

Appendix G

Mail, Fax and Email Submissions

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 16:06
À: info@liaisonsrcn.ca
Cc: LLwow@ncc-ccn.ca
Objet: Reminder: Phase 2A - Online Consultation on the Draft Study Design

Indicateur de suivi: Assurer un suivi
État de l'indicateur: Avec indicateur

Sirs, Mesdames:

It's not the 15-20 minutes for the survey, it's the time to required to thoroughly examine the 58 page document (which doesn't even have its very essential 'Appendix A' (subfactors)).

My wife and I are trying to find the time to read the report...

At 15:16 2010-04-14 -0400, you wrote:

>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

>

>(English follows)

>

>Dites ce que vous avez à dire! Nous vous invitons à compléter un
>questionnaire en ligne. Le présent questionnaire s'adresse à toute
>personne qui vit, travaille et se déplace dans la région de la capitale
>nationale
>(RCN) et qui est intéressée à formuler des commentaires sur le futur
>pont interprovincial entre Gatineau et Ottawa.

>

>Votre participation à la consultation en ligne est appréciée et fait
>partie intégrante de l'Étude d'évaluation environnementale des liaisons
>interprovinciales. Vos réponses contribueront à guider l'équipe de
>consultants de l'Étude dans l'élaboration d'un Rapport de conception de
>l'Étude. Ce rapport donne un aperçu de la méthode et du processus qui
>seront utilisés lors de l'étape finale de l'Étude d'évaluation
>environnementale (Phase 2B), afin d'analyser les trois corridors
>envisagés et de déterminer un emplacement préférentiel du pont.

>

>Cela vous prendra tout au plus 15 à 20 minutes pour remplir le
>questionnaire, cependant, veuillez d'abord passer en revue l'ébauche de
>la conception de l'Étude, disponible au site suivant :

><http://www.liaisonsrcn.ca/fr/Online%20Consultation%20.php>. Veuillez
>cliquer sur le lien suivant pour accéder directement au questionnaire :
><http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/liaisonsrcn>

>

>Nous vous encourageons également à acheminer ce questionnaire à vos
>collègues, amis ou employés dans la région de la capitale nationale qui
>seraient intéressés à participer au sondage. Veuillez noter que la
>consultation en ligne prendra fin le vendredi 16 avril 2010.

>

>Pour obtenir de plus amples renseignements sur l'Étude d'évaluation
>environnementale des futures liaisons interprovinciales, veuillez
>consulter le site Web: www.liaisonsrcn.ca.

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 15:21
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: RE: Reminder: Phase 2A - Online Consultation on the Draft Study Design / Rappel: Phase 2A
- Consultation en ligne sur la version préliminaire du Rapport de conception de l'Étude

Indicateur de suivi: Assurer un suivi
État de l'indicateur: Avec indicateur

I have a quick question, will the bridge (Wherever it will be) be built before 2020?

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 3:14 PM
To:
Subject: Reminder: Phase 2A - Online Consultation on the Draft Study Design / Rappel: Phase 2A - Consultation en ligne sur la version préliminaire du Rapport de conception de l'Étude

(le français suit)

Have your say! You are invited to complete an online questionnaire for the Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment (EA) Study as part of Phase 2A. This questionnaire is intended for anyone that lives, works or commutes in the National Capital Region and who is interested in providing comments on a future interprovincial bridge between Gatineau and Ottawa.

Your participation is appreciated and is an integral component of the Interprovincial Crossings EA Study. Your responses will help inform the Study's Consultant Team as they develop a 'Study Design.' This report outlines the process and methodology that will be used at the concluding step in this Environmental Assessment (Phase 2B), to analyze the three corridors under consideration and identify a preferred crossings location.

The questionnaire should take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete, however you will first need to review the draft 'Study Design,' which is available on the website at: <http://www.ncrcrossings.ca/en/Online%20Consultation%20.php>. To access the online questionnaire directly, please click on the following link: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/crossings>

We also encourage you to forward this e-mail to any of your colleagues, friends, or employees in the National Capital Region who might be interested in participating. Note that the online consultation closes on Friday, April 16, 2010.

For more information on the Interprovincial Crossings EA Study, please visit the website at www.ncrcrossings.ca.

Thank-You,
Co-Enterprise AECOM-Delcan

The mandate of Phase 2A, the current stage, is to consult with members of the public and stakeholders to develop a Study Design and a Canadian Environmental Assessment Act Scoping Document. The Study Design will include a process and methodology that will be used at Phase

From:
Sent: March 21, 2010 4:13 PM
To: 311@ottawa.ca
Subject: corridor de l'île Kettle Ref:(__7YWFHC)(1)

Bonjour,

Je voudrais tout simplement vous faire part de ma suggestion pour le corridor de l'île Kettle pour le futur pont interprovincial. Je sais qu'il y aura une rencontre au centre communautaire de Beacon Hill North afin d'obtenir des infos et poser des questions demain à 17h00 mais je ne peux m'y rendre.

