
C1 Terms of Reference

Introduction

The Public Consultation Group (PCG), a group of stakeholders representing various regional interests, was established during Phase 1 of the Study to provide comment on the Study assumptions, alternatives, evaluation factors, evaluation methodology, conclusions and recommendations.

The PCG, which is made up of community associations and interest groups, provides a forum for a two-way dialogue between the member organizations and the Study Team. PCG meetings are scheduled at key points during the Study to facilitate the understanding of issues and for committee members to provide feedback.

Membership

PCG membership has been organized into two sections; Working Members and Observers.

Role and Responsibility of the PCG Working Members:

- Ensuring their organization is represented at each PCG meeting
- Assuring two-way dialogue between the Consultant and the organization
- Providing input on behalf of their organization
- Collecting and distributing information to their organization, and helping to promote consultation activities
- Becoming informed of the Study and its progress.

Role and Responsibility of the PCG Observers:

- Attending PCG meetings to observe - any contribution must be made through a PCG Working Member
- Collecting and distributing information to their organization, and helping to promote consultation activities
- Becoming informed of the Study and its progress.

Administration

- The PCG will be chaired by the Project Manager for the Consultant Team
- The Chair has the discretion to determine the language in which the meetings will be held, taking into consideration attendance and participant wishes
- The Chair will be responsible for meeting notifications, meeting agendas and meeting notes. Notes will be circulated for review and approval following each meeting
- To ensure that meetings are productive, collaborative and respect meeting objectives, they will generally not be open to the broader public or media

C2 PCG Membership

Action Sandy Hill
AGAP du vieux Gatineau
Association des citoyens du Manoir des Trembles
Association des résidents de la Croisée
Association des résidents de la Terrasse Lakeview
Association des résidents de l'Île-de-Hull
Association des résidents du District 15 et membre citoyen du Commission consultative sur les choix stratégiques (CCCS)
Association des résidents du Parc Champlain et des environs
Association des résidents du quartier village Parc Lucerne
Aviation Museum
Beacon Hill North Community Association
Blackburn Hamlet Community Association
Britannia Village Community Association
Britannia Yacht Club
Byward Market Business Improvement Area
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society - Ottawa Chapter
Cardinal Creek Association
Cardinal Creek Community Association
Carlsbad Springs Community Association
CECLFCE
Centretown Citizens' Community Association
CEPEO
Chambre de commerce de Gatineau
Chapel Hill South Community Association
Chatelaine Village Community Association
Villages Community Association
City Centre Coalition
City of Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee
City of Ottawa Pedestrians and Transit Committee
City of Ottawa Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee
Club de voile Grande rivière
Club Vélo Plaisirs
Collectif Vigilance Petite-Nation
Comité de vie quartier Pointe-Gatineau
Common Sense Crossings
Convent Glen Community Association
CREDDO
Crystal Beach/Lakeview Community Association
Cumberland Village Community Association
Dalhousie Community Association
Downtown Coalition
Enviro éducation
Environment for the Briarbrook/Morgan's Grant Community Association
Fallingbrook Community Association
Federation of Citizens Association
Friends of Greenspace Alliance
Go for Green
Greenbelt Coalition
Greenspace Alliance
Heart of Orleans BIA

Island Park Community Association
Jp2g Consultants Inc.
Kanata Lakes Community Association
King Edward Avenue Task Force
Kriska Transportation / Ontario Trucking Association
Lac Deschenes Sailing Club
Le Regroupement des gens d'affaires de la Capitale nationale (RGA)
Lowertown Community Association
Manor Park Community Association
March Rural Community Association
Marina de Hull
Montfort Hospital
Navan Community Association
Nepean Sailing Club
OCDSB
Ontario Kiteboarding Association
Orléans Chamber of Commerce
Orleans Woods Community Association
Ottawa Chamber of Commerce
Ottawa Field Naturalists
Ottawa Riverkeeper Inc.
Pontiac Bridge Committee
Portobello South Community Development Association
President of Multicultural Association
Queenswood Heights Community Association
Réseau des femmes d'affaires et professionnelles de l'Outaouais (REFAP)
Rideau Street BIA
Riverwalk Community Association
Rockcliffe Mews Residents Association
Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
Rockcliffe Yacht Club
Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association
South March Community Association
Table jeunesse Gatineau
Table jeunesse Outaouais
Tecumusch Gatineau
Tourisme Outaouais
Vars Community Association
Village of Sarsfield CA
Villages Community Association
Vision Centre-ville de Gatineau
Westboro Community Association
Woodpark Community Association

C3 Letter of Invitation

[For existing PCG Members: Dear Member of the Interprovincial Crossings Public Consultation Group (PCG)]

[For New Members: Dear Mr./Ms. XXXX. I am writing you to invite you to participate in the Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment study, as a member of the Public Consultation Group. The PCG was established during the first phase of this study and is comprised of a broad-based group of individuals or organizations that have an interest or stake in a future bridge crossing in the National Capital Region.]

[To All] As you may know, the NCC and its partners recently launched Phase 2 of the Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment study. This last phase in the study will be implemented in two stages (a copy of the project launch announcement is attached for your reference).

The mandate of the current Phase 2A is to develop a process for evaluating and selecting a bridge crossing in the east-end of the National Capital Region. Three corridors are under consideration. Note that the actual selection of the crossing will be the focus of Phase 2B, to be initiated in late 2010.

