I would like this question addressed which relates to two primary study objectives in the Terms of Reference:

• Provide a truck route, including the possible modification of existing routes, that can link to existing truck routes on both sides of the river;
• Minimize community effects by linking to freeways, expressways or arterial roadways (i.e. not local or collector roads which were not designed for high volumes of traffic or truck traffic);

Why wasn't a direct sunken highway corridor specifically for transient heavy trucks between the Nicholas exit to the McDonald Cartier Bridge along King Edward Avenue given any consideration as a planning alternative?

Since 70% of the existing commercial traffic will continue to use the McDonald Cartier Bridge route, why wasn't this alternative part of the 'basket of solutions" discussed in the Terms of Reference? A sunken corridor for transient traffic would be very short, less noisy and it would not allow any exit to neighbourhood streets. There are sunken thoroughfares used in several areas of Montréal with residential cross streets above. Tunnels were considered as a planning alternative but not carried forward. This planning option appears to have been neglected in the analysis. In time, a sunken highway corridor could also be enclosed forming a tunnel.

Please address why this alternative was not given proper consideration and public visibility as an option.

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 Kettle Island option must be rejected since it ignores two recommendations from The Mayor of Ottawa's Task Force on Transportation - Final Report dated June 1, 2007 entitled "Moving Ottawa" makes two recommendations; namely,
a) not destroy traditional neighbourhoods in Quebec and Ontario, and
b) to build a ring road tied to a new bridge?

Furthermore the report states:
"The Task Force welcomes the recent announcement by the federal, Ontario and Quebec governments to study the issue of crossings between Ottawa and Gatineau. The Task Force recommends building a bridge across the Ottawa River east of the downtown core before 2017. The east-end river crossing makes sense because a bridge could easily join with highways on both sides of the river, thereby not destroying traditional neighbourhoods in Quebec and Ontario. The Task Force also recommends that the City consider building a ring road tied to a new bridge over the Ottawa River as outlined in the Transportation Master Plan. However, the City must ensure that any proposed ring road incorporates a good public transit component to provide suburb-to-suburb transit. "

Why are the recommendations of an expert transportation panel being ignored?

COMMENT CARD:

Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.

See attached sheet

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5 Corridor 6 Corridor 7

If we put a tunnel starting at Nicholas just south of Laurier (underneath Lowertown) connecting to the Macdonald Cartier bridge then could we not all be winners and there be no losers? Then finally we would have a real inter-connection (ie. no traffic lights to pass through) between the 4 lane highways on both sides of the river.
The Pros:
1. the huge truck problem downtown is completely solved without moving that problem to other neighbourhoods (even a new bridge only gets some but not all of the trucks out of downtown)
2. some improved peak hour commuting capacity by bypassing the clogged King Edward corridor

Add to this solution a co-ordinated inter-provincial transit solution and we've made a lot of things a whole lot better without having to build another controversial bridge. Last year the NCC consultant estimated that bridge would cost 400M$ once all the additional roads and ramps needed to connect to both ends are factored in. This seems to be a very low and misleading estimate.

COMMENT CARD:

Please provide your comments on the Site Study Area.

See attached sheet

Please let us know which Study Area you are commenting on

(Please circle one)

Corridor 5 Corridor 6 Corridor 7

Why isn't a ring road around Ottawa-Gatineau being considered first? Why can't you build a tunnel, or link the Vanier Parkway to King Edward one km away? Why isn't there a tunnel option from Nicholas to King Edward being considered? Why haven't various options been included and considered in an objective fashion first?

The rational for dismissing some viable options seem capricious and do not flow from the analysis. For example, the conclusion of the OMB Hearing in 1999 is based on unsubstantiated truck demand data for 2010. Using a one-sentence conclusion to dismiss a very viable option does warrant public credibility. The potential to link the Macdonald Cartier Bridge with the Vanier Parkway was considered by the OMB in 1999, in order to assess whether this link should be removed from the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. The expert (sic) testimony presented at this hearing identified that a tunnel (or at-grade) connection to the Vanier parkway could use the available capacity of the Macdonald Cartier Bridge but this would not accommodate future forecast demand in the Official Plan's 20 year planning horizon, even if transit mode share targets were met. The conclusion was that a new crossing is required and the available capacity on the bridge is not sufficient to meet future travel demand.

It seems to me, that this conclusion is equal to dismissing the option of building a new bridge since it fails to reduce the downtown truck traffic in 20 years, therefore a tunnel is required. These conclusions do not flow from the analysis and all options should be compared using relevant criteria.