Ainsi, si vous pouvez simplement faire parvenir ce message au comité de la ville en tant que suggestion venant d'une citoyenne, ce serait apprécié.

Le corridor de l'île Kettle permet à la circulation en provenance de la 40 Ouest de filer directement vers la promenade de l'Aviation sans avoir à y faire de route d'embranchement. De plus, ce couloir est déjà prévu pour une circulation plus dense et n'interfère pas excessivement avec les routes avoisinantes, ni les quartiers résidentiels. Également, la circulation en provenance de la 174 est déjà assez lourde aux heures de pointe. Il serait malheureux d'y voir davantage de circulation. Finalement, le corridor de l'île Kettle est le plus rapproché du centre des deux villes et permet une centralisation du transport qui fait du sens.

J'espère que ces suggestions puissent vous être utiles.

Ne ratez rien! [Installez Messenger sur votre téléphone.](#)

De:
Envoyé: 19 avril 2010 20:17
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: Construction of bridge in Ottawa region

Hello,

I'm a resident in Ottawa and after reading the draft 2B study design, I believe that the best option for corridor 5 (Kettle Island) would be good option, because. although it crosses the kettle island conservation area, it mostly would not disturb natural habitats as much as near duck island and in the McLaurin Bay wetlands. Although report says there is no significant flora or fauna on the Ontario side for corridor 6 and 7, I have witnessed many wild animals, who have already been disturbed by the 174 east, by cutting off their movements, and now only have the small portion of greenbelt and farmer fields to move around. Canada geese also use this land. Duck Island, I have canoed there many times, and its a home for many important species as well.

I think All three choices are not very good. But if I have to choose, it would be an already developed area, such as corridor 5. Please contact me for more information on public input at

Best Regards,

De:
Envoyé: 15 mars 2010 15:03
À: Marley Ransom
Cc: mstone@paceconsulting.ca;
Objet: RE: PCG Meeting Minutes and FTP Site / Note de la première rencontre du GCP et accès au site ftp

In terms of the public consultations, I am looking through my records as to any decisions on extending the involvement of the community groups that are directly affected by any of the corridors.

In particular, at the last meeting (Feb.22) members of the Blackburn Community association attended and they have a clear interest in the process and the outcome of the current initiative as they are directly affected by the traffic impacts which corridors 6 or 7 would have on existing streets such as Bearbrook and the pressure to create new connections through the Greenbelt from the 174 to Innes.

Would you kindly advise as to how the interests of the Blackburn community will be gauged and expressed in the current phase.

From:

Sent: April-06-10 2:03 PM

To: Gabrielle Simonyi; "Fred Gaspar (Business Fax)"@smtp104.rog.mail.re2.yahoo.com; Patrick.Deoux@aecom.com; pturbin@simbal.ca; qiodouin@paceconsulting.ca

Cc:

Subject: Groupe de Consultations Communautaires

Importance: High

Bonjour à tous,

Suite à mes discussions avec la plupart d'entre vous lors des consultations publiques du 30 et 31 mars et des réunions des groupes de consultations communautaires à Beacon Hill et à Convent Glen, je me permets de partager avec vous quelques suggestions.

Il est évident que la participation aux réunions du côté de Gatineau était loin d'être au même niveau que celle du côté d'Ottawa. D'après ce qu'on m'a dit, seulement deux des trois réunions des GCC ont eu lieu à Gatineau à cause du manque de participation (2 participants à une des réunions, 8 à la seconde et personne à la troisième). D'autre part, il y avait une grande différence de participation entre la réunion du 30 mars et celle du 31. Il est évident que même la distribution d'invitations dans les communautés n'a pas réussi à attirer les citoyens de Gatineau.

J'ai senti un peu de frustration de votre part suite à ce manque d'intérêt. Toutefois, vous savez qu'il est très important d'inclure l'opinion publique des citoyens de Gatineau dans le dossier des liaisons interprovinciales. Sans la participation de Gatineau, il sera impossible d'obtenir une vue d'ensemble de toute la population de la Région de la capitale nationale affectée par ces liaisons..

Comme je vous l'ai déjà mentionné, si les citoyens ne viennent pas à la table, il faut donc prendre une stratégie inverse pour les attirés. Il faudrait alors considérer des groupes de consultations « focus groups » parmi lesquels des personnes bien ciblées sont invitées à partager leur opinion sur un sujet donné. Pour que cette approche soit efficace, un minimum de 4 ou 5 « focus groups » seraient appropriés. Ce principe d'opinion publique est utilisé depuis plusieurs années en marketing pour positionner un produit sur un marché ciblé. Les membres du groupe sont rémunérés pour leur participation.