A major component of Phase 2A is to consult with communities, stakeholders and members of the public in order to determine the best approach for delivering open and meaningful consultations during Phase 2B.

We are seeking your involvement in this process. An initial meeting of the PCG will be held on Tuesday, December 15th. This meeting is mostly informative and will include a presentation by the Study Team on the objectives for Phase 2. An outline of the consultation program that is planned for Phase 2A will also be presented, followed by an open dialogue session on consultation expectations. Two other meetings of the PCG are planned for the new year, details of which will be forthcoming.

When: Tuesday, December 15th from 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Where: Room 324, National Capital Commission offices, 40 Elgin Street

[For Existing PCG Members: Please confirm your interest in remaining a member of the PCG for this next phase of the study, as well as your availability to attend this meeting, before end-of-day Friday, December 11. You can RSVP with Marley Ransom, a member of the Consulting Team, at (613) 860-1685, extension 204, or by email at mransom@paceconsulting.ca.

[For New Members: Please confirm your interest in joining the PCG, as well as your availability to attend this meeting, before end-of-day Friday, December 11 by contacting Marley Ransom, a member of the Consulting Team. Marley can be reached at 613.860.1685 ext. 204, or mransom@paceconsulting.ca.

[To All: For more information on the particulars of this Study, please visit the project website at www.ncrcrossings.ca, or you can reach me at the contact information provided below.

Regards,
Patrick Déoux
Project manager
Co-entreprise AECOM-Delcan

C4 Minutes of PCG Meetings



Notes of Meeting

Subject: Interprovincial Crossing Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Date: Dec. 15, 2009
Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
Location: NCC Boardroom 324
Purpose: Discussion on Phase 2A: engagement program, schedule, process
Meeting: PCG Meeting Number 1

Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Karen Maw	Ottawa Riverkeeper / Le Sentenelle Outaouais	Don Lishman	City of Ottawa Roads and Cycling Advisory Committee
John Murray	Rockcliffe Yacht Club	John Forsey	Manor Park Community Association
Joel Jancovic	Gatineau Tecumseh	Alexa Brewer	Common Sense Crossings
Pat Boulé	Common Sense Crossings	Ruth Tremblay	Crystal Beach/Lakeview Community Association
Norman Kruse	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association	Fred Perkins	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association
David Power	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association	Hugh Carter	Greenbelt Coalition
Marc Aubin	King Edward Avenue Task Force	Bruce Baker	Lowertown Community Association
John Verbaas	Action Sandy Hill	David Gladstone	Centretown Citizens Community Association
Gaétan Provencher	CREDDO	Janice Seline	Friends of the Greenspace Alliance
Peter Levick	Cardinal Creek Community Association	Andrew Hope	RCMP
Staff and Project Team			
Gabrielle Simonyi	NCC	Monique Stone	PACE
Arto Keklikian	NCC	Patrick Déoux	AECOM
Sandra Pecek	NCC	Cécile Leblanc	AECOM
Gerry Augusta	NCC	Grégoire Jodouin	PACE



Item		Assigned
1.0	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Attendees sign-in. Introductions are made.</p>	
2.0 - 5.0	<p>Presentation:</p> <p>2.0 Background 3.0 Project Team and Work Plan 4.0 Work in Progress 5.0 Phase 2A and 2B Program and Schedule</p>	
6.0	<p>Issues of Mutual Interest – Questions and Discussion</p> <p><u>Discussion on PCG Meetings and Expectations</u></p> <p>Members felt that the PCG is an appropriate forum to share information with them and to consult on key questions.</p> <p>A member of PCG stated that in Phase 1, he had provided input and information. Specifically, he had submitted a paper on boating and crossings at the request of the consultant team. However, he never received feedback on his paper.</p> <p>Members made the following suggestions for the PCG process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One member indicated that the PCG process used for the DOTT project worked well because it was more interactive. • There should be an acknowledgement for all submitted comments. • A member requested that PCG meetings be recorded. • Consultant Team replied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A matrix for replying and cataloguing public comments is being worked out. ○ Also there is a function on the website to register e-mail addresses to receive project updates. <p>A member suggested that comments, reports, etc. should be put on a “wiki.” This would not be open to the public but would be convenient for members. The site could serve as a repository for large documents, and could include a lexicon for technical terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant Team replied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provided an overview of a wiki consultation: each member has the opportunity to comment on the posted items (for example: slides) and the tool keeps track of the comments and who has made them. ○ For the time being, an FTP site will be made available for PCG members. 	<p>Consultant Team: FTP site, Acknowledgment of Comments, Submissions</p>



