
From: Lwow, Lyne
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 9:05 AM
To: Racine, Michel
Cc: Boyadjian, Sylvia
Subject: FW: Ottawa River planned bridge crossing - moving to a sound decision

Please add to system. Thanks.

Lyne Lwow
Manager, Executive Office Administration and Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer / Gestionnaire,
administration du bureau de la direction et adjointe exécutive à la première dirigeante
National Capital Commission / Commission de la capitale nationale
(613) 239-5271
lyne.lwow@ncc-ccn.ca

From: Lemay, Marie
Sent: April 9, 2010 5:42 PM
To: Lwow, Lyne
Subject: FW: Ottawa River planned bridge crossing - moving to a sound decision

Exec corr

Marie Lemay, P.Eng., ing.
Chief Executive Officer / Première dirigeante
National Capital Commission / Commission de la capitale nationale

From:
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 2:34 PM
To: minister@mto.gov.on.ca; bairdj@parl.gc.ca; Lemay, Marie; real.gregroire@mtq.gouv.qc.ca
Cc: Patrick.Deoux@aecom.com; Simonyi, Gabrielle; Rob.Jellett@ottawa.ca; Monette, Bob; Bloess, Rainer; maire@gatineau.ca; Larry.OBrien@ottawa.ca; pmcneely.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org; GalipR1@parl.gc.ca; Mills, Russell
Subject: Ottawa River planned bridge crossing - moving to a sound decision

TO:
Ms. Marie Lemay, CEO, NCC
Mr. John Baird, Minister of Transport for Canada
Mme. Julie Boulet, Minister of Transport for Quebec (c/o real.gregroire@mtq.gouv.qc.ca)
Ms. Kathleen Wynne, Minister of Transportation, Ontario

April 9, 2010

Ladies and Gentleman:

I have been interested in the Ottawa/Gatineau "next bridge crossing" for well over a year now, I have studied the 2009 Roche/NCE engineering report that recommended one of the ten location alternatives across the region, I have seen the decision to more closely examine 3 alternatives (# 5, Kettle Island, # 6, Upper Duck Island, # 7, Lower Duck Island), and to date, I have participated in one of the consultative sessions for the current round of public consultation activity dealing with these 3 alternatives. I have also reviewed relevant past documents and

4/12/2010

10.0232

decisions, particularly those related to actions by and for one special interest group.

It is not yet clear that the benefits of the next bridge crossing would outweigh its costs. These costs must be determined for each alternative location in comparison to the existing "do-nothing" scenario. It is clear that the current consultative phase of the work is preliminary. It seems to lack a clear sense of purpose or direction, and it also seems to be groping for a useful methodology. This would be an unsatisfactory and ill-informed setting in which to attempt to reach a sound decision for the location of the next bridge crossing, and proceeding on a flawed foundation could have serious fallout. Years ago, a completely improper decision related to "next-bridge" planning was made, and it required an appeal of citizens to the OMB, a hearing and an OMB order, and some years to reverse the impropriety.

It is clear that if a sound and reasoned productive decision is the objective of this present process, the location alternatives currently under study as well as the "do-nothing" alternative must be fully quantified and comprehensively evaluated, all to the same properly relevant criteria, and all evaluated under the same quantitative and qualitative methodologies. If that comprehensive and perceptive evaluation does not take place, the process will be flawed. Specifically, there would be a high risk that fewer considerations would be quantified, total lifecycle costs would not be determined, more and more subjective discussion would take place with less and less clarity about movement toward the right decision, and the decision would risk becoming one made through political influence. That would be neither legitimate democracy nor legitimate public participation. The concerns set out herein require full attention if this matter is to proceed to a sound decision without repeating past errors or generating new errors.

The following approach quantifies as much as possible, and leaves only the subjective aspects to be debated. Please note Item **A** following, completely accounts for economic aspects of the alternatives, while Item **B** following, sets out some thoughts and guidelines for dealing with the subjective aspects of the alternatives. Item **B** is a work-in-process set of initial notes. I am confident this approach can be utilised and improved upon by the engineering firms engaged in this bridge crossing undertaking. I have applied it to NIMBY-susceptible projects under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act more than 2 decades ago. It is not exotic, but rather, it is logical, easily understood, and defensible.

