

To whom it may concern

March 30 2010

RE : Kettle Island bridge project

I am a resident of Carson Grove and have been for almost 10 years now. As a mother, I enjoy bicycle rides along Aviation Parkway to the Aviation Museum with my 2 young children. As a working mother, I take Ogilvie Road towards St-Laurent every morning to go to work at CHEO and find the Aviation intersection busy.

I am very concerned about the choice of Kettle Island to create a new bridge between Ontario and Québec to lighten up traffic in downtown Ottawa. Why redirect traffic from one urban neighborhood to another? How much pollution from noise and exhaust from trucks is expected to be redirected to our residential area, where a multitude of children play? Why destroy a green zone (there are few in the city) and replace it with a highway?

There is a brand new school and a busy hospital adjacent to Aviation Parkway, it just doesn't make any sense to expose vulnerable people to more pollution. It seems to me that the human factor has been neglected in the choice of Kettle Island. As a pediatrician, I am concerned about exposure to exhaust for our children and families living around the Aviation Parkway and request that the environmental analysis be relooked at, taking the human factor and green zone into high consideration.

Respectfully,

**COMMENT CARD:**

*Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.*

*see attached sheet*  
*Response requested*

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5

Corridor 6

Corridor 7

The stated population and traffic forecasts that gave rise to this project has been questioned by the public and therefore needs to be verified. Will the population and traffic data collected in the 90's justifying this project be independently re-evaluated before proceeding with the next phase?

"Previous transportation studies, including the 1994 Joint Administrative Committee on Planning and Transportation (JACPAT) Study of Interprovincial Bridges in the National Capital Region, and the 1999 Interprovincial Transportation Concept Plan, conducted jointly by the National Capital Commission (NCC), the former Communauté urbaine de l'Outaouais and the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC), concluded that additional interprovincial crossing capacity will be required by 2021 to accommodate forecasted growth in the movement of people and goods in the NCR. The anticipated rise in interprovincial movements is based on forecasted increases in population, employment and tourism across the National Capital Region (NCR)." - Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment Study Feb 11, 2008.

As proof of changes trends, here is actual traffic data from the Bay Area, San Mateo-Hayward Bridge showing a steady decline in traffic from 2003 to 2009. Fuel costs and economic factors have made past forecasts irrelevant in today's environment. This brings into question the need for a bridge based on flawed forecasts.

2003-04	124,742,532	0.6%
2004-05	120,135,213	-3.7%
2005-06	118,297,920	-1.5%
2006-07	116,658,521	-1.4%
2007-08	114,570,347	-1.8%
2008-09	113,072,157	-1.3%

COMMENT CARD:

*Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.*

*See attached sheet*

*Response requested.*

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5

Corridor 6

Corridor 7

123  
Will there be a public referendum on this project to ensure there is no possibility that the Abilene paradox is ~~a~~ play here? The public may not want this bridge at all, yet no one is speaking up to voice his or her objections. It would be tragic if a small group of people collectively decide on a course of action that is counter to the preferences of the entire population of Ottawa Gatineau.

Abilene Paradox = a paradox in which a group of people collectively decide on a course of action that is counter to the preferences of any of the individuals in the group.<sup>[1][2][3]</sup> It involves a common breakdown of group communication in which each member mistakenly believes that their own preferences are counter to the groups and, therefore, does not raise objections.

**COMMENT CARD:**

*Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5

Corridor 6

Corridor 7

A simple solution to remove trucks from the downtown core is to prohibit these trucks from city streets (yes, a city can do that). The trucks would just have to suck it up and detour over at Hawkesbury. Sorry, we shouldn't be having pedestrians KILLED and dangerous goods transported through our downtown core so that trucking companies can move goods from west Quebec to Montreal or Toronto conveniently. Why hasn't a ban on trucks from Lowertown been considered in the analysis?

COMMENT CARD:

Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.

See attached sheet

Response requested.

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5

Corridor 6

Corridor 7



The Terms of Reference submitted to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) were not approved because there was no defined proponent that is subject to the Ontario EA Act. Nevertheless, this evaluation went forward and was completed without a properly defined proponent, which is contrary to the Act. Before any east or west transportation corridor is recommended for protection, there must be a clearly identified proponent in terms of an individual and an organization. Stating that some unidentified proponent will decide if one or both projects are carried forward to Stage 2 of the Environmental Assessment means that there is no one publicly accountable for this very costly undertaking. There must be openness and transparency to all the decision deliberations involving funds being paid out of the pockets of all taxpayers.

In order to democratically debate the need and location of an interprovincial crossing, the public must be informed of the specific individual and organization who will be sponsoring and funding this endeavour.

Please address this concern.

COMMENT CARD:

Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.

See attached sheet

Response requested.

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5

Corridor 6

Corridor 7