

---

January 2004

## Discussion following the Remarks of Mr. Philips and Mr. Crane

Discussion

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj>

 Part of the [Transnational Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Discussion, *Discussion following the Remarks of Mr. Philips and Mr. Crane*, 30 Can.-U.S. L.J. 341 (2004)  
Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol30/iss/53>

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canada-United States Law Journal by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE REMARKS OF MR. PHILLIPS AND MR. CRANE

MR. PHILLIPS: Real quick as a sort of anchor presentation. I am going to tie back a little bit to yesterday, this is called a Border Analysis Management Model. It is proprietary, but I thought it is something you would be interested in.

This is an actual three-dimension model of the Peace Bridge in Buffalo. We were talking about infrastructure yesterday and what was happening. But I just want to run through this real quick to show you this is a model designed by Regal Decision Systems, who do a majority of the modeling work for INS in Washington.

This is the secondary area at the Peace Bridge in the U.S. This is the problem, the warehouse area and it is full and full, so full. These lines were occurring coming into the United States on the bridge. This model measures all kinds of through put time of the day, etc.

We know just about everything there is to know about what the total revenues are, what the inspection times are, how many were inspected by hour of the day, by day of the week. It tells you just about everything, new trends.

We then took this model and said on a base case, this is what the bridge actually looked like on this day in 2001 on November, this is the primary coming into the U.S. Plaza. This is where the primaries are done. This is the secondary. This is the secondary warehouse area. You can see it is all clogged up. The cars here in red, we did the NEXUS cars in white. NEXUS was not at the bridge, but we were able to know how many cars were frequent travels so we were able to designate what they were. That is what the actual primary - this model takes the actual traffic as it arrives, it's not any kind of prediction. We know to the second every truck and every car and we simply model the reality as they arrive so the actual flows, the actual cueing is all the way, it really was in these times.

We had a scenario, this is what it looks like when we put NEXUS at 30 percent, same traffic, same number of trucks, same number of cars, same arrival time sequence and that shows the end result if all these three what-ifs were done. You can see this warehouse area is empty. We only put trucks in there in secondary when we know, and it is exactly the same, see the free flows the cue are gone. That shows the end.

We did the inter I.T. spatial. This is the first 3-D model that was ever done. You saw that model, the little boxes moving around, that is 2-D. This is 3-D. Everything is to scale within a foot of reality, red lights, green lights, and the layout of the crossing.

I just want to show you, this is - it just took a while to load - this is the model, helicopter view to scale of everything on Peace Bridge just the way it is, absolutely to the minute detail, and the model allows to you do a fly over from a helicopter point of view. We will next bring you down to truck level as if you were sitting in the seat of an 18-wheeler and then bring down to car level.

We actually use this, put it in front of customs inspector, and have them watch and make them see it when cars are lined up.

Here is a helicopter coming in. You can see the overhead, all of this to scale. We are coming into the Canadian secondary truck commercial, so, it is all modeled.

So we said, what are the assumptions, move the truck tolls to Canada. That has been done; we went to one-way tolls. They used to charge by weight. They had to have two-way tolls, because the trucks were full one way and empty the next way. It was not fair. So they went to axles, so whether a truck is full or empty now, it is a five axle, six axle, seven axle, they pay the same toll. We can charge them in one direction for two ways.

We move the primary to Canada, which we call the core-processing zone, where no trucks arrive at the bridge. It is a primary. They do not have everything in order. We put 20 percent NEXUS in. That is 20 percent of the people would join NEXUS and would join NEXUS and be low risk.

I am going to take you to what this means.

Here is the base case. Actual, took 43 ½ minutes for a truck to transit from one end of the bridge to the other. 150 trucks in cue, waiting.

The average speed across the bridge was two miles an hour. Car transit time was 14.7 minutes.

The car lane always travels faster. There are more booths as well. There were 240 cars in cue. And average hours of traveling, that is cars waiting to cross the bridge, 108,000 an hour.

What we did then is moved the truck tolls to Canada then eliminated the two-way tolls. Very quickly, it cuts it to 27 minutes. Half the trucks are gone. Save 2.6 million and so forth, you reduce the wait time.

Then when we moved the primary, we cut the truck time to 18 minutes, only 45 trucks waiting. We are now at 15 miles an hour, every truck going over the bridge. That is important, because an idling truck has five times the environmental discharge as a truck that is moving.