Je crois que AECOM-Delcan et PACE-Simbal doivent considérer sérieusement cette façon d'assurer la participation des citoyens de Gatineau dans le plan des valeurs communautaires. Il faut considérer une méthode de consultation adaptée à la communauté. Ce qui fonctionne bien à Ottawa, n'est pas nécessairement le même cas du côté de Gatineau.

Meilleures salutations,

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 10:29
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: Cost Estimates

This document does not indicate an author:

[http://www.liaisonsrcn.ca/upfiles/Probable%20Project%20Total%20Costs%20-%20Revised%206%20Jan%2009\(3\).pdf](http://www.liaisonsrcn.ca/upfiles/Probable%20Project%20Total%20Costs%20-%20Revised%206%20Jan%2009(3).pdf)

Who was contracted to develop this document? On what basis were the estimates arrived at?

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 20:02
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: KI

Hi,

I agree with all of these comments specifically I am very concern about the Health and safety issues. The noise and the high emissions will have a terrible negative impact on our health. Also we need to keep our green space and promote transit transportation.

Thank you for your great work on this project.

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 21:36
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Cc:
Objet: Proposed KI Bridge

Trucks routes don't belong in established residential neighbourhoods: It doesn't make sense to take trucks out of one community - no, not a community, the down town core that is not so much of a community as it is a business district (I work there at the corner of Cumberland and Rideau) and dump them into a **residential** community. KI is the most heavily populated of all the corridors with 100,000 people from one end to the other. A truck route will have a negative impact on the cohesion of our community, splitting it into two relatively inaccessible parts; the one east of the Rockcliffe Parkway, and the part west of the parkway. My kids won't be allowed to cross from one to the other, that's for sure!

People's peace of mind and lifestyle must be considered. The impact of a designated truck route with a literally constant flow of heavy commercial vehicles will be constant noise; direct, continuous exposure to high emissions, risk of toxic spills and serious accidents. Our community includes homes, schools, Montfort Hospital and retirement home, Cité Collegiale, Aviation Museum, RCMP stables and Musical Ride, Terry Fox Centre, and one of the few remaining nice old established neighborhoods in the city!

Although I really won't be as adversely affected by the change as some that live closer to the parkway, I am just incredulous that a city with so few nice, old, established neighborhoods left unscathed by the encroachment of bigger roads, would contemplate ruining one of the nicest neighborhoods left - Manor Park, by putting a truck route through it. If I could afford to live there - which I aspire to - I would be livid. Is that how industriousness is rewarded in our society; by wrecking everything someone worked for by putting a truck route through his/her backyard? Take a look at Montreal - the West Island to be exact, and you will see city buses operating on narrow roads such as Beaconsfield Blvd and the Lakeshore Road. Why? Because Montreal can't afford to confiscate the land required to widen the road? No, because it would ruin the character of the neighborhood to do so. And Montreal values character more than convenience!

So, let's take a lesson from a "city with a heart" and its desire to preserve its resident-friendly character that is greater than its desire to be traffic-friendly; say "NO!" to the Kettle Island bridge proposal.

De:
Envoyé: 14 avril 2010 21:40
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: KI bridge

To Whom it may concern,

Please take in consideration my comments regarding your project

The Environmental Study needs to be a harmonized process for the protection of the people: If the Ontario legislation does not apply in the next phase of the study (because the Ontario Ministry of the Environment has chosen to opt out of the environmental assessment process), public consultation and community value plans will lack teeth. There will be no guarantee that our concerns will be addressed, weighted or mitigated. The only way this process can be fair is if Ontario opts back in.

Trucks routes don't belong in established residential neighbourhoods: It doesn't make sense to take trucks out of one community and dump them into another. KI is the most heavily populated of all the corridors with 100,000 people from one end to the other. A truck route will have a negative impact on the cohesion of our community.

Thank you for your patience in reading it

Best Regards,

De:
Envoyé: 15 avril 2010 23:24
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: General comments on Crossings proposed.

To whom it may concern;

Yes, I have a comment regarding Corridor 5:

Perhaps the most intrusive and ultimately most expensive choice. Aboriginal lands, the intrusion and possible closure of the airport both land and water and if not, certainly the cost of implementing new flight procedures and area surveillance and tracking by aviation authorities. Don't like that local airports and their air space will be intruded upon in Corridor 5 with its airport and aviation museum together offering a unique experience. Discover the history and world of aviation and then have lunch on the grass outside at one of the picnic tables and watch the aircraft of today take flight. Something to think about, not for you but maybe for your kids or grandkids. Also due to cutting a high traffic road through the middle of the highest density of buildings and residences of any of the three corridors additional expenditures will result from repair of side roads, overpasses, etc.

