The DRIC study team concluded that the Windsor-Essex Parkway achieves all of the benefits that might be provided by the GreenLink concept, at a significantly lower cost.</p>
7	25-May-09	Mary Ferguson	<p>I am strongly opposed to any plan that would bring a 6 lane superhighway with 4 service lanes within 5 meters of family dwellings. Although this plan doesn't make things worse, it doesn't make things any better. Rarely are there opportunities to improve the quality of air as proposed by the GreenLink. Not only will air quality be improved, but quality of life will be enhanced as well. These 2 factors alone will make Windsor a far more desirable place for new -comers as well as existing residence.</p> <p>I am not going to make this a long protracted letter as I feel that your officials have</p>	<p>In the Huron Estates area, the edge of the proposed six-lane freeway will be situated between 80 m and 90 m (approximately) from the rear property lines of the nearest remaining houses. This buffer area, proposed as part of the Recommended Plan, will allow for implementation of various landscaping features as well as effective noise attenuation features such as berms and/or noise barriers adjacent to the freeway. Although the spacing between the proposed roadways and adjacent residential properties varies along the corridor, the Recommended Plan provides for appropriate screening and/or buffering features throughout.</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			made your decisions and no longer are listening to the will of the taxpayers. This too me is inexcusable and maybe the bigger travesty. There is a better alternative to the DRIC plan that you have chosen not to look at. Shame on you!	<p>Constructing tunnels longer than those proposed in the Windsor-Essex Parkway would not provide additional improvements in air quality. The longer tunnels of the GreenLink proposal could result in increased emissions near tunnel portals because emissions that would otherwise be dispersed over a larger area would now be concentrated at the portals. The amount of contamination released to the air under the GreenLink concept would be the same as for the six practical alternatives.</p> <p>The DRIC study team was able to use the information gained through the analysis of the six practical alternatives, including the Parkway, to understand the benefits and impacts of the GreenLink concept. The study team listened to input from various stakeholders in making refinements to the Parkway alternative.</p> <p>The DRIC study team concluded that the Windsor-Essex Parkway achieves all of the benefits that might be provided by the GreenLink concept, at a significantly lower cost.</p>
8	25-May-09	Winnifred Harwood	<p>I am a registered nurse living in Huron Estates right beside the proposed DRIC Parkway, a member of the Huron Estates Home Owners Association, composed of over 210 households. I am so disappointed and insulted that the Ontario Environment Ministry has upheld the Detroit River International Crossing's environmental assessment. I understand that solving the border crossing issue is critical to facilitating international trade, but I oppose it being done in a way that is compromising the health and well-being of those living in Windsor and Essex County. And it is important that our City Council be an integral part of that process. With the current approved crossing, the wants and needs of citizens (i.e. more tunneling, more green space) living here are being ignored.</p> <p>I expect, like all my previous communication, this letter will be ignored, adding to my insult. As before, my comments will fall on deaf ears. Why do you encourage people to speak out when you have no intention of listening to what we say! Still, I insist on speaking out for what is in the best interests of the people of Windsor.</p> <p>The ministry of the Environment, at this point, has assessed the DRIC EA as "adequate". We demand better health and environmental protections than this. We strongly object and disagree. "Adequate" is not good enough when human health and human lives are at stake.</p>	<p>Consultation was an essential component of the DRIC study. The DRIC study team participated in more than 300 consultation events during the study, including at least 50 meetings with city representatives.</p> <p>The human health risk assessment demonstrated that the health of individuals living or using the green spaces along the Parkway would not be compromised. The evaluation considered that individuals would be exposed to the maximum air concentrations at a given location (outdoors) such as schools, daycares, residences and homes for the aged for 24 hours a day, every day for their lifetime. This is very conservative given that the indoor air concentrations would be lower and thus exposures would be lower. Additional calculations and discussion were provided for recreational users of the trails on the green space in the updated Risk Assessment document (March 31, 2009). While the concentrations within these green spaces are higher than concentrations in the residential receptor locations, background concentrations still account for a substantial fraction of the exposure. No adverse effects are predicted as a result of exposure within the right-of-way.