Item	Assigned
<p>A member highlighted that at Phase 1, it was difficult to know when consultants were going to deliver and what the deliverables were going to be. Once deliverables were shared, it was too late to provide input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A framework will be provided in the next coming weeks, which will be a more in-depth plan on consultations and deliverables.○ The PCG input will be taken into account in the development of deliverables. <p><u>Discussion on the EA Process and Phase 2A</u></p> <p>A member was unclear on how the EA process is being regulated by 3 levels governments with 3 different types of criteria. Inquired how members will be able to understand the proper context to have an informed position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Manager replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ At the end of Phase 1, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment indicated that the provincial EA process didn't apply to this project.○ No confirmation from Quebec in regards to whether their EA process would apply.○ Federal EA applicable (screening). <p>A member asked a question about weighting: How will the Study Team go about weighting? Does the Study Team have a methodology to address this now? For example: cost over traffic? How and when will the Study Team develop the methodology?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The first steps were a review of documents and correspondence, including an overview of the weighting that was used for Phase 1. The aim of Phase 2A is to highlight factors that are important for Phase 2B.○ The mandate for Phase 2A is to develop a methodology and to make it reflect community values. During the public and community consultations that will be held in winter/spring, we will look at the values that will contribute to the development of the factors. <p>A member highlighted concerns about weightings. Felt that weighting is a fundamental process to make a decision, and believed that there was no transparency in Phase 1. The public needs to be involved with the weighting decisions. Another member expanded on weighting. Highlighted that a traditional method was used for Phase 1, but that it didn't take everything (example: costs) into account. For example, property taxes could be reduced for the most impacted community. A deeper financial analysis is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ We'll investigate innovative methods. Weighting is only one way of evaluating, but, for example, we can also look at values. Different methodologies and process will be explored.	



Item		Assigned
	<p>A few members asked about the screening level for the EA. If screening is done on the three options, it was felt it would not be enough. Suggest a full EA should be carried out during the selection process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Study Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ CEA is based on self-assessment. It is up to the responsible federal department, in conjunction with regulatory and federal experts to determine the scope of the project and the assessment. Phase 2A will lead us to that scope and the things to be evaluated at 2B.○ Screening is an odd word. Under the Canadian Environmental Act (CEA), there are 4 types of EAs: Screening, Comprehensive Study, Panel Review and Mediation. There's no real significant difference between a 'screening' and a 'comprehensive study.' Comprehensive study is reserved for large significant projects identified by the Comprehensive Study Regulations and must consider alternatives. A screening, however, can apply to more than alternatives for a project.○ There's no restriction on the process using a 'screening' approach. A 'panel review', can result if there is significant public interest. <p>A member inquired if Study will look at new corridors. Another member highlighted that a lot of time was spent at Phase 1 trying to expand the corridor review to look at better alternatives. Felt that Phase 2 should not be restricted to what was done at Phase 1, because input on better alternatives was never addressed. Felt that at least 2 other options in the east end and probably others in the west should be explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This point is well taken but it is not the mandate of this phase to look at other alternatives.• (Addition to the Minutes by the NCC PM: To clarify the NCC, MTO and MTQ decided that only three bridge corridors (Corridors 5, 6, and 7) would be carried forward into Phase 2 for further analysis. There will be no other corridors examined in Phase 2.) <p>A member stated that a perception exists that at Phase 1 the corridors were pre-selected or 'framed' around making only three corridors the obvious choice. Some people had heard that Kettle had been pre-selected before the process had begun. Member felt it would be easy to modify Corridor 6 or 7 but this doesn't seem to have been considered. Another member stated that a local MP stated that the corridor could be modified and this would be easy to look at.</p> <p>Another member stated that they believed there is a consensus to refuse to discuss the actual solution which would be to reduce cars and increase transit. Traffic is the root of the problem. There's no immediate solution that will deal with pollution effects right now.</p> <p>A member asked whether the consultants had access to the information provided by communities in Phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Yes. First step included a review of all comments and documents. We read all of them and we determined that we need a mechanism to report back and communicate better.○ Recognized that more has to be done to attract Gatineau residents. <p><u>Engagement program</u></p>	
		AECOM to post PCG



Item

Assigned Meeting # 1 Presentation on Study Website

Consultants noted that the PowerPoint presentation delivered at the PCG meeting will be posted on the project website.

Consultants outlined the engagement program:

- Phase 2 divided into A and B.
- Four steps in public engagement program in 2A.
- Consultant Team will be proactive in meeting with select community groups through the Community Consultation Groups (CCG).
- An engagement program will be developed later in Phase 2A for Phase 2B.
- This will be an opportunity to develop a solid engagement program that takes into account community values.
- In addition, we will develop an engagement program with First Nations.
- There is a CEA requirement to make sure everything is well done and communicated.

Consultants provided an initial overview of the Community Consultation Group concept:

- There will be 10 meetings in total, 5 before public consultation events and 5 after. The consultants will be working on the process over the next couple of weeks regarding the criteria for how these groups will be selected. The terms of Reference for the CCGs will be shared as part of the Consultation Program.
- We will need to do more than the typical Open House techniques (boards, Q&A's, etc.) in order to have a true discussion. We are testing the CCG concept.

A Consultant Team member inquired with group on the format that should be used for the PCG meetings, so that they are productive and meaningful. There will be two more PCG meetings during Phase 2A.

- Members replied:
 - Currently the PCG is a manageable size.
 - Need discipline and microphones.
 - Workshops would work well for public events, less so for PCG meetings.

A member commented that the public consultation sessions in Phase 1 were not productive. In regards to PCG meetings, felt it was only informative but there was no consultation. States public briefings are useful for information but should not be considered consultation.

- Consultant Team replied:
 - Workshop provides smaller spaces for shy people, allows more voices and allows for deeper engagement. We will incorporate these into the public events to be more meaningful.
 - Community Consultation Groups are two smaller meetings. This allows us to have smaller group dialogue.