I will be grateful for an unambiguous reply to this submission, including planned action. I look forward.

Yours Truly,

Ottawa

cc. Mr. Russell Mills, Chairman, NCC
cc. Ms. Gabrielle Simonyi, Project Lead, NCC
cc. Mr. Royal Galipeau, MP
cc. Mr. Phil McNeely, MPP
cc. Mr. Larry O'Brien, Mayor, City of Ottawa
cc. M. Marc Bureau, Maire, Ville de Gatineau
cc. Mr. Bob Monette, Ottawa City Councillor
cc. Mr. Rob Jellet, Ottawa City Councillor
cc. Mr. Rainier Bloess, Ottawa City Councillor
cc. AECOM Delcan

A. Principles for Evaluating alternative locations for a Bridge Crossing of the Ottawa River

First and foremost, key to the selection of a sensible sound bridge location is economic performance of the transportation network. To determine this, the aggregate total of lifecycle cost to society of the transportation network existing (the "do-nothing" alternative) and the transportation network that would exist under each of the current alternatives under consideration requires to be determined. Lifecycle cost will show the economic costs of each transportation system alternative. Lifecycle costs include capital cost, operation and maintenance (O&M) costs (including foreseeable replacement costs of parts of the system), environmental mitigation costs and costs of using the transportation system over the life of the system. Of course, one-time costs and recurring costs must be clearly and consistently expressed in the same terms, such as present value, annualized value or future value.

4/12/2010

Capital costs are the upfront costs of planning, environmental assessments, public consultations, property acquisitions, design, construction, and generally any other costs required to produce the completed functional infrastructure.

O&M costs include right-of-way maintenance (off-roadway drainage, grass-cutting, fencing, etc.), roadway maintenance (pavement repairs, road drainage & pavement repairs, buried plant repairs, roadway lighting, line painting, snowplowing, etc.), and structural items (concrete repairs, bridge lighting, steel painting, etc). (The 2009 Roche/NCE engineering report on the 10 alternatives used a flat 30% of capital cost as a reasonable approximation for equivalencing O&M costs. This summation of capital and equivalenced O&M produces a cost differential between the Aviation Parkway alternative and the Lower Duck Island alternative on the order of \$170 million. Not to be taken lightly.)

Environmental impact mitigation costs are those costs required to bring the works to within recognised performance and operational standards. Mitigation measures might address unacceptable levels of heat, light, noise, vibration, and air quality. Mitigation measures may include for whatever might be required to bring the relevant performance parameters to within standard values, and they also may include measures to relocate, recreate or otherwise ensure that artifacts or valuable attributes of the physical environment are properly preserved.

The costs of using the transportation network are the costs associated with the movement of people and goods through the transportation network. These include vehicle operating costs, pollution mitigation, person-travel-time, etc, etc. These costs are very large, and it is intuitively obvious that a few percentage points difference between efficiencies of alternatives can result in millions or tens of millions of dollars differences annually, and proportionately more over the life of the system. These costs are quantifiable from computer modelling of transportation networks, and the differences in transportation system useage costs between alternatives is quantifiable with sufficient accuracy on which to base economic decisions. These costs are not adequately set out in engineering reports to date. It is not known if sufficient computer modelling work has yet been done on the "existing" situation or the alternatives to it. It should be done, as it is crucial to supporting the decision on the most economically sound location for the next bridge crossing.

In the context of public participation in the decision-making process for a major capital works project, there are two inter-related purposes for the rigorous costing of all the quantifiables as above. First, the approach above quantifies the economic performance of each alternative, full stop. In a setting where there are no other considerations, that brings the analysis to a clearly quantified best alternative and to a "go or no-go" decision point. But the public participation world is more complex, and therefore an additional purpose of the analysis above is to minimize the complexity of subjective considerations. Anything that is not quantified and costed can only be addressed subjectively. Thus, the exercise of quantifying and costing as much as possible resolves all economically-based arguments and leaves only subjective items unresolved. Without understating the importance of the subjective matters, the process above simplifies as much as possible the remaining part of the decision-making process. That is, when all costs are taken into account, the remaining factors that enter into the decision process are addressed subjectively. In contrast to objective evaluations, subjective evaluations are primarily based on personal perceptions, expectations, life experience and biases. Due to individual diversities, there is then little common ground on which to reach consensus. And without a supplementary framework for working toward a decision, the exercise tends toward decision by political influence, which is neither legitimate democracy nor legitimate public participation.