</p> <p>The tunnels proposed as part of The Windsor-Essex Parkway are strategically located to safely connect communities and to provide connections for wildlife. Each tunnel location and length has been carefully considered to provide the maximum benefit to the adjacent neighbourhoods while adhering to certain physical constraints.</p> <p>Constructing tunnels longer than those proposed in the Windsor-Essex Parkway would not provide additional improvements in air quality. Longer tunnels of the GreenLink proposal could result in increased emissions near tunnel portals because emissions that would otherwise be dispersed over a larger area would now be</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>concentrated at the portals.</p> <p>The DRIC study team concluded that the Windsor-Essex Parkway achieves all of the benefits that might be provided by the GreenLink concept, at a significantly lower cost.</p>
9	27-May-09	Robert Sieler	<p>I am a chemist living in Huron Estates, a residential community composed of over 210 households which is situated along the proposed DRIC Parkway.</p> <p>I am very upset with the inadequate environmental and health protections offered by the DRIC project.</p> <p>Additional to the attachment, a hardcopy of which has been mailed to your attention, I would also like to mention the following:</p> <p>The DRIC proposal and Environmental Assessment has received a failing grade from several quarters including two members of the Ministry's own analysis team who have pointed out serious flaws and distortions with "findings" in DRIC's EA Report. One concluded that, either "the impacts to air quality are much worse than the description (in the Report) suggests or they are downplaying environmental concerns." And further, "The Ontario Medical Association continues to assert that poor air quality results in thousands of premature deaths in Ontario each year. This should not be downplayed in the interest of improving regional mobility." as the DRIC team asserts.</p> <p>Most importantly, it has poor or no protection for human health. Another scientist, a regulatory toxicologist for the standards development branch of the Ministry of the Environment, has cited "numerous inconsistencies and errors" in the DRIC EA. This critique states that "several known pollutants, some considered human carcinogens, from diesel emissions were among those not measured by DRIC." Other criticisms include the fact that the DRIC health study fails to consider the impact on users of the Parkway's green space and trails, fails to measure the indoor exposure for nearby residents and schoolchildren, and that the DRIC team used outdated and incorrect standards to measure health risks for several toxins, including formaldehyde and sulphur dioxide. The Parkway will be too dangerous for recreational use.</p> <p>DRIC has no serious or effective plans to prevent damage or to clean up pollutants. There is no proper tunnelling. There are no fans or venting for directing, no filters or scrubbers (chemical washes) for cleaning diesel and car exhaust (such as benzene, a known carcinogen), and no plans for clean-up of traffic sloughage (such as asbestos on the roadway from brake linings).</p> <p>It is time public bodies and private industry began cleaning up after themselves. We demand better health and environmental protections than this. The ministry of the Environment, at this point, has assessed the DRIC EA as "adequate". We strongly object and disagree. "Adequate" is not good enough when human health and human lives are at stake. Our assessment from studying the deficiencies of this DRIC proposal is that it borders on being criminally negligent.</p>	<p>As noted in the MOE Review, MTO has responded to all the comments that were raised about the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA). An amended HHRA report (March 31 2009) was prepared, in response to discussions with MOE. There are no errors in the calculations provided in the DRIC EA. Appropriate standards were used to determine exposures to chemicals such as formaldehyde and sulphur dioxide. Chemicals associated with vehicle tailpipe emissions and vehicular movements on roads were considered in the selection of Chemicals of Concern (COCs). A detailed discussion of all the chemicals considered and the rationale for dropping chemicals from further consideration was also provided, therefore all potential pollutants were considered in the health evaluation. Indoor air exposure was not considered, and an explanation is provided in the updated HHRA. The evaluation considered that individuals would be exposed to the maximum air concentrations at a given location (outdoors) such as schools, daycares, residences and homes for the aged for 24 hours a day, every day for their lifetime. This is very conservative given that the indoor air concentrations would be lower and thus exposures would be lower. Additional calculations and discussion were provided for recreational users of the trails on the green space in the updated Risk Assessment document (March 31, 2009). While the concentrations within these green spaces are higher than concentrations in the residential receptor locations, background concentrations still account for a substantial fraction of the exposure. No adverse effects are predicted as a result of exposure within the right-of-way.