A member inquired if two public events will be enough. Suggested that there should be open houses at the end of Phase 2A to inform the public of what the conclusions were.

- Consultant Team replied:
 - This comment has been noted.
 - There will be a report and presentations to councils. (**Addition to the Minutes by the NCC PM: To**

AECOM Delcan to share consultation program



Item		Assigned
	<p>clarify there will be a NCC Board meeting which the public can attend. There will be presentations by the Consultant to the Ottawa Transportation Committee and the Gatineau Comité Plénier, which are generally open to the public.)</p> <p><i><u>Discussion on Phase 2B Selection Process</u></i></p> <p>A member discussed process and procedure. Felt that there is a problem of democracy because the NCC and the consultants were not elected. This is a problem because the consultants and the NCC can't be voted out. People should be able to vote to give their approval for the solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Study Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Consultants aren't the decision-makers. People are the voice feeding into the process. That is part of the democratic process. <p>A member inquired who the decision-maker is and who ultimately decides on the location of the crossing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Manager replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The project is funded by the NCC, MTQ and MTO with the two cities participating. Decision at Phase 1 was made by the NCC Board, MTO and MTQ, with input from city councils. The same process will be carried out in Phase 2. (Addition to the Minutes by the NCC PM: To clarify that the federal Screening decision rests solely with the NCC and the federal regulators) <p>A member asked when the options will go from 3 to 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ We are in the process of developing a methodology. We're at the start of this but the thought is to identify the best 2 corridors, then move to 1. <p><i><u>Discussion on Phase 2 Mandate</u></i></p> <p>A member inquired if there is an option to have the RFP for Phase 2B look at a modification of a third corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ We will take note of this. <p>A member inquired why the tunnel option at Phase 1 had been removed. Highlights that it's done in other parts of the world and it might solve many of the environmental impact issues. Felt that the tunnel makes more sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This comment has been noted. We can't comment on decisions made at Phase 1, as this is not part of our mandate at Phase 2. <p>A member inquired about the corridors: If people want other options to be explored, where do they go?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mandate for Phase 2 is to look at three corridors. We'll not be looking at other corridors within phase 2A. We have recorded your comment, but that is not the mandate at this time.	



Item		Assigned
6.0	<p>Another member inquired on where they could access the full mandate for Phase 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project Manager replied: Recommends that members look on the NCC website for the mandate. The full Request for Proposals (RFP) has been posted. <p>A member stated that they understand the box the consultants are in terms of their mandate, but feels that the members are boxed in as well. Inquires how this will be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ We have recorded your comment. It will be reflected in our reports. This is the point of the PCG; there are no barriers in the discussion. <p>A member inquired if it is possible to have a session to deal with 'legacy frustration' from Phase 1. Feels that this session would respond to concerns from Phase 1 participants to 'air' frustrations.</p> <p>A member stated that it would be good to have justifications why these three corridors were selected. The eventual recommendation must be justified.</p> <p>Other Business and Next Meeting</p> <p>Next Meeting is scheduled for February 22. Consultants state that they will be communicating with members of PCG prior to it.</p> <p>Comment sheet and Terms of Reference for the PCG were distributed. Consultants recommended that members communicate with PACE with comments on this meeting (for example: to add an item in the minutes).</p>	



Notes of Meeting

Subject: Interprovincial Crossing Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Date: February 22, 2010
Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Location: NCC Boardroom 324
Purpose: Update on Phase 2A activities
Meeting: PCG Meeting Number 2

Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
David Glastonbury	Ottawa Chamber of Commerce	Louis Caron	Common Sense Crossings
John Murray	Rockcliffe Yacht Club	John Forsey	Manor Park Community Association
Peggy DuCharme	Rideau Street BIA	Alexa Brewer	Common Sense Crossings
Pat Boulé	Common Sense Crossings	Michel Vallée	King Edward Avenue Task Force
Norman Kruse	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association	Fred Perkins	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association
David Power	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association	Hugh Carter	Greenbelt Coalition; Common Sense Crossings
Keith Brewer	Convent Glen Association	Brian McGarry	Rockcliffe Park Residents Association
Peter Stewart	Orléans Chamber of Commerce	Robert Brocklebank	Federation of Citizens' Association of Ottawa-Carleton
Alexander Macklin	Rockcliffe Park Residents Association	Marc Thibault	Orléans Chamber of Commerce
Peter Levick	Cardinal Creek Community Association	Rainer Bloess	City of Ottawa Councillor – Ward 2 Innes
Don Lishman	City of Ottawa Roads and Cycling Committee; Infrastructure Sub-Committee	Sol Shuster	Greenbelt Coalition
Staff and Project Team			
Gabrielle Simonyi	NCC	Valerie McGirr	AECOM
Arto Keklikian	NCC	Patrick Déoux	AECOM
Sandra Pecek	NCC	Cécile Leblanc	AECOM
Fred Gaspar	NCC	Grégoire Jodouin	PACE
Hanako Cardinal	MTQ	Monique Stone	PACE
Louis Tay	MTO		