B. Principles for Evaluating Subjective Aspects (this section is a preliminary work in progress)

Notes/thoughts:

The 2009 Roche/NCE report did credible work evaluating impacts of all 10 of the alternatives considered therein. Review of those would possibly assist in quantification and costing of practical environmental mitigation measures, to further reduce "subjective" aspects of each of the alternatives presently being evaluated.

There needs to be criteria and a process to screen out invalid subjective considerations. "NIMBY" in and of itself, without specific reasons, is not valid. "I don't like it", "I just don't want it" & similar statements of personal feelings are similarly not valid.

Items like "Negative visual impact" require context in which to judge, such as intrusion of massive industrial-appearance structures in a pastoral setting. "Negative visual impact" probably is in some degree to mitigation by attractive architectural treatment, and by design features that allow the structure(s) to retain a clean finish.

"Separation" of a community requires to be expressed in quantitative terms. (eg, how would the improvement of the existing Aviation Parkway further separate neighbourhoods abutting the Parkway? Would those neighbourhoods suffer reduced access to each other? Visual separation? "Psychological" separation? Any so-called psychological aspects require breakdown into their specific negative attributes.)

It would be desirable to establish proxies to weigh the sum total of negatives of the relatively few adversely impacted who might raise valid but unquantifiable objections against the sum total of economic benefits that would accrue to the very many times more persons across the region who would gain from an improved, more efficient transportation system. At the very least, it will be desirable to articulate the impartially-perceived significance of objections and objectors, and weigh those against the very real economic benefits, and the numbers of persons who would benefit.

It is also clear that if there are real economic benefits above, they can be related to the forecasted economic robustness of the region. These impacts also can and should be addressed in this work.

April 9, 2010

De:
Envoyé: 25 janvier 2010 19:36
À: Déoux, Patrick G.
Cc:
Objet: Re: Évaluation environnementale Phase 2 - Réponse

Bonsoir M. Deoux,

Merci pour votre réponse très informative.

Je ne suis pas surpris de remarquer que le côté ontarien est très bien organisé et fort mieux représenté que le côté québécois. Je ne suis pas réellement surpris d'apprendre que le secteur Lorrain n'est pas représenté. La qualité de vie des riverains de Lorrain s'est détériorée aux cours des années à cause entre-autres de la circulation toujours plus intense et particulièrement celle de poids-lourds sur une route qui n'a jamais été construite pour accueillir un tel flot. Certains résidents pourraient avoir déjà lancé la serviette. En qualité de résident de Lorrain, cette situation ne me rassure pas. J'ose espérer toutefois que la décision finale du parcours ne sera pas prise en considération du niveau de représentation?.... mais comme on dit en anglais "the squeaking wheel....."

A mon avis, compte tenu qu'un tel changement sur Lorrain effectuera deux lieux de culte (et cimetière) situés sur ou à proximité de Lorrain, que des représentants de la paroisse Sainte Rose de Lima et de la United Church soient invités aux consultations. Je crois qu'il y a aussi des groupes intéressés par la faune à la Baie McLaren (CREDO et peut-être aussi Canards Unlimited).

Il y a des maisons ancestrales sur Lorrain qui n'ont peut être pas le statut "historique" officiel mais qui demeurent quand même un témoignage du vieux quartier/ex village de Templeton/Sainte Rose de Lima. L'Association historique de l'outaouais pourrait être intéressée à participer si ces maisons devaient être détruites. Le club ornithologue de Gatineau qui a passablement d'activités dans le Parc du Lac Beauchamp pourrait avoir des suggestions car le parc est aussi à proximité de Lorrain. L'école des Belles-Rives risqu aussi d'être sérieusement affecté alors des représentants de la Commission scolaire et de l'association de parents auront certainement intérêt à être consultées. Finalement, l'Association Récréative de Templeton (ART) qui est une institution dans le coin souhaiterait peut être participer aux consultations? Il y a aussi sans doute d'autres groupes d'intérêt que je ne connais pas. Je copie donc le Conseiller Yvon Boucher qui pourrait avoir d'autres suggestions.