</p> <p>Over the course of the DRIC study, analysis of the practical access road alternatives showed that, effectively, there would be no difference in air quality between the below-grade alternatives (including the Parkway) and the end-to-end tunnel alternative (which consists of considerably more tunneling than The Windsor-Essex Parkway) beyond 100 metres from the roadway, and only minor differences between 50 and 100 metres from the roadway.</p> <p>While many tunnels worldwide employ mechanical ventilation techniques due to their length and requirement of maintaining in-tunnel air quality, few of these have air cleaning systems. Where air cleaning systems have been used, Electrostatic Precipitators (ESPs) have typically been installed primarily to control in-tunnel visibility. These tunnel cleaning systems only typically treat a small amount (between 10-20%) of the in-tunnel air and do not treat the balance.</p> <p>Comprehensive reviews on the use of air pollution controls in tunnels have been conducted by regulatory agencies in Australia. They have generally concluded that although the technologies for tunnel air pollutant removal exist, their use is not warranted. This is primarily due to the fact that dispersion techniques are effective at reducing air pollutant concentrations such that ambient air quality criteria are</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			<p><u>Attachment (Letter to Catherine McLennon signed "a concerned resident"):</u></p> <p>As I had stated in a previous communication from February of this year, the process for selecting the new border route has been long and arduous and in a number of cases, flawed. The most significant flaw has been the lack of consideration for VOC and particulate emissions in sensitive areas along the route (schools, residential neighbourhoods and senior citizen residences) by DRIC. Additional concerns are noise and the negative impact on property values along the Parkway.</p> <p>The Ministry of the Environment, at this point, has assessed the DRIC EA as "adequate". I strongly object and disagree. "Adequate" is not good enough when human health and human lives are at stake. "Adequate" states that the DRIC project is lacking in meeting basic environmental protection to residents (and were it to be marked in a classroom it would receive a grade of 'C'). The DRIC EA has room for substantial improvement.</p> <p>I am concerned by the fact that a project, which fails to meet environmental emission targets, has been considered for approval by the MOE. The deficiencies of the DRIC proposal make it border on being criminally negligent.</p> <p>As a resident of Huron Estates, Windsor and a resident who will be directly impacted by the DRIC proposal, I must voice several concerns with the Parkway (and it's design process) as had been submitted to the MOE and deemed "adequate" after review:</p> <p>(A) EMISSIONS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) DRIC is predicting pollution levels next to the Parkway that are more than double Ontario's air quality standards. (Ex: PM10 levels next to the Parkway are predicted to be as high as 114 ug/m3, more than double the provincial air quality standard of 50 ug/m3 (ref: TEPA Air Quality Impact Assessment, Dec. 2008, Table 4.14) Increases of PM10 have been documented as increasing death rates, hospital admissions and asthma attacks. Additional contaminants of concern are PM2.5, Carbon Monoxide, Nitrous Oxide and organics such as ethyl benzene, formaldehyde etc. The Parkway 'green spaces, trails and bike paths' will be highly polluted and not advised for use. 2) The DRIC 'Health Impact Assessment' somehow ignored all pollution modelling where the Parkway received a failing grade. 3) The Environmental assessment of the Parkway, by DRIC admission, has only been compared to the current and no-build situation. In some areas along the route, emissions will actually increase. No consideration has been given to increasingly stringent air quality standards in the future. 4) There are schools along the route. Playgrounds will be within 200M from the route. Children will be exposed to the highest level of VOC and 	<p>met. In addition, there is no evidence to support that the use of such systems would result in an improvement in Ambient Air Quality.</p> <p>Recent and on-going improvements in vehicle emission control technologies and fuels will combine to substantially reduce the emissions from transportation sources.</p> <p>MTO is committed to best management practices in roadway maintenance which include road sweeping and washing as appropriate.