Item		Assigned
	<p>A member inquired if it was conceivable that all three corridors could be rejected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant replied that Phase 1 lead to three potential crossings. The exercise at Phase 2 is to examine these three and make a recommendation for the best one. <p>F. Gaspar (NCC) added that Phase 2A was introduced by Study Partners in response to public input and a rigorous process has to be followed. Stated that public opinion does not negate the fact that three corridors scored well. Highlighted that the Study could not ignore technical results, but if human factors are missing then a process needs to be developed to consider them and then compare the corridors.</p> <p>A member inquired if the EA would lead to a recommended corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant confirmed that the EA would make a recommendation to the Study Partners. <p>Several members asked whether a variation of an existing corridor, also referred to as the Canotek option, would be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant and the NCC replied that they will be reviewing the merits of this proposal, particularly with respect to whether or not it can be considered a variation of an existing corridor. Confirmed that maps of this will be included at the next meeting for closer review and discussion with the PCG. In the meanwhile, PCG members can obtain details on this option at www.stopthebridge.org or www.pourunmeilleurpont.com.The Consultant and the NCC noted that the 'Canotek' option has not received as thorough an examination as the other three corridors being considered, but that the rationale and facts supporting it will be examined. As it stands, it is not a stand alone corridor. It will be looked at further to determine its suitability for further examination. It is an important piece of input, but needs to be more refined before it can be assessed under the EA process. <p>A member inquired if the Study were to look at Canotek's option, then the Study should be open to other new recommendations as well. Another member commented that Canotek's option is a variant of the three, not a new corridor. Councillor Bloess commented that there is no Canotek corridor. Stated that the Study should move forward with the three in the EA.</p> <p>The Consultant replied that if it is within the context of one of the three corridors, it will be looked at. This will be determined at Phase 2A.</p>	
4.0	<p>PowerPoint Presentation: Slide on Key Environmental Features</p> <p>The PCG suggested the following additional features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Rockcliffe Yacht ClubGreenbelt. (It was noted that one side of the NCC is looking at the Greenbelt Master Plan, the other is looking at developing the Greenbelt).Roads and highways	



Item		Assigned
	<p>The Consultant clarified that the list was not meant to be exclusive and that the above comments would be noted as part of further refinements to the draft Study Design.</p> <p>A member commented that they felt it was not fair to be expected to provide input and feedback on a complicated Study without having the opportunity to review materials in advance. Also noted that many PCG representatives need to report back to their members before providing comments. Felt that this was not meaningful consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Consultant replied that this was only an initial presentation on where we were at in the Study and that materials would be made available on the ftp site for further comments. Stated that the PCG allows the Consultants to present to a targeted group; the PCG is the beginning of the process for review and input into the Study. Members are not expected to come to the meeting with finalized input and feedback. Rather, they are expected to leave the meeting informed, consult within their stakeholder group and provide feedback and comments subsequently through the established communications channels. 	<p>Consultant to post presentation on the FTP site</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>PowerPoint Presentation: Slide on 'Community' Map</p> <p>A member commented that Ottawa's Lowertown and Centretown were not included on the Study 'community' map. Stated that these communities are the most affected by 3500 trucks per day. Another member noted that 100,000 people live east of the Greenbelt (all of Orléans), and beyond Orléans, and that these areas needed to be reflected in the Study.</p> <p>The Consultant replied that these comments are noted as part of further refinements to the draft Study Design.</p>	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>PowerPoint Presentation: Slides on Evaluation Factors</p> <p>Factors from Phase 1 will be refined. The Consultant noted that they began with a review of Phase 1 factors.</p> <p>The PCG suggested additional factors and sub-factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health (air quality) and Traffic Safety (member highlighted that fourteen people died or were seriously hurt in the last eight years on King Edward.) Economic Development and Commuting under 'Socio-Economic Environment' NCC Parkways <p>The Consultant replied that these comments are noted as part of further refinements to the draft Study Design.</p>	
<p>7.0</p>	<p>PowerPoint Presentation: Slides on Technical Tasks</p> <p>Members suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality should be in "Social Environment" 	



Item		Assigned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Water quality should be included• 'Pedestrians' and trails should be added to Social Environment (notably waterfront trail in Gatineau)• 'Landslide risk' needs to be added• Light pollution should be added (the Greenbelt is known for darkness)• Tour buses (casino, etc.) are currently under Economic Development, but should also be under 'Traffic and Transportation'• Public transit should be carefully considered• Under 'Land Use' it was important to consider developments on King Edward and Rideau Street. <p>Another member commented that not everything was regarded in the cost analysis at Phase 1 (only incremental costs, i.e. if it was going to be built anyway, it was not assumed to be a project cost). Stated that Phase 2 needed to be clearer about what will be included or not.</p> <p>A member commented that Phase 1 was about alleviating truck traffic; however, the notice posted with the CEAA registry for Phase 2 was about connecting Gatineau's and Ottawa's major roadways (417 and 50). Stated that there was a change in language. Highlighted that there was no mention of the King Edward truck problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Consultant replied that it was not the intent of Phase 2 to re-define the mandate from Phase 1. <p>A member commented that the Interprovincial Transit Study is considering a rail loop. Inquired if rail is going to be considered on the corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Consultant replied that they were working closely with Transit Strategy Team. <p>A member commented that the Interprovincial Transit Strategy and the Trucks and Goods Movement Study need to be tied together. Another commented that the Transit Strategy was at odds with what people want and the scoring at Phase 1. Stated that a weighting factor at Phase 1 was how many cars a corridor could attract. Stated that more cars are not what people want.</p> <p>Another member asked to see the Terms of Reference for the Goods Movement Study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Consultant replied that they were working closely with the Transit Strategy Team. Also noted that the Terms of Reference for the Goods Movement Study were not yet ready. It is an NCC led Study. <p>A member commented that they were encouraged to see the scope at Phase 2 broadening, but that they still had concerns regarding the Notice of Commencement. Inquired why the Study was subject to a 'screening' and not a full panel review. Inquired if this indicated a new direction and asked when a decision would take place. Noted that the criteria for a full panel review included high public concern and significant impact and that these are both met with the Interprovincial Crossings Study.</p> <p>Another member commented that the Study was starting at the most narrow point rather than doing an independent full panel review. A member inquired if Phase 2A would make a recommendation regarding a screening or full panel</p>	