And the last one is the NEXUS at 20 percent. It does not affect the trucks much; look what it does to cars. Cut the car time in half from 14 minutes to 7 minutes. The inconvenience time is down to 24,000 hours from 108,000. That is a lot of time for you and me to be doing something else.

Finally, when NEXUS gets to 30 percent, we got five minutes. We cut the travel time 2/3rds. You only got 90 cars in the loop and no waiting time.

And bottom line of all this that it's important to you, for those of you in the environmental issues, this is a gallon saved of gasoline, and the car gallons, 104,000 gallons of diesel saved, 62,000 gallons of - look at the environmental discharge.

MR. PHILLIPS: Here is a case where the kilos emission per year. That is a lot of emissions for hydrocarbons, CO and nitrous oxide, which is deadly stuff. You can see the numbers. That is reducing over 50 percent of total emissions for a year at that bridge by just doing these three things. I did not build a bridge.

It's less booths open, etc. and that tells you, just to show you that - by the way, half of this is done and we're well on the way to getting the rest in shortly. Therefore, we are making progress. We still need crossings. We still need to build a bridge. I just thought I'd let you know, there's a lot of stuff going on behind the scenes that doesn't make it as negative a message as might be we have to wait ten years for anything to happen.

That is the end of that and we are all set.

MR. FRASER: Why don't we have a question period.

Henry, you'll have the first question.

MR. KING: I have a question. I'm I impressed with all these developments and I'm looking at the future which you guys have done a wonderful job of explaining here.

I'm wondering if the structure that's in place has kept up with current need for cooperation and whether, rather than just being employed by night this could continue if you had more structure?

Is there something more that needs to be institutionalized here? That's what I'm looking at and so that this is not just a temporary period of great happiness, but will be with us permanently?

MR. PHILLIPS: Two words, political will. It took 9/11 to generate the political will in both Canada and the United States to do what's been done.

I worry a bit because if we don't get this window of opportunity finished, pretty soon the very needed things like education and transportation and welfare and other things are going to come along. If the political will continues to be minimized, you're going to find grid lock again, as far as resources are concerned, that's a big concern to me.

MR. CRANE: I would say that we're in an evolving situation. The institutional arrangements will follow the things that are actually done.

I think what is different today is that North America as a region feels itself under much more competitive pressure vis-à-vis the rest of world. So there is a greater recognition within North America that we're going to have to respond to all the challenges of China, India and all these kinds of things. I think that will drive things a lot. So you already have in an economic development sense, even in Canada, cities are becoming much more focused on their roll of economic development and certainly states and provinces.

I get e-mails from something called the State Science and Technology Institute, and it comes every second week and it's a list of all the new states' government strategies that are coming out. So I think globalization competitiveness is also pushing very hard on the idea of collaboration. Thank you.

MR. GELFAND: Marty Gelfand, Office of Congressman Dennis J. Kucinich.

In certain environmental circles I travel in, there is lot of talk about bioregionalism and the interest of a region can best be focused on whether it's a watershed or maybe a mountain range or some kind of environmental or geological divide, rather than a political divide, like we have borders that are shaped like a square.

So, you know, and I think there is some practical advantage to that. Like for instance, you know, it's easy for the rest of the United States to build nuclear power plants and say, well, it's okay to say we can dump the waste on Nevada, which doesn't even use nuclear power, at least they don't have a nuclear power plant in that state. And when they only have two senators against the other 98, they can't resist it so well.

But if you have a bio region that's also a political region, they can - politically they can start thinking in ways that benefit the environment and themselves without having to push off their waste or their problems on somebody else.

So I'm kind of fascinated by this Republic of Cascadia idea, just as an interesting discussion topic, but if you follow it through, I know Canada hasn't yet resolved it's succession problem.

The United States seems to have a while ago, so maybe you can address that.

MR. CRANE: What's interesting, one of the driving forces, I think, of Cascadia was the work that was done on the planning of the lower B.C. mainland and all the environmental - looking at the future population growth of the region, the impact of population growth and increasing urbanization on the waters on the bio diversity and all these things, I think that helped move out a consideration, well, this is just not a lower B.C. problem, it goes across the border into the State of Washington, which also tends to be more of an environmentally sensitive state. So there is an identifiable eco-region, if you'd like, that brings people together.

A number of the initiatives, such as the efforts to see whether or not they can develop a high speed rail transportation between Portland, Seattle, and Vancouver are all designed to deal with these land use issues and things of that sort.

One of the things that gets overlooked a lot, in environmental and other economic aspects is the significance of land use planning.

It's central. I think that as you say, a natural eco-region is the basis in which to do sensible land use planning.