</p> <p>The <i>DRIC EA TOR (May 2004)</i> does not require the team to assess alternatives generated by external stakeholders. However, the DRIC study team was able to use the information gained through the analysis of the six practical alternatives, including the Parkway, to understand the benefits and impacts of the GreenLink concept. The study team listened to input from various stakeholders in making refinements to the Parkway alternative. Thus, the Windsor-Essex Parkway is the culmination of all of the analysis, evaluation and consultation carried out over the course of many years. Both the GreenLinkWindsor and The Parkway included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A six-lane below-grade freeway with separate service roads for local traffic; • Tunnelled sections in key locations to link communities; • Hundreds of acres of green space, with new spaces for community features; • Walking and biking trails which allow pedestrians and cyclists to travel from E.C. Row Expressway to Howard Avenue without ever crossing paths with a vehicle; • Air quality and noise improvements by eliminating stop and go truck traffic and getting trucks off local streets; • The same general layout of roadways and interchanges; • Nearly identical property requirements with buffer areas between the roadway and the adjacent community; and, • An opportunity to create a signature gateway welcoming travellers to Canada, Ontario and Windsor and Essex County. <p>The DRIC study team concluded that the Windsor-Essex Parkway achieves all of the benefits that might be provided by the GreenLink concept, at a significantly lower cost.</p> <p>Extensive analysis of potential noise impacts was undertaken as part of the DRIC study, resulting in a proposed mitigation strategy for the Recommended Plan. With the strategy in place, most locations adjacent to The Windsor-Essex Parkway will be below the threshold for hearing an increase in noise in comparison with the future "no-build" scenarios. In fact, many locations will realize a reduction in noise levels in comparison with the future "no-build".</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			<p>particulate matter.</p> <p>5) DRIC has not compared GreenLink as a viable alternative to the Parkway.</p> <p>(B) NOISE A below grade Parkway, constructed on 1950 era technology, even with noise protection buffers, will not drown out diesel noise from a truck driving at freeway speeds.</p> <p>In an era of justifiable concern over the environment and the health of Canadian citizens, Ontario must ensure that prior to beginning construction of a new highway, especially a new highway which will pass thru residential areas, all established requirements are met, especially a detailed comparison of the DRIC Parkway vs. GreenLink with respect to emissions and public health safety. For a marginal cost increase, approval and construction of GreenLink would allow emissions to be released in non-sensitive areas along the route, allowing greater dispersal before they reach residential and public areas. An additional benefit of the GreenLink option is that the tunnel design allows them to be retrofitted with scrubbers should the need arise. The DRIC Parkway has no provisions to add emission controls in a cost effective manner, if indeed at all possible. It should be noted that GreenLink was designed as an environmentally sound alternative to complete tunnelling, which is the preferred option.</p> <p>As a resident of Windsor and Huron Estates who will be personally affected by the DRIC decision to ignore the Parkway's impact on Windsor air quality, I am asking you, Minister Gerretson and Premier McGuinty to not approve the DRIC environmental assessment report as submitted. Require the MTO to properly evaluate the City's GreenLink Windsor proposal as an alternative.</p>	<p>As part of the analysis of practical alternatives, the study team evaluated a full 6 km tunnel alternative. The technical studies showed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The end-to-end tunnel alternative was found to offer no real advantages in terms of reducing impacts to properties, land use, natural features or cultural features. While an end-to-end tunnel alternative offers some advantages to air quality in the immediate corridor through lower particulate concentrations compared to the do-nothing alternative, through improvements to fuels and technology all the alternatives provide this same benefit to some degree. The benefits offered by an end-to-end tunnel in reducing particulate concentrations are offset somewhat by increases in concentrations of gaseous pollutants emitted over a larger area beyond the access road corridor from the ventilation buildings and these cannot be captured with current pollution control technology. The cost of the end-to-end tunnel was found to be three to six times more expensive than the other alternatives under consideration, representing a difference of between \$2.5 and \$3 billion. These costs are reflective of both the increased effort and materials needed to construct an end-to-end tunnel as well as the increased construction risks and complexities. <p>The limited additional benefits of an end-to-end tunnel solution do not justify the associated enormous additional cost, when other solutions are available that offer similar benefits at less cost and with less risks during construction.</p>
10	29-May-09	Dan Stamper, President The Canadian Transit Company	See PDF	Response provided separately.