Item		Assigned
8.0	<p>review. Inquired who would make this decision.</p> <p>A member commented that people are really interested in this Study. Felt that people are sceptical that the Study is looking at the most narrow of the EA options. Member added that they were encouraged by the broadening of the Study and the additional factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant noted that it does not have a preconceived notion of the direction of the assessment. Noted that at this point, this project is a screening and that it does not fall under the comprehensive study regulations or a panel review. The decision to go to full panel is premature. In terms of the 'significant impact' criteria, it has to be weighed against what measures or technologies exist to mitigate that impact. At this stage, it is not yet known what mitigation measures exist until we are further in the process. In regards to public reaction, the decision is made by Ministry of Environment. We are just starting the EA and we don't have the data just yet. <p>All consultant reports will be considered by the Study Partners (and all relevant government departments and agencies) as they are the ones making the decisions.</p> <p>PowerPoint Presentation: Slides on Consultation</p> <p>The Consultant stated that there will be several opportunities to provide input: PCG meetings, Public Sessions and CCG meetings. Highlighted that the CCG meetings are an extra dimension of the process and are an opportunity to discuss with directly impacted communities.</p> <p>The CCG concept was discussed and why these meetings would be held only for community organizations located within or adjacent to the three corridors. Some felt that this served to exclude other communities outside of the corridors that are also impacted.</p> <p>A member of the Kind Edward Task Force asked if Ottawa's downtown will be considered as part of the CCG process. They believe that the downtown communities are being excluded. Felt that there was better opportunity at smaller meetings such as the CCGs to have a conversation.</p> <p>A Common Sense Crossing representative commented that their organization is torn about participating in the CCG process because they represent a directly impacted community (Convent Glen) and also the much larger eastern part of Ottawa. Another member commented that there are 115,000 people in the east end, and that they will be affected by all three corridors. Stated that they did not want Convent Glen speaking for them at a CCG.</p> <p>A member commented that everyone is affected. Highlighted that some people will be more impacted than others. Stated that they support the CCG process outlined at Phase 2A.</p> <p>A member commented that King Edward is directly impacted by trucks. Felt their organization deserved to be a part of the CCG process. Other members expressed support for this.</p>	Consultant to review Consultation Plan



Item		Assigned	
9.0	<p>The Consultant replied that they incorporated several other opportunities for consultation at Phase 2A for community groups, such as the PCG, website and the public sessions. For example, the Public Sessions will be designed using a ‘world cafe’ approach to give opportunity for small groups to be involved a meaningful dialogue. The CCG concept is something that is being piloted at Phase 2A for broader consideration at Phase 2B.</p>	<p>Assigned</p>	
	<p>The Consultant also stated that they will consider all comments received at the PCG meeting and will look at ways of amending their Consultation program to address the concerns that were raised.</p>		
	<p>A member inquired about the representation from Gatineau.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 500 1696 597">The Consultant noted that this was currently being worked on. Highlighted that the Consultant Team at Phase 2A is working to support Gatineau communities to establish more formal community organizations so that they can participate more fully at Phase 2B. 		<p>Consultant to review Consultation Plan</p>
	<p>The Consultant Team noted that the PowerPoint presentation will be put on the ftp site.</p>		<p>Consultant Team</p>
	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>Thursday, April 22. Noted that it is not April 20 as indicated in the PowerPoint presentation.</p>		



Notes of Meeting

Subject: Interprovincial Crossing Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
 Date: April 22, 2010
 Time: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.
 Location: NCC Boardroom 324
 Purpose: Update of recent activities; Update on Study Design
 Meeting: PCG Meeting Number 3

Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Branden Malleck	Pedestrian and Transit Advisory Committee	Louis Caron	Common Sense Crossings
John Forsey	Manor Park Community Association	Sandra Cullen	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association
Peggy DuCharme	Rideau Street BIA	Alexa Brewer	Common Sense Crossings
Philip Berthiaume	Councillor Bob Monette's Office	Marc Aubin	King Edward Avenue Task Force / Lowertown Community Association
Norman Kruse	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association	Fred Perkins	Rockcliffe Mews Residents' Association
Marc Despatis	Office of Minister Meilleur (Gov of Ontario)	Sol Shuster	Greenbelt Coalition
Keith Brewer	Convent Glen North Community Association	John Verbaas	Action Sandy Hill / City Centre Coalition
Ian Maclean	Canada Science and Technology Museum Corporation and Canadian Aviation Museum	Lorna Lyttle	Common Sense Crossings
Alexander Macklin	Rockcliffe Park Residents Association	David Gladstone	Centretown Citizens Community Association
Peter Levick	Cardinal Creek Community Association	Rainer Bloess	City of Ottawa Councillor – Ward 2 Innes
Don Lishman	City of Ottawa Roads and Cycling Committee; Infrastructure Sub-Committee	Phil Marion	Chambre de commerce de Gatineau
André Chaumont	Chambre de commerce de Gatineau	Annick Laporte	Blackburn Community Association
Joel Jancovic	Tecumseh Gatineau		
Staff and Project Team			
Gabrielle Simonyi	NCC	Valerie McGirr	AECOM
Fred Gaspar	NCC	Patrick Déoux	AECOM
Sandra Pecek	NCC	Grégoire Jodouin	PACE
Arto Keklikian	NCC		
Hanako Cardinal	MTQ		



Item		Assigned
1.0	<p>The Consultant delivered a presentation on the status of the Study Design and the results of consultations.</p> <p>A participant enquired about the two year time timeline for Phase 2B. Asked how much technical work will be completed before there is a functional design. Specifically, they wanted to know how the EA would tie-in with other studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied that timelines for the technical work was different for each of the various tasks to be accomplished, and that in some cases, specific studies required timeframes that included a spring and a fall season to be complete.• Consultant also noted that the EA would include its own analysis on trucks. While the upcoming goods movement study would help inform the EA, that study was more strategic in nature and as such, the EA would include a more in-depth analysis on trucks. Also commented that the Interprovincial Transit Strategy was further along and would feed into Phase 2B. <p>A participant asked whether at the preliminary design stage, it might be possible to find something that would result in a corridor being excluded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied that while this might be a possibility, it would be unlikely that any such information would be uncovered at that point in the EA. Noted that Step 1 will include a considerable amount of analysis, including geotechnical, geophysical and borehole data to better understand what's under the earth. <p>A discussion was held regarding the site study areas for Phase 2. It was noted that the maps included in the Powerpoint presentation depicted corridors that were wider than those presented at Phase 1, particularly Corridor 6. Some participants noted that they were displeased or uncomfortable with the new study areas while others expressed support for it. A participant inquired if the new study area captured all of "Corridor 6A", as proposed by representatives from all three levels of government. Another noted that it had been clearly stated that no additional corridors would be considered at Phase 2 but that the changes at Corridor 6 were too significant to be considered a variation; wanted to know how this could be justified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant Team replied that the corridors had not changed. Phase 1 only had concepts for the corridors under consideration; there was no specific site area developed, just a 'line.' The task at Phase 2A was to go further and look at the scope of the corridors and provide more detail on the site study areas. The new maps outline the areas where it is believed that physical structures could be built. The analysis was based on the same criteria used at Phase 1, but also includes new criteria added by the Consultant Team. As such, both Corridors 5 and 6 were somewhat widened from the original tracing presented at Phase 1. Further technical analysis will be done at Phase 2B to fully evaluate the viability of the study areas before anything can outright be dismissed. <p>A participant inquired if better alternatives would be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant replied that they would look at alignment alternatives but that no new corridor would be	



Item		Assigned
	<p>considered. The Study Team stands by the results of Phase 1.</p> <p>A participant noted that at Phase 1, the PCG was told the 'Canotek Option' did not meet road standards, and asked why it had been included in the detailed study area for Corridor 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant clarified that what was referred to during Phase 1 as the 'Canotek Option' was along Shefford Road and has not been carried forward to Phase 2 as that option had already been dismissed as not viable. The site study area for Corridor 6 includes area for alignment variations, but does not include what was proposed in the Phase 1 'Canotek Option'. <p>A representative stated that they were pleased with the broadening of Corridor 6 in Ontario but enquired why the corridor had not been broadened in Gatineau as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Consultant replied that Phase 1 looked at Lac Beauchamp in Gatineau as an option to be included in the site study area for Corridor 6 and that it was not carried forward due to it being a sensitive area. As such, Lac Beauchamp was not an option to consider at Phase 2A. Another of the issues with the Lac Beauchamp area is that residential development is ongoing as well as future development plans in the area. The primary reason it was dismissed as viable was because of the natural protected environment. <p>A representative of Rockcliffe Park offered to review the alignment proposed for Corridor 6 to see if it captured all of 'Bélanger's' proposal.</p> <p>A participant noted that during the Greenbelt Master Plan review, several participants expressed their opposition to developing the Greenbelt, and asked whether this review was being considered as part of the Crossing Study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Consultant replied that this review will definitely be included in the Study's analysis. <p>A participant inquired what the process was for comments, and asked what the difference was between the 'Minutes' and the 'Activity Table'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Consultant replied that the minutes are a record of the discussion at the meeting and the activity table captures any follow-up that is required from questions or undertakings not resolved at the meeting. <p>A participant inquired how much spacing was required between interchanges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Consultant replied that the desired spacing is 2 km. <p>A participant enquired if the same weighting for factors will be used for each corridor. Another member asked whether the public would be consulted. Stated that at Phase 1 there was no input considered in the weighting; that the evaluation committee made a decision on weighting the day after a public event on this topic was held.</p>	<p>Rockcliffe Park member</p>