MR. PHILLIPS: Marty, I would respond that it's very unlikely probably that political outlines would be, but I tell you PNWER that I described tonight is an eco region; and while they don't delegate their political authority so someone else can decide for Idaho, Washington, they are very much together on the bio effects of planning and water quality and use, recreational use of Puget Sound, the whole thing, where you find you now have five Governors and ten Senators that are of a mind. They don't speak for each other, but together, so I think PNWER is an example of how to get toward your point. I don't think it will ever get to the point where it will be one governor and you change the state lines. It's not likely. We can't define an eco region that clearly, but PNWER is - a PNWER region is a very clearly defined eco region as David said.

MR. KING: Tom.

MR. SILVIA: This is just an observation. I had never given any thought at all to the idea that there was a regional cooperation going on in the Pacific Northwest. It's not part of what I do. I recognize it here in the Great Lakes. But last night we were talking about the role of the media in educating people to do this, I realize sitting here tonight there is a police television show called the Sentinel, which is another one of the many, many shows that are produced in British Columbia, because Hollywood has been doing that for a long time.

But the fictional setting of it is called Cascadia. And just as - without the risk of sounding ridiculous - Star Trek has been leading the edge of many of scientific development in thinking how technology works, I'm not making this up, the idea that there is this concept in the public mind, it's sound. It's an example of how the media can effectively portray this idea that, you know, it transcends borders and transcends governmental units and is a reality for people.

MR. PHILLIPS: We're talking about Cascadia tonight, because that's what Henry asked us to do, but I can stand up and tell you about the Rocky Mountain West area, which is Alberta/Montana which is very highly organized the same way to the point where they have joint truck inspection stations between Canada and the United states on one side of border and the police both do it on one side.

We have the Northern Great Plains, which is Manitoba, Minnesota and North Dakota, and South Dakota that is, again, as highly organized as Cascadia.

As David said, you stop at Minnesota, because you get over into Ontario, New York, there are working relationships, nothing like there is out west and going east. Quebec/New York has now got a very close working association so the New York/Quebec has got a very close working association, so does the New York/Quebec corridor, Montreal south to New York City. That one is very active, but Maritimes and western New York and Michigan, they got

very qualified people, but there isn't a regional cooperative coming together. We're the least effective, I think in that. But Cascadia is a very good example. But there are others that are in the same boat. I'm glad to bring it to you tonight.

MR. CRANE: They all kind of hide under their brow, you might try to go get the same money they're after. Everyone is doing their job quietly.

MR. FRASER: I don't think there can be any question, as I tried to say in the serious part of my remarks, that the Cascadia initiative has been largely a bought them up initiative based on what people at the local level have found to be synergies throughout the Pacific northwest. Much of the work they've done in their cities is work that has become obvious to do on a regional basis. There isn't any doubt either, as someone who actually lives there, that things like the transportation corridor have come alive under Jim's aegis and the aegis of his colleagues. Believe it or not, at 9:00 o'clock at Saturday night here in Cleveland, we have the tracks between Vancouver and Seattle with a train that never ran until about five years ago.

And now it's running. And running well.

Well, Henry -

MR. KING: I think we're pretty the well set. I urge you to come around tomorrow for a very good session in the morning.

MR. FRASER: Before people do that, will you permit me to thank our panel, particularly I'd like to thank David who did today what he does for most of his day job time, that is he met a very tight deadline and generously gave up a day off.

I thought it was appropriate, Henry, that we should finish with the pictorial depiction of what's going on with the Buffalo area, simply because I know the elegance that you like to effect in these things and our friend, Michael Robinson talked today about the War of 1812. And what we saw tonight is close to that, and Michael Robinson, of course, was absolutely right, Jim, that it was a war that, in our view, we won and won handily, but I think it's important as we end tonight that we do so in an even-handed way, because the American position on that is the war didn't happen.

So, Henry, thank you very much for giving all of us have an opportunity and I thank our panelists.

MR. CRANE: One last thing I wanted to say that the one positive thing the Republican Cascadia does is take away from the Alaska the Alaska panhandle which was given by the British to the United States to settle another disagreement and has deprived British Columbia of its rightful ownership of the B.C. Coast, so at least the Republic of Cascadia recognized that Alaska wrongfully possessed this piece of land.

MR. FRASER: I will tell you this, Professor McRae, who has been paid an enormous amount of money by a number of people will buy drinks for all of us and discuss that subject from now until midnight.

Thank you and good night.  
(Session concluded)