11	29-May-09	Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP	See PDFs: May 29, 2009 Submission to MOE-TOR_LAW-7137195-v1 MNR OjiwayPrairie_Wetland Evaluation Form Nat Res letter-6 Thurston4_21_09	Response provided separately.
12	28-May-09	Borden Ladner Gervais	See PDF (3 letters in 1 PDF)	<p>MTO will continue to work with representatives of the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall, to address their concerns through the property acquisition process.</p> <p>Following is the text from two recent responses which the DRIC study team sent to Borden Ladner Gervais (BLG) in response to concerns raised by BLG on behalf of OPTrust Retail Inc. (Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall).</p> <p><i>Response to BLG, letter dated December 12th, 2009:</i></p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>“The concerns expressed on behalf of OPTrust Retail Inc. regarding impacts to the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall and consideration of these impacts within the Detroit River International Crossing (DRIC) EA study are noted.</p> <p>The DRIC study team is aware of the importance of the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall within the Windsor economic environment. In the report entitled <i>Draft Practical Alternatives Evaluation Working Paper – Economic Impact (May 2008)</i> the Outlet Mall is described as “by far the largest business along the access road, employing roughly 300 people.” The report also acknowledges concerns expressed during past consultation with OPTrust Retail Inc. including the concern that any net loss of stores may reduce the attractiveness of the mall as a shopping destination.</p> <p>Alternatives for an access road between Highway 401 and a new crossing of the Detroit River, were developed and evaluated based on balancing benefits and impacts in many categories to achieve the purpose of the study and meet the community’s goals. Assessed factors included <i>Changes to Air Quality, Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Characteristics, Consistency with Existing and Planned Land Use, Protection of Cultural Resources, Protection of the Natural Environment, Improvements to Regional Mobility and Cost and Constructability</i>. Impacts to local businesses within the corridor were measured as part of the <i>Protection of Community and Neighbourhood Characteristics</i> evaluation factor.</p> <p>Resulting from the evaluation of Illustrative Access Road Alternatives which included numerous corridor alternatives in Amherstburg, LaSalle, Windsor and Tecumseh, a portion of the Highway 3/Huron Church Road corridor was selected as the preferred access road corridor and was carried forward as the Area of Continued Analysis (ACA). Subsequently, the evaluation of six Practical Access Road Alternatives within the ACA (which included at-grade freeways, below-grade freeways, a 6 km tunnel and The Windsor-Essex Parkway) was carried out and The Windsor-Essex Parkway was identified as the preferred access road alternative. Impacts to the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall were considered during each of these evaluations together with benefits and impacts to all other evaluation factors listed in the preceding paragraph. Details of these comprehensive evaluations are contained within Chapters 6 and 8 of the EA Report and further details are contained within the supporting documentation available on the study website (www.partnershipborderstudy.com). The position and width of the Windsor-Essex Parkway right-of-way in the vicinity of the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall has been developed to accommodate various engineering requirements while balancing impacts to all features in the area including the mall, local institutions, surrounding communities and natural features while providing for green buffer areas and a recreational trail network as desired by the community. As such, The Windsor-Essex Parkway results in the need for property impacts to surrounding properties including the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall.</p> <p>When planning the Windsor-Essex Parkway and service road, maintaining good vehicle access to the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall was a priority. Once construction begins, best efforts will also be made to ensure continued access to all businesses in the corridor including the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall. It should be noted that local pedestrian access to the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall will improve under the Recommended Plan as a result of the reduction in traffic on the surface roads and further by the provision of the tunnel at Hearthwood Place allowing pedestrians to cross the corridor unimpeded by vehicular traffic. To mitigate the impact of reduced exposure to passing vehicles on the proposed freeway, signage may be considered to inform motorists of businesses and business clusters, as polices permit.