Item		Assigned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant confirmed the weighting of factors would be the same for the three corridors, and that each criterion would include a range in its weighting to consider contributions from the public and experts. This will allow for a more robust analysis of the corridors. Public consultation on weighting will take place at Round 2 of Phase 2B.• Consultant also clarified that the factors are not compared against each other. For example, environmental impacts are not compared against costs; rather, the results of the cost analysis for one corridor would be compared against the results of the cost analysis for the other two corridors. <p>A participant stated that there was a problem with the methodology in that it should include a benefit cost analysis that recognizes that there are winners and losers. Methodology has to be set out in a way that makes sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant confirmed that this comment had been recorded. <p>A participant noted that while the proponents of the Study had demonstrated the best of intents, the fact that the Government of Ontario had decided that their legislation would not apply means that there was no legal protection to residents of Ontario in the process going forward. Stated that there was no appeals process provided under the federal legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant noted that they disagreed with this position. Confirmed that the federal legislation currently applies and that the proper notice has been posted. Stated that the letter from the Province of Ontario clearly sets out why Ontario Legislation does not apply, and that the best protections and most rigorous standards from all three laws will be the ones that will direct the Phase 2B process. As well, extensive consultation will take place.• The participant replied that it was arguable when CEAA is triggered, as the definition of a project is site-specific. Since there are 3 corridors, there isn't a site-specific project to trigger the law. As well, since public consultation is discretionary under the federal legislation, there's no guaranteed protection or appeal. Participant also noted that the EA proponents changed from all three Study Partners to just the NCC. Suggested that Ontario needs to rescind their decision and become involved, giving a right of appeal. <p>A participant asked about how the Interprovincial Transit Strategy would tie-in to this EA and stated that priority should be placed on transit in urban areas. This project seemed to only consider roads. Enquired about a railroad bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant replied that the need for a new interprovincial bridge had been established at Phase 1, which had also considered the transportation plans for both Gatineau and Ottawa. As a result, Phase 2 will not re-examine this need. <p>A participant stated that a lot of focus has been on the three corridors, but that the core issue was whether trucks would be diverted from the downtown. Asked how this would be evaluated in the analysis at Phase 2B.</p>	



Item		Assigned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant replied that truck traffic is a consideration for Phase 2B. The Study will consider several scenarios, and take into account the Ontario Municipal Board ruling that 'truck designation' be removed for King Edward. This will be a scenario, as will time of day restrictions and a 'do nothing' option. <p>A participant enquired which 'truck' scenario will be the one used in the analysis and when will it be discussed with the PCG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant replied that such a discussion would take place at Round 2 of Phase 2B, once the technical studies have been completed. <p>A participant asked if the commercial truck study would be completed by then.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant confirmed that the commercial goods movement study would likely not be complete by Round 2 of Phase 2B but that work completed would help inform the Crossings Study. Also noted that the commercial good study will be a strategy and as such, will be high level. More in-depth study of the trucks issue will take place during Phase 2B as part of the Crossings Study. Also noted that the EA will consider data from a commercial vehicle survey that was completed in 2007, and which resulted in considerable data on interprovincial truck movement. <p>A participant stated that there was a reference at an NCC board meeting in February 2009 that both the Crossings EA and the goods movement study would lead to a decision on a bridge. Enquired whether this decision had been revoked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• With respect to the goods movement study, a NCC representative stated that the Commission and its partners are aiming to start at it at the end of this year (12-18 month duration). The study will help inform the EA, though it may not be completed by Round 2 of Phase 2B. It will be a parallel process. <p>During the discussion about the requirement to conduct a trucks analysis at Phase 2B, a participant stated that there was no distinction between trucks and 18-24 wheel trucks in the 2007 cross-Canada trucks survey. As a result, the survey concluded that most truck traffic was local. Asked how this would survey would be used at Phase 2B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A NCC representative replied that when the cross-Canada truck survey had been undertaken in 2007, the TRANS Committee prepared a different survey aimed at obtaining regional data focused on interprovincial movement of heavy trucks origin-destination data. As a result, they have good data and complementary details are available through the cross-Canada study.• The NCC representative also indicated that the TRANS survey distinguished the types of trucks by axels and that this is available on TRANS website. <p>A participant enquired when members might see the Community Value Plans (CVPs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultant replied that the CVPs will be developed during Round 1 of Phase 2B. The concept was	



Item		Assigned
	<p>successfully introduced as a pilot at Phase 2A.</p> <p>In closing, the Consultant stated that all comments received at Phase 2A were being reviewed and analyzed, and would result in changes to the Study Design and CEA Act Scoping document. In addition, a Consultation Summary Report will be made available that will show where comments influenced the results. The Consultant also noted that the reports would be tabled and a presentation delivered before the City of Ottawa Transportation Committee (June 2), the ville de Gatineau Comité Plénier (June 8), and the NCC Board of Directors (June 29). The Committee Meetings and the NCC Board meeting will be open to the public.</p> <p>The next meeting of the PCG will take place at the beginning of Phase 2B. The membership will be the same although new members may be added as requested/required.</p>	All