Encore une fois merci d'avoir partagé votre information.

De:
Envoyé: 21 avril 2010 15:34
À: Déoux, Patrick G.
Objet: Re: Interprovincial Crossings Study - Response to your letter

Dear Mr. Deoux:

I would like to thank you for your reply. I proposed this corridor to the consultants a year and a half ago and this is the first time anyone has had the courtesy to reply.

We all know that there is no perfect corridor and the selection will involve a system of trade-offs. That said the reasons given for not including this corridor in Phase 2B are not unique to this location. Several of the corridors in Phase 1 passed through recreational areas as do all three remaining in the study and these areas are equally important to the people who live there and others who use them.

Secondly, why should future residential development be more important than existing residential development?

Finally, with a little bit of engineering ingenuity the interchange difficulty could be overcome. There are many examples in Ottawa where there are interchanges closer than 2 km. In fact, the proposed interchange for corridors 6 and 7 and the Queensway is closer than 2 km to the Montreal Road interchange. The proposed interchange at 417 and the Aviation Parkway is also closer than 2 km to the interchanges at St. Laurent Blvd. and Blair Road.

I believe that inadequate consideration was given to this corridor. In fact, the consultants originally did not even include corridor 6, upon which this is a variation, as an option and did so only after public pressure. It is interesting therefore to see that corridor 6 ranked second of 12 alternatives in the Phase 1 evaluation.

I believe that the reasons given did not justify the exclusion of this corridor from Phase 1 and do not justify its exclusion from consideration as an alternative alignment in Phase 2B.

If the proponents are serious about public consultation then a fair and meaningful examination of suggested alternatives must be made.

From:**Sent:** March-05-10 11:42 AM**To:** Marley Ransom**Cc:****Subject:** PCG Meeting #2 - Comments on Slide Deck

Hello Marley:

The following comments are for the attention of Patrick Deoux.

I am referring specifically to pages 16 and 18 of the slide deck, that is within the section that discusses evaluation factors that might be used in Phase 2B of the upcoming work. My general comment is that there should be greater focus on the **uses** made of the Ottawa River. I also make the following four specific points about those uses.

1. The seaplane ramp that is central to the activities of the Rockcliffe Yacht Club is actually owned by the National Aviation Museum and operated by the RYC on behalf of the museum. Any discussion of the activities of the Rockcliffe Airfield must also consider the uses made of the ramp as well as the use of the waterway by float aircraft including the mooring of those aircraft.
2. Waterway uses are mainly recreational, but there are also commercial uses, mainly related to the tourist industry. The NCC has ambitious plans to encourage water-related tourism, in part by encouraging the use of the recreational waterway by larger power boats transiting from Kingston and Montreal. Greater waterway use will in turn require more facilities on the river to support tourism, in particular more bigger and better marinas with transient berths for visiting vessels. There have also been some discussions about the possible use of the seaplane ramp at the Rockcliffe Airport/Yacht Club as a means for water-borne tourist access to the National Aviation Museum and making that historic ramp a focal point for tourist interest.
3. The current wording in the evaluation factors makes reference to "sailing". This is a limiting term because of the thousands of boats that make use of the river many are not sailboats. In addition to tourist sightseeing boats there are many canoes (racing shells) and of course power boats of every description. All types of boating are impacted to some degree by bridges but many of these impacts can be mitigated by the details of bridge pier location and span clearances. In the case of sailing however, bridge location is critical because there are so few suitable sailing areas on the lower Ottawa River and the impact of a bridge, if it goes over a sailing area, cannot be mitigated by bridge design.
4. There should be an evaluation factor relating to the impact of a bridge (and in particular its approaches) on all of the marinas and yacht clubs within the area under study. In addition to the RYC this would include the Rockcliffe Boathouse Marina and the Ottawa New-Edinburgh Club on the Ontario side and Marina Kitchissippi and Marina Leblanc on the Quebec side.

Cheers...