</p> <p>As you are aware, the DRIC study Recommend Plan encroaches on the northern section of Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall and property acquisition will be necessary. Financial compensation for disruption of the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall will be provided through the property acquisition process. The Ministry is currently purchasing property in the corridor on a “willing seller-willing buyer” basis and remains available for further meetings in this regard.</p> <p>It is estimated that construction of The Windsor-Essex Parkway (estimated to cost approximately \$1.6 billion) could provide 12,000 project related jobs. When the crossing and plaza are included,</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>the economic benefits are even greater. Given the current economic climate in Windsor, the jobs created through the project have added significance. Furthermore, the expanded transportation network and new border crossing will improve the speed and efficiency of goods and services crossing the border which will have a tremendous impact on the economies of both Ontario and the Windsor-Essex region.”</p> <p><i>Response to BLG, letter dated February 26th, 2009:</i></p> <p>“The study team has reviewed the plan that was provided by the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall on Jan.22, 2009. While this plan does not comply with MTO signage policies, MTO will continue to work with the Windsor Outlet Crossing Mall to develop a viable signing strategy that meets MTO’s standards. The turnarounds as suggested are not being adopted as the existing access to the mall is adequate and is being maintained.”</p> <p>As noted above, MTO will continue to work with representatives of the Windsor Crossing Outlet Mall, to address their concerns through the property acquisition process.</p>
13	29-May-09	Transport 2000	See PDF	<p>Before commencing the EA Study, the Canada-U.S.-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership (the Partnership) undertook a Planning/Need and Feasibility (P/NF) study. The objective of the P/NF study, commissioned in 2001 was to identify a long-term strategy to address the safe and efficient movement of people and goods between Southwestern Ontario and Southeastern Michigan. The P/NF Study, completed in January 2004, identified a 30-year strategy for improvements to address the medium and long-term (2030 and beyond) needs of the transportation network serving cross-border traffic in the area of Southwestern Ontario and Southeastern Michigan. The strategy included four major elements to address the medium and long-term needs of the transportation network. The four major elements were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to Border Processing • New/Expanded International Crossing • Optimize Use of Existing Network; and, • Travel Demand Management <p>A total of 17 individual strategies were identified as part of the recommended improvements. These strategies included (among others) encouraging greater use of intermodal rail, providing support to improvements of rail terminals and encouraging and supporting improvements to both transit services and inter-city passenger rail. However, while the P/NF identified that improvements to rail and transit services may improve utilization of the network, the results of the study indicated that these improvements alone will not reduce the need for a new crossing and other road-based improvements.</p> <p>As a result of the recommendations and confirmed need for a new or expanded crossing of the Detroit River with connections to the freeway systems in Ontario and Michigan, the Partnership initiated the Detroit River International Crossing EA study. The overall purpose of the study is to provide for the safe, efficient and secure movement of people and goods across the Canadian-U.S. border in the</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>Detroit River area to support the economies of Ontario, Michigan, Canada and the U.S. As discussed in Chapter 5 of the EA Report, a wide range of Alternatives to the Undertaking were considered as part of the EA Study to address the stated transportation problems and meet the purpose of the undertaking. The alternatives that were considered were brought forward from the P/NF study, and included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do Nothing; • Improvements to border processing; • Transportation demand management; • Transportation systems management; • New and/or improved rail alternatives including a new and/or expanded international rail crossing; • New and/or improved transit services; • New and/or improved marine services; • New and/or improved road alternatives with a new or expanded international road crossing; and • Combinations of the above. <p>The assessment of transportation planning alternatives provided an opportunity to examine fundamentally different ways of addressing transportation problems. In recognition of these fundamental differences among the planning alternatives, it was considered appropriate to assess the effectiveness of each type of alternative in addressing the problems and taking advantage of opportunities at a functional level. Additional details on the Alternatives to the Undertaking that were considered are available in the Draft Feasible Transportation Alternatives (Alternatives to the Undertaking) Report, February 2006.