Yes, I have a comment regarding Corridor 6:

Perhaps, the best choice as it centers BETWEEN residential and high density areas while being less intrusive on the areas infrastructure that is presently in place. Cheaper because of this and instead of traffic congesting by travelling to both crossings in the same direction the traffic could split.

Yes, I have a comment regarding Corridor 7:

Short term, possibly problematic with environmental issues and the airport. Down the road with the speed of expansion of businesses and residential areas developing in the east on both sides of the river this Corridor will alleviate traffic now and as areas of construction are relatively clear of buildings construction should prove more economical. Leading to eventual expansion and land use for both sides of the river. The potential for land expansion and new areas for business and residential development with Corridor 7 should increase economic growth for both sides of the river for decades to come.

Live connected. [Get Hotmail & Messenger for mobile.](#)

De:
Envoyé: 16 avril 2010 06:50
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: Bridge

This is a unique opportunity to do things well. Please do not get trapped into "tunnel vision"

- Give due consideration to people, unlike the previous study. Their approach was technocratic and traffic was the only important thing
- Factor in overall traffic plans, e.g. Ottawa's future ring road, for the future. Do not build a bridge just to pour traffic into already congested roads (leading downtown like Beechwood and Aviation Parkway) Do not just build a bridge but something that makes overall sense to move people. Factor public transport like parking lots in Gatineau side and buses/light rail downtown
- Move trucks out of downtown
- Accomodate a green and alternative traffic approach. Do we want to build a bridge just to ensure that more people travel downtown? Serve more than the interest of commuters and do not destroy the life of people in existing neighbourhoods. You can never build enough roads to accomodate peak traffic. This is yesterday's thinking
- Factor economic alternatives to include other corridors like Gatineau Airport. This corridor makes sense to me

--

De:
Envoyé: 16 avril 2010 14:55
À: info@liaisonsrcn.ca
Objet: A propos de la reunion d'information du 31 mars 2010

Bonjour,

Suite a la reunion d'information du 31 mars a la mairie de Gatineau, voici mes commentaires.

J'ai ete desagreablement surpris de voir qu'il y avait tres peu de monde durant cette reunion d'information. En fait, surpris pas trop car la couverture mediatique ne fut pas a ma connaissance tres "efficace". Les sites web de la ville de Gatineau et de la CCN ne comportaient aucun lien sur leur page d'accueil indiquant cette reunion qui pourtant me semble tres importante pour l'avenir de notre region.

Les journaux televises n'en ont pratiquement pas parle, ni avant, ni meme apres. Un simple petit 15 secondes le jour meme durant le journal televise de TVA le jour meme, et rien sur Radio Canada. Rien non plus sur le web du journal Le Droit.

je crois savoir que les conseillers municipaux et les deputes ont des outils pour communiquer avec leurs administrés. Ne vous est il pas possible de vous servir de ces outils pour votre communication. A ma connaissance, votre mandat vous vient des 3 niveaux de gouvernements (municipal, provincial et federal).

Merci de votre attention,

De:
Envoyé: 15 avril 2010 22:46
À: info@ncrcrossings.ca
Objet: Opposition to Kettle Island Corridor

To Whom It May Concern:

As residents of the Rockcliffe Mews community bordering the Aviation Parkway between Ogilvie Road and Montreal Road, we want to express our strong opposition to the Kettle Island corridor option for the interprovincial bridge. Our comments are:

- 1) The increased traffic along the Aviation Parkway, in particular the addition of heavy truck traffic, will generate excessive and unacceptable air pollution, noise pollution and light pollution (if additional street lighting is placed along the Aviation Parkway) for the residential communities, the Montfort Hospital, schools and churches that are situated adjacent to the Parkway. Our children suffer from asthma and this would further be aggravated by the increased vehicle emissions, as well as the air particulates generated during the lengthy construction process.
- 2) School children, pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists would all be at increased risk at each intersection and along the corridor. We often see children and youth crossing the Aviation Parkway at non-intersections on their way to school, etc. There will no doubt be some pedestrian fatalities with the proposed Kettle Island corridor.
- 3) 100,000 people live along the Kettle Island corridor. A bridge at Kettle Island would mean that the problem of truck traffic in the downtown core would just be moved slightly eastward and would affect many more people. This does not make any sense. The impact of any corridor on the residents who live along it is of the highest importance. The other 2 proposed corridors as well as a Canotek-Gatineau Airport corridor (with realignment to the 148 on the Quebec side) would affect considerably less number of people. A truck corridor should NOT go through ANY community at all.
- 4) A bridge at Kettle Island does not fit into any future ring-road plan. The bridge at Kettle Island is just too close to the downtown core. Also, such a corridor so close to downtown will not remove much of the truck traffic through the downtown core, so communities at both locations will be affected.
- 5) Property values of the corridor communities would severely decline. Many of the communities along the Kettle Island corridor are renowned for their picturesque beauty in a great, central location.
- 6) The current traffic congestion problem at the "417 Split" would be further aggravated by the addition of yet another interchange, adding further travel time for everyone in the east end, including the Orleans residents.
- 7) The tranquility and natural beauty of the present greenspace along the scenic Aviation Parkway will be negatively altered by the opening of this corridor. Widening of the Aviation Parkway north of Montreal Road would not only affect the Montfort Hospital and surrounding communities, but recreational space would be diminished or destroyed (bicycle paths, RCMP stables and musical ride, Aviation Museum, etc.). Kettle Island is itself a beautiful gem of nature and a precious habitat to many species, and so it should remain untouched.