...Rockcliffe Yacht Club

Bonjour. J'aimerais vous exprimer mon exaspération concernant les consultations pour l'utilisation d'une île ou l'autre pour construire un pont. La question est régie depuis longtemps. Pourquoi continuer ce cirque? De toute évidence, ce n'est pas votre argent que vous dépensez. La logique est claire mais certains des élus d'Ottawa n'aiment pas le Québec, point à la ligne. On les dérange mais ils aiment bien avoir les jobs sur leur territoire. C'en est assez, la discussion était close, la décision prise et allons de l'avant. La niaiserie du pont McDonald-Cartier est une évidence pure de l'incroyable incompétence des élus d'Ottawa. On ne veut pas avoir les camions au centre-ville d'Ottawa alors pourquoi attendre plus longtemps. Les axes routiers sont déjà là alors bâtissons le ponts. La CCN est un organisme d'élus d'Ottawa qui prend toujours les intérêts de ontariens avant ceux des québécois, c'est bien connu. Cessez de niaiser et allons de l'avant.

C'est incroyalble que l'on vous paye des salaires pour tant de niaiseries.

C'est assez.

Gatineau

Accès direct à Messenger depuis votre téléphone Plus de détails.
<<http://go.microsoft.com/?linkid=9712962>>

From:

Sent: February-16-10 9:41 AM

To: Patrick.Deoux@aecom.com

Cc: gjodouin@paceconsulting.ca

Subject: Réunion du Groupe de consultation communautaire - Phase 2A - Évaluation environnementale des liaisons interprovinciales

Bonjour Patrick,

Merci de faire suite à mon message à Grégoire Jodouin.

J'apprécie l'optique d'AECOM-Delcan et de PACE pour ce qui est de la Phase 2A – Évaluation environnementale des liaisons interprovinciales, mais je n'ai pas vraiment senti que votre équipe reconnaît Liaisons Raisonables (Common Sense Crossings) comme porte-parole des citoyens d'Orléans. La plupart des membres de Liaisons Raisonables sont des résidents de Convent Glen. Je n'ai pas non plus senti que vous accepteriez notre invitation pour participer à une réunion dans le cadre du Groupe de consultation communautaire.

Par ailleurs, il importe de préciser que toutes les communautés à l'est de l'intersection entre l'autoroute 174 et le chemin Montréal seraient particulièrement touchées par les corridors 6 et 7. La plupart des plus de 100 000 résidents d'Orléans doivent emprunter l'autoroute 174 pour faire la navette depuis leur domicile jusqu'au centre-ville, surtout lors des heures de pointe. L'autoroute 174 est déjà caractérisée par une circulation très lourde. En y ajoutant d'autres véhicules, comme des gros camions et les navetteurs provenant de Gatineau on empirerait une situation qui est déjà intolérable.

De plus, empêcher la participation des communautés à l'est du chemin Montréal est inimaginable et déraisonnable. Une consultation publique doit faire preuve d'ouverture et de transparence, autrement, on doutera de la validité du processus.

Il est essentiel que le Groupe de consultation communautaire accueille à sa réunion non seulement les résidents de Convent Glen, mais aussi les citoyens qui habitent à l'est de la Ceinture de verdure, plus précisément, les communautés adjacentes aux corridors 6 et 7 proposés dans la Phase 2 de l'évaluation environnementale.

Monique Stone m'a envoyé un courriel dans lequel elle m'invite à discuter mardi matin de la réunion du Groupe de consultation communautaire, qui aura lieu à la fin du mois de février ou au début du mois de mars. Je demeure réceptif à cette discussion. Alors qu'il faut trouver une solution où tout le monde y gagne, il est tout aussi important de réaliser qu'une consultation publique limitant la participation des citoyens est sans fondement et vouée à l'échec.

Meilleures salutations,

Objet: Emailing: NCC and PACE Consulting Inc. discount views of Orléans residents - Editorials - By Bob monette Orleans Local Community News

DE :
PATRICK G.
CC :

ENVOYÉ : 26 FÉVRIER 2010 09:19 À : DÉOUX,

OBJET : EMAILING: NCC AND PACE CONSULTING INC. DISCOUNT VIEWS OF ORLÉANS RESIDENTS - EDITORIALS - BY BOB MONETTE ORLEANS LOCAL COMMUNITY NEWS

GOOD MORNING PATRICK,

IN TODAY'S LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF ORLÉANS EMC NEWSPAPER, BOB MONETTE, COUNCILLOR FOR WARD 1 ORLÉANS, EXPRESSED HIS CONCERN OVER THE COMMUNITIES IN THE EAST-END OF OTTAWA NOT BEING ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION GROUP MEETING PROCESS. POPULATION IN THE EAST-END NOW EXCEEDS 100,000 AND OVER THE NEXT 25 YEARS, ORLÉANS IS ESTIMATED TO INCREASE BY AN ADDITIONAL 25,000 PEOPLE. THE MAJORITY OF THE WORKING COMMUNITY COMMUTE TO OTTAWA AND THE MAIN ACCESS ROUTE TO THEIR PLACE OF WORK IS THE 174. A BRIDGE AT CORRIDOR 6 OR 7 WILL SEVERELY IMPACT ALL EAST-END COMMUNITIES – EVERY WORKING DAY. ADDING MORE TRAFFIC FROM THE GATINEAU SIDE, INCLUDING THE HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC WILL MAKE AN IMPOSSIBLE SITUATION EVEN WORSE. IT IS OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE THAT ALL THE COMMUNITIES IN THE EAST-END BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE INCLUDED IN AN OPEN AND INCLUSIVE PUBLIC CONSULTATION THROUGH THE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION GROUP PROCESS.

Racine, Michel

From: Lwow, Lyne
Sent: Tuesday, March 16, 2010 8:49 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: FW: Letters to the Editor

Please add to system. Thanks.

Lyne Lwow
Manager, Executive Office Administration and Executive Assistant to the Chief Executive Officer / Gestionnaire,
administration du bureau de la direction et adjointe exécutive à la première dirigeante
National Capital Commission / Commission de la capitale nationale
(613) 239-5271
lyne.lwow@ncc-ccn.ca

From: Lemay, Marie
Sent: March 15, 2010 5:27 PM
To: Lwow, Lyne
Subject: FW: Letters to the Editor

Exec corr

From:
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 4:27 PM
To: Lemay, Marie
Subject: FW: Letters to the Editor

In the event the first address was wrong.
-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: March 15, 2010 4:25 PM
To: 'MLemay@ncc-ccn.ca'
Subject: Letters to the Editor

Good afternoon Marie,

I want to bring you into the loop on correspondence in the local papers regarding the interprovincial bridge and to provide more fodder on this already complicated file.

In the event you have not read my letters, the link below from L'Express also appeared in Le Droit this morning.

<http://www.expressottawa.ca/article-439195-Courrier-du-lecteur.html>

I raise the spectre of including additional corridors since there is a movement to introduce the non-existent Canotek link into the current review. I would suggest that if the NCC does consider adding new corridors to the mix (even though this is outside the mandate prescribed by the NCC when your Board unfortunately ignored the wishes of both municipal councils on either side of the Ottawa River), this would open the door to further studies and objections.

3/16/2010

10.01910

For instance, the lack of consensus could have us revisit original proposals such as a downtown tunnel as per the King Edward Avenue Renewal Planning and Environmental Study Report in September 2002 (Delcan). While the the screening previously undertaken by Roche/NCE ruled this option out, with no viable new crossing on the horizon, back-to-the-future may become our only choice.

The weakness of such a plan is that the work would all be on the Ottawa side to accommodate trucking from the the MacDonald-Cartier Bridge to the 417. While the cost of such an alternative would be considerably less than any of the bridges, it is not apparent if cost-sharing would still be considered by the two provinces or the NCC.

From:
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 9:24 AM
To:
Cc:
Subject: FW: Disagree with Bridge option 6 & 7

Hi Michel,

Please see email below addressed to Mme. Lemay.

Thanks,
Roasna

From:
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2010 10:27 PM
To: NCCinfoCCN
Subject: Disagree with Bridge option 6 & 7

Dear Marie Lemay,

Study after study conclude that the best option for a bridge is Kettle Island (corridor 5). Why do we keep wasting tax payers money with other options that we know do not make sense?

Yours truly

4/12/2010

10.0233