</p> <p>Regarding the alternative of providing new and/or improved rail alternatives to address the transportation problems, a scenario involving significant diversion of freight to intermodal rail through major investments and transportation policies was considered and is documented in the Travel Demand Forecast Working Paper, September 2005. That paper concludes that, even under such an optimistic diversion scenario, rail improvements would defer, but not eliminate the need for improvements to the transportation network. This alternative would therefore only marginally improve congestion on the road-based transportation network. Delays and queuing on the road network would continue to occur and gradually worsen as traffic volumes increased. Such delays and queuing on the road-based network of this international trade corridor are not consistent with governmental planning objectives or tourism objectives. Similarly, improvements to rail would only partially address border processing needs. Improvements to rail may assist in the processing of freight traffic, but would have little benefit to truck and passenger vehicle inspection processes on the road network.</p> <p>The EA Study also reviewed the possibility of providing new and/or improved transit service to address the identified transportation needs of the area. While it is</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<p>recognized that transit improvements could be implemented at a reasonable cost and in a relatively short timeframe, delays and queuing on the road-based network would result even with the transit service improvements. This result is not consistent with planning or tourism objectives. Similarly, improvements to transit services would only partially address border processing needs (i.e. transit improvements would only address passenger travel).</p> <p>The alternative of providing new and/or improved roads with a new and/or improved crossing was identified as the most effective at addressing the transportation network requirements, border processing requirements, and provides the highest overall level of support to planning and tourism objectives. It is also recognized that improved and expanded border processing capacity is an integral component of this solution.</p> <p>In terms of addressing transportation network requirements for people and goods movement, the EA Report notes that a multi-modal approach provides choice for travellers and offers viable mechanisms to reduce auto use. It is recommended that these alternatives be included as part a multi-modal strategy to meet the medium and long-term needs of the transportation network in the area. However, alternatives for travel demand management, rail, transit, ferries, etc., cannot independently address the diverse user needs, sufficiently alleviate traffic congestion on the transportation network or effectively provide reasonable options for maintaining the movement of people and goods in cases of disruptions at any of the existing border crossings. As such, alternatives involving rail and/or improved transit services were not carried forward to either the illustrative or practical alternatives stage of the study.</p> <p>The purpose of the undertaking is to provide for the safe, efficient and secure movement of people and goods across the Canadian-US border in the Detroit River area to support the economies of Ontario, Michigan, Canada and the US.</p> <p>In order to meet the purpose, this study has addressed the following regional transportation and mobility needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide new border crossing capacity to meet increased long-term travel demand; • Improve system connectivity to enhance the continuous flow of people and goods; • Improve operations and processing capabilities at the border; and • Provide reasonable and secure crossing options (i.e. network redundancy). <p>In addition, the study team has sought to recommend transportation solutions which minimize community and environmental impacts as much as reasonably possible. In particular, the study team has strived to address the local communities' goals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve quality of life;

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take trucks off local streets; and • Improve traffic movement across the border. <p>While it is recognized that capacity needs could potentially be delayed by current economic conditions and initiatives to divert cross-border traffic to the BWB, it is important to note that improvements to the capacity of the border-crossing system in the Detroit River area is only one of the objectives of the DRIC study. There is also a need to serve the local/regional (Windsor/Essex County – Detroit/Wayne County) cross-border movements by meeting the other study objectives of improving system connectivity, improving operations and processing capabilities at the border, and providing reasonable and secure crossing options. These local needs would not be met by diversion of traffic to Sarnia-Port Huron.</p>