8) The Kettle Island corridor is opposed by the Montfort Hospital board for several reasons (traffic congestion and difficult access, noise and vibration affecting patient comfort and sensitive hospital instruments, etc.) but one that has not been mentioned is the increased flow of patients from Gatineau, Quebec, into our Ontario community hospital.

You could expect a 40% increase in ER visits as the case in Hawkesbury showed. One reason the Quebec side favours the Kettle Island corridor may be because the Outaouais is a very underserved area from a health care perspective, and the Montfort would be able to offer them health care in French. All of this would increase ER wait times at the Montfort, our community hospital, thus limiting our rightful access to the hospital.

In conclusion, we feel that the NCC study of the various corridor options for the interprovincial bridge has been flawed on many levels, especially at the level of consideration of impacts on communities in Phase 1, a phase which was not open and transparent enough before the corridor options were narrowed down. We should all agree that the reason for a bridge is not only efficient traffic flow but also getting trucks out of urban areas. Pitting the values of the different corridor communities against each other is not the answer. We need to find another solution that helps us achieve our common values in an open and transparent way.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the bridge study.

Sincerely,

De:
Envoyé: 15 avril 2010 22:58
À: info@liaisonsrcn.ca
Objet: Fwd: Commentaires - Évaluation environnementale des liaisons interprovinciales

Bonsoir,

Vous trouverez ci-dessous mes commentaires formulés en 2008 à propos de l'évaluation environnementale des liaisons interprovinciales.

Malheureusement, ils sont toujours pertinents. Je tenais à vous les transmettre pour vous rappeler sur quoi est basé le choix des trois corridors actuellement proposés. La deuxième phase de l'étude semble beaucoup mieux planifiée, mais elle ne servira qu'à choisir le meilleur corridor parmi les trois corridors "imposés".

Je m'intéresse à ce dossier d'abord parce que je suis concernée en tant que résidente du corridor

No.5 mais aussi par intérêt et expérience en évaluation environnementale de projets linéaires de diverses infrastructures.

Ne sachant pas si j'aurai l'occasion (surtout le temps) de formuler d'autres commentaires ultérieurement, j'en profite pour vous mentionner que je traverse tous les jours la Promenade de l'Aviation en vélo en face de La Cité collégiale pour me rendre au travail. Plusieurs personnes le font également, soit à vélo ou à pied. Je tiens à vous le mentionner car aucun sentier n'est officiellement indiqué à cet endroit, quoique c'est un trajet suggéré sur la carte de vélo du site Web de la Ville d'Ottawa. D'ailleurs, La Cité collégiale n'est pas identifiée sur votre carte et elle a une entrée directe sur la Promenade de l'Aviation.

Merci,

>Date: Fri, 10 Oct 2008 23:20:31 -0400
>To:
>
>
>From:
>Subject: Commentaires - Évaluation
>environnementale des liaisons interprovinciales
>
>Madame, Messieurs,
>
>Vous trouverez ci-dessous mes commentaires que je transmets au
>consultants concernant le projet de liaison interprovinciale.
>
>Merci de suivre ce dossier de près.
>
>
>
>COMMENTAIRES:
>

>À titre de nouvelle résidente d'Ottawa, je commence à peine à suivre ce
>dossier. Je ne veux pas revenir sur tout ce qui a été dit lors de la
>dernière consultation publique, bien que j'estime que la plupart des
>interventions étaient très pertinentes et méritent grandement d'être
>considérées. Le temps me manque pour lire toute la documentation
>présentée sur votre site et ailleurs. J'ai cependant pris la peine
>d'examiner chacun des critères, leur unité de mesure, les pointages et
>la pondération accordée à chaque secteur d'intérêt.