The public needs an explanation why some viable options are prematurely dismissed based on one-sentence expert statements, whereas other expert opinions are considered irrelevant? All options should be measured against all criteria to assess their relative merits. Options should not be eliminated due to a one-sentence conclusion that is not related to the criteria being used.

INTERPROVINCIAL CROSSINGS
ENVIRONMENTAL
ASSESSMENT

ÉVALUATION
ENVIRONNEMENTALE DES
LIAISONS INTERPROVINCIALES

Comment sheet
Feuille de commentaires

Other Comments / Autres commentaires :
See attached sheet
NAME / NOM :
ADDRESS / ADRESSE :
PHONE NUMBER / Nº DE TÉL. :
E-MAIL / COURRIEL :
Please leave this comment sheet in the appropriate Comment Box. You may also send it by mail to Marley Ransom, PACE Public Affairs and Community Engagement, 302-370 ave. Churchill Ave., Ottawa, ON, K1Z 5C2 or by fax to 613-686-1889. Veuillez déposer votre feuille de commentaires. Vous pouvez également l'envoyer par la poste à Marley Ransom, PACE Public Affairs and Community Engagement, 302-370 ave. Churchill Ave., Ottawa, ON, K1Z 5C2 ou par télécopieur au 613-686-1889.

Thanks to John C. Ainsworth who designs instrument approaches I am forwarding what I believe is factually correct information that demonstrates a potential hazardous safety situation is created for aircraft taking-off or approaching at the Rockcliffe Airport when there is a bridge located there. My previous questions to the National Capital Commission (NCC) about this safety hazard were not acknowledged or answered possibly because of the technical complexity of an instrument approach.

I have done the research and concluded that a bridge approximately 500' to the east of the threshold of the runway at Rockcliffe (CYRO) would have to be at ground level so as to not penetrate the normal "Obstacle Limitation Surfaces" for any future aircraft instrument approach. There are 3 different and separate "Obstacle Limitation Surfaces" mentioned in the Transport Canada standard below. I have included a link to a diagram that shows all three surfaces in a plan and profile view.

Ref: TP312 Aerodrome Standards and Recommended Practices
http://www.tc.gc.ca/CivilAviation/publications/tp312/images/Figure4-1a.gif

Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS). A surface that establishes the limit to which objects may project into the airspace associated with an aerodrome so that aircraft operations at the aerodrome may be conducted safely. Obstacle limitation surfaces consist of the following:

1. Outer surface. A surface located in a horizontal plane above an aerodrome and its environs.

2. Take-off/Approach surface. An inclined plane beyond the end of a runway and preceding the threshold of a runway.

3. Transitional surface. A complex surface along the side of the strip and part of the side of the approach surface, that slopes upwards and outwards to the outer surface, when provided.

1. The outer surface is a circle around the Rockcliffe Airport about 335.65' high (Above Sea Level) or approximately 147.65' (Above Ground Level) from the local terrain. This surface extends for a radius of 4000 m (13625') or almost 2.5 miles! This may be useful information for those in Manor Park who need justification to limit the heights of buildings in the vicinity of the Airport. I doubt city planners are even aware of this constraint as a public safety issue.

2. The take-off/approach surface is a slope of 4% (1:25) from the threshold of the runway from which an aircraft either descends or climbs.
At 250' back from the threshold, the surface would be 10' high
At 500' back from the threshold, the surface would be 20' high
At 1000' back from the threshold, the surface would be 40' high
At 2000' back from the threshold, the surface would be 80' high
At 3000' back from the threshold, the surface would be 120' high
At 4000' back from the threshold, the surface would be 160' high
Sec 4.3.1.3 of Ref TP312 also states that objects like highways would be 20 ft (6m) below these limits.
(Therefore, approximately 500' back from the threshold, the slope is at 20' and objects like highways have to be 20' below that which means that the highway or bridge would have to be at ground level.)

3. The transitional surface is like a fence around the landing surface approximately 98.4' around the tarmac which leans away from the runway 1' for every 5' high up to the outer surface at 335.65'. This fence is already being infringed upon by the Aviation Museum. Some speculate that the museum was deliberately built there to infringe upon the runway transitional surface thus curtailing certain kinds of aircraft traffic. Obviously a bridge that violates the take-off/approach path might ultimately lead to the closure of the airport for safety reasons. The other option mentioned is moving the runway to the east to resolve this obvious problem.

Although detailed, my facts are correct and presented for your response. Is the NCC is willing to acknowledge this as a hazardous situation? Has the Aviation Museum or the Rockcliffe Flying Club publicly expressed any safety concerns about the bridge location near the approach and departure end of their runway complex?