14	29-May-09	Anna Lynn Meloche	<p>I have written to you before, and feel the need to continue to do so. I have followed the DRTC project for several years and am not satisfied that a thorough assessment was done. I am not critising the team for all the good work and the new designation of portions of Ojibway as a Provincially Significant Wetland was long overdue in my estimation and in the judgement of locals such as Allen McKinnon who wrote to this effect in 2005 and 2006. I feel that the Ojibway region is a national treasure and that all projects that impact the region need a very high level of scrutiny.</p> <p>In particular, in respect to birds, I concur with the MNR's concern that the methodology was perhaps not as complete and rigorous as it should have been. The recent email I have received from a young Oriental and his fiends, frequent off-road vehicle drivers in Brighton Beach, and their observations of golden pheasant in the region, of which they have sent me a fuzzy yet still recognizable picture taken in the Morton Terminal region is a case of how easy it is to miss a species in an area as big and unusual as Ojibway.</p> <p>For myself I don't how the loss of so many trees, thickets and savanna habitats to the plaza itself will not be a severe impact to both migratory bids and to the humans in the region as well, in terms of air quality degradation. This area is at once a highly active area for migrants as well as the first defense against the assault on local air coming courtesy of Zug Island and the other feature stateside.</p> <p>In tern of mammals, the photo of roadkill that I was finally able to obtain of a creature that I and others see in the region, is all the evidence of its existence. So far. And that is a shame. It seems to me that modern use of trail cameras at night as well as infrared equipment would have served better to take a look at these creatures.</p> <p>So currently, the best guess of any biologist is that I have found something of the rodent family. That does not correspond to anything of this size, small raccoon to groundhog size. Hands and feet, so to speak are wrong.</p> <p>And yes, better methodology would perhaps have led to the grey fox. There are so many sighting of the grey. And I don't mean the crossfox, a grey version of the red fox. Including one Michael Weis who teaches biology at the University. But alas, I</p>	<p>The extensive fieldwork conducted as part of the DRIC study to investigate and document existing natural environmental conditions in the study area and identify potential project effects to species and habitat was carried out thoroughly and as per work plans developed in consultation with the appropriate regulatory authorities. This fieldwork as well as the gathering of secondary source information has led to the development of a comprehensive mitigation strategy for impacts to the natural environment. Despite the thousands of hours that have been spent in the field by qualified biologists for this project, it is unrealistic to expect that every species that may be present has been identified. This is true of any environmental assessment. In light of the extensive field work conducted, the review of secondary source information and the recognized protocols that have been followed, due diligence has been performed on this project.</p> <p>The study team has confirmed the presence of eight species at risk within the area of influence of this project. As a result, the DRIC study team has applied for a Permit under the Endangered Species Act 2007 to help ensure that appropriate measures are taken to mitigate the potential impact to these species.</p> <p>As outlined in Chapters 10 and 11 of the EA report, additional work will be undertaken during subsequent stages of the project.</p>

Study Team Responses to External Comments on Ministry Review of EA

#	Date	Commenter	Comment Received	Response
			<p>am also in an OMB proceeding currently on land adjacent to Ojibway, and at least the new PSW report on the s-w does mention the grey fox. There are many sightings, but only Micheal is an expert, and if he doesn't report it, I suppose the HNIC does not care. As per the DRIC response letter I received earlier, in which it was stated of the grey fox "if it does exist", I take it that neither my sightings nor those of Mark Jacob nor those of Cherie Martin, all reported to the NHIC were not deemed valid, or the DRIC would have access to the NHIC d showing such</p> <p>I have taken precautions with the Blandings Turtle, in case the Ojibway staff did not report it in either 2007.or 2004, by securing photos from a photographer or a recorded entry sighting in the Ojibway sightings book. There is a lot of politics and other things interfering at times the records.</p> <p>I would have expected that I would have felt more satisfied with the DRIC Assessment and would not be trying to find and sight creatures myself at this point. My most compelling sighting was of a bear sized creatures in Brighton Beach, that I have known about for about 8 years. I may get a photo yet, but that would be at night as it is nocturnal. Hopefully I can find it before someone digs it out. I am not in the least the only one to see the "grey creatures" or the strange cats. For the longest time DRIC and Ojibway staff and MNR treated my sighting as "opposums , skunks, or raccoons". The latest roadkill which is sharp and clear, needs an explanation. And I am waiting.</p>	