>

>Avec plus de 90 critères pour un total de 7 facteurs ((?) circulation
>et transport, milieu naturel, etc.), lorsque je vois que le corridor de
>l'île Kettle affiche le plus haut pointage pour TOUS les tests, je ne
>peux m'empêcher de penser que le choix du corridor a été arrêté avant
>la sélection ou l'ordonnancement de ces fameux 90 critères. Lorsqu'il
>est déterminé que les facteurs de coûts et de transport compteront pour
>55%, avec un pointage de 1 pour 10 des 14 critères de ces 2 catégories,
>le résultat est assez prévisible, indépendamment du pointage pour les
>autres facteurs. Et je me demande également pourquoi une telle étude
>porte le nom "Évaluation environnementale". Je serais aussi curieuse de
>savoir ce qui est inclus dans l'estimation des coûts; par exemple
>est-ce que l'aménagement/construction de routes de liaison aux
>autoroutes est considérée?

>

>Quant à la multitude d'autres critères, je m'interroge sur la
>pertinence de certains, la façon de les mesurer et leur influence sur
>le résultat. Par exemple, pourquoi avoir 3 critères de potentiel
>archéologique autochtone (élevé, moyen et faible) qui possède une même
>valeur de pointage? Je comprends mal le pointage pour les critères des
>aires naturelles d'intérêt régional ou provincial pour la liaison de
>Kettle Island; on donne l'exemple de Kettle Island et de l'aéroport de
>Rockcliffe et ces 2 critères ont chacun 1 point avec 0 ha. Pour le
>socio-économique, n'est-il pas un peu simpliste d'évaluer le potentiel
>économique à partir de données de circulation anticipées? Ces mêmes
>chiffres servent pour au moins 5 critères.

>

>Enfin, le mal aimé: l'environnement culturel.
>Les pointages absolus sont remarquablement bas pour Kettle Island. Et
>ce, sans considérer les nombreux biais dans le choix des critères de
>cette catégorie (archéologie X 5, traversier de Cumberland et champ
>magnétique à Montfort qui sont des éléments spécifiques). Inutile d'en
>rajouter.

>

>À mon avis, cet exercice est loin d'être crédible. Je trouverais même
>inacceptable de sélectionner quelques alternatives à partir de cette
>évaluation en vue d'une étude d'impact en bonne et due forme, ce qui
>par surcroît a été exclus.

>

>Malheureusement, le temps me manque.

Ottawa April 16, 2010

Dear Mr. Déoux,

Please find some additional questions and remarks that I had after the March public meeting...

(1) Scoring non-singular factors

When scoring some of the evaluation factors and sub-factors, it can be expected that some of these cannot be represented into one single score. As one example, the score for the factor 'noise' will depend on the mitigation measures that will in the end be put in place. Until the mitigation is determined, there would be an upper limit score and a lower limit score.

Therefore, in calculations or tabulations, which score would be used?

- the lower limit (best case scenario)
- the upper limit (worst case scenario)
- the mathematical average between upper and lower limit
- the most likely expected score
- the center but with a (confidence) interval around it
- the entire interval

Related to this...: one factor can be expected to affect another. Noise mitigation measures would lower the 'noise' score but raise the 'cost' score as well as the 'visual impact' score. So, scores will start to interact.

My argument is, that the plan should include a precise method for dealing with scores that reflect a range rather than one best estimate. Also, a precise method for dealing with interacting scores will need to be defined. These aspects will need to be defined in phase 2A, not only once these issues arise in phase 2B.

(2) Scoring baseline

One thing that raised my eyebrows regarding the phase-1 study was, that in the scoring for the Lower Duck option, it listed impact on a school and golf course which are situated along the current highway 174. It seemed that it was not taken into account that the **current** situation already has an impact -- the score seemed to reflect the **final** impact rather than the **incremental** impact. The methodology for phase-2B would need to specify what the baseline score would need to be to properly reflect the **change** in impact.

(3) Rockcliffe Airbase redevelopment

In the public meeting, I got confirmation that future development plans will be taken into consideration for those plans that have been approved. Now, I don't know what the current approval status is for the Rockcliffe Airforce Base redevelopment - as you know, plans were well under way until a native land claim froze the project. That may lead to a situation where, through a formality, the plans are not taken into consideration for the Phase-2B scoring and evaluation. However, with a project of this large scale and thorough importance, I would urge you to specifically include it into the evaluation.

The plan foresees about 14,000 additional residents (4500 residential units) for that area, plus 1500 jobs. About half of the area (west of Codds Road) is closely adjacent to the proposed Kettle Island corridor. Aviation Parkway and Montreal Road would be key (public) transport corridors for that area and would drastically alter traffic patterns from what they are now. Again, please do include the Rockcliffe Redevelopment plans in the evaluation, despite its current frozen status.

De:
Envoyé: 10 mars 2010 15:16
À: mrransome@paceconsulting.ca
Cc: info@ncrcrossings.ca; gabrielle.simonyi@ncc-ccn.ca
Objet: Interprovincial Bridge

Blackburn Community Association

77 BeechmontCr.
Gloucester, On
K1B 4B3

Ms Marie Lemay
Chief Executive Officer
Office of the Chief Executive Officer
National Capital Commission
40 Elgin St., Suite 202
Ottawa, On

Mar.8, 2010

Subject: Interprovincial Bridge Deliberations (Phase 2)

Dear Ms Lemay,

I represent the Blackburn Hamlet Community Association. At the recent Public Consultation Group meeting dated February 22 hosted by PACE, it became evident that the selection of Community Consultation Groups has been limited to only three groups on each side of the river. The selection appears to have been based on the questionable theory that these groups would be the only three directly impacted by the selection of the location of the proposed bridge.

It is imperative that the NCC and their consultants (AECOM Delcan and PACE) understand that this choice goes to the base of our concern over the manner in which these deliberations have proceeded to date. In particular, impact to traffic flows will have huge consequences to the people of Blackburn Hamlet as well as the issue of access to (and changes to) the Greenbelt should either of the 2 lower crossings be chosen. By opening up these other two options for consideration, it is only logical that more community groups be added to cover the increased number of communities affected.

As evidenced by the solid public interest shown at the recent Greenbelt Review Open House hosted by the NCC at Louis Riel High School, Blackburn citizens are prepared spend the time and energy needed to defend their interests. We would urge the NCC and their consultants to consider asking for more input from other affected East End Ottawa communities before concluding this phase of the deliberations.

I recognize this would, once again, delay the overall process but, from what it appears, these excluded communities will only have one public meeting to make their positions known and one large (likely emotional) public meeting is not a good forum for the communication of our concerns.

Yours truly,

Cc. Mr. Parick Deoux (Aecom Delcan), M Ransom (PACE), R Bloess (City of Ottawa), Gabrielle Simonyi (NCC),

De :

Envoyé : 25 mars 2010 10:52

À : Déoux, Patrick G.

Objet : Convent Glen CCG

Good morning Patrick:

Well done to you and your team for last night.

I am giving you my Values below to save someone keying them in but also since you will have to pass them onto Monique, it allows me to thank her also! I did leave a paper copy of these comments on our table anyway.

Personal Values:

1. Paid extra for property close to greenbelt and even more when adjacent to the greenbelt not only purchase price but also Municipal taxes paid above normal for size of house for duration of life in the house.
2. View looking west from the house sunsets - wildlife - hawks, geese twice a year, turkeys, foxes, rabbits etc. - seasons different position of the sunsets during the year - see stars, Gatineau hills and the river - all from the house
3. Walk ride, ski, snow shoe, look at plants and animals and insects around the fields and in Greens Creek.
4. Lack of sound pollution and visual pollution are essential elements of what we have bought with our property.
5. Travel time to downtown is only 15 minutes outside the extended rush-hours. More traffic will

reduce the periods when this road can be used by non-rush hour travellers and seriously reduce the productivity of those having to use it during the rush-hours.

6. Silence in the back yard by the Greenbelt is a treasure broken only by the sound of birds.

7. A home with the convenience of suburban living and easy access to downtown outside the rush hour but with the peace and tranquility of a country setting with lovely views, especially from the mouth of Greens Creek looking West.

Community values:

1. Bicycling to work
2. Continuous use of the paths around the fields throughout the year
3. Home with country environment yet within easy range of downtown
4. Quiet - when a rowdy neighbour arrived all the others got together to resist them.

Construction Phase:

1. Continuous noise and upsetting of wildlife.
2. Heavy trucks on local streets
3. Dirt - mud on roadways and dust in the summer
4. Construction period could last for more than two years
5. Quick drop in property values meaning that we cannot sell without appreciable loss and try to find alternative home with similar attributes as we have now. Large personal financial loss. Municipal tax income reduced.

Bridge in operation:

1. Wildlife virtually gone from the area - might as well be living in the midst of Orléans
2. Visual block from the house with bridge and ramps in full view
3. Blockage to the path round the fields. No more lovely walks by the river to Greens Creek
4. Noise all day and night from traffic and trucks and emergency vehicles wailing.
5. Traffic on Hwy 174 much worse, - at all times not just in the rush hour.

--

Cheers

If there is an attachment and your E-Mail package does not recognise the attachment file type, in order to open it, copy the attachment to your hard drive and open with the processor indicated in the text of this message (e.g. Word, Excel PPoint) using the suffix required by your software.

De:
Envoyé: 8 avril 2010 21:58
À: Marley Ransom
Objet: Comments
Pièces jointes: Comments on the phase 2A of the Interprovincial Crossing Assessment.docx

Here are my written comments. Please submit.

Comments on Phase 2A of the Interprovincial Crossing Assessment

Process

The assessment cannot be called an environmental assessment because it is not bound by any legislation. The Federal EA Act can only be applied to a defined project of which there is none in this phase. The Ontario Provincial EA Act is perhaps being followed but since the Ontario Ministry of the Environment had decided to opt out, there is no legislation to protect the rights of citizens.

The fact that the Ontario Ministry of the Environment has opted out of the EA may prove to have been illegal and will most certainly result in a court challenge.

For this crossing assessment to be seen as legitimate, Ontario will need to opt back in. Failing to do so will give the public the perception that the process is fixed in favour of a particular crossing option and will erase the openness that the NCC and its consultants are trying to achieve after the badly executed phase 1.

The assessment of future traffic patterns, not just traffic crossing the river but in the region as a whole must be considered. The traffic studies done in phase 1 have serious flaws that overestimate traffic flows and crossing capacity needs. The problem may not be of crossing capacity but rather of the appropriate routing of heavy truck traffic. The bridge (a possible solution to the problem) is being put before the problem and the root cause have been properly identified.

Values

Communities & people must come before any other factor. The health and safety of people living in any community are paramount.

Noise, vibration and air pollution must be moved as far away from established communities as possible.

The only mitigation for air pollution is distance from the source, which will allow concentrations to diminish. Only the Ontario EA Act will consider the impacts of air quality. There are plenty of studies (contact me if you need examples) that show that even low concentrations of fine particulate matter that results from diesel exhaust is carcinogenic and for which there are no safe levels.

Increased traffic concentrations near health care facilities will not allow the free and easy movement of emergency vehicles resulting in delayed emergency care and increase risk of death.

The problem of trucks in the King Edward corridor must be solved.

Public transit must be given a priority. More interprovincial transit capacity must be added before passenger vehicle capacity is added.

The regional transportation plan must look to 21st century solutions that diminish the role of the passenger vehicle as a means of commuter transit.

Mr. Patrick Déoux
Program Manager
AECOM Delcan
569 Blvd. St. Joseph
Gatineau, QC
J8Y 4A1

Jan. 14, 2009

Via e-Mail

Dear Mr. Déoux:

Re: Interprovincial Crossing Environmental Assessment PCG

Thank you for the minutes of the Dec.15, 2009, PCG meeting. I commend the consultant team for the accuracy in capturing the salient points. I am, however, concerned regarding some of the additions by the NCC Program Manager (PM). Through you, I am seeking clarification on two points.

Corridors to be Studied

On page 3 of the minutes, it is noted that "the PCG input will be taken into account in the development of deliverables." On page 4, the PM states categorically that only three corridors (Corridors 5, 6 and 7) will be examined in Phase 2. This implies that the alignments of the corridors under study will be those of Phase 1. However, as noted in the paragraph in the minutes immediately above this insertion, more than one member of the PCG suggested that flexibility is required concerning the corridors to be studied. The view was also expressed by PCG members that suggestions made during Phase 1 concerning alternative corridors were dismissed without justification. The statements on pages 3 and 4 therefore appear to be in contradiction.

The view of the Manor Park Community Association is that all three of Corridors 5, 6 and 7 have serious deficiencies. We do not advocate revisiting in Phase 2 sites widely separated from these corridors (e.g. in the west end). However, the objective of the EA should surely be to find the best possible location within the general confines of the three corridors, and not be artificially constrained. Further, we believe that such an approach is consistent with the provisions of the federal environmental assessment legislation. If the Study Team believes that they do not have the mandate to fulfill this objective, we would like to determine what process needs to be followed to change the mandate.

Decision Making

It is noted on page 3 of the minutes that the Ontario EA process would not apply to the Phase 2 study. On page 6, the PM states that the federal screening decision rests solely with the NCC and the federal regulators. Does this mean that the Government of Ontario has no decision-making power concerning the results of Phase 2? This would be in

contradiction to what has been said since the start of Phase 1¹; namely that the decisions would be made jointly by the three funding governments, taking into account the views of the two non-funding municipal governments.

In view of the limited time remaining in Phase 2A and the fundamental nature of these apparent contradictions, we would appreciate it if you and the NCC could clarify these points in the near term. I may be reached by e-mail at

Sincerely,

¹ See, for example, the following statement on the NCC web site: "Recognizing the importance of integrated transportation planning in CCR, and based on past studies, the National Capital Commission (NCC), the Ministère des Transports du Québec (MTQ) and the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO), with technical support from the City of Ottawa and Ville de Gatineau, formed a partnership to conduct an environmental assessment."

Original Message:

Hi!

My name is _____ and I'm 16 years old, my brothers and I live near the green belt or the bike path and spend most of our time enjoying exploring the nature and having a stroll. By putting a bridge in the green belt means that you're destroying more nature in orleans and turning it into a industrial enviromment that we in orleans don't enjoy. Another important factor is that it would be a large waste of money and a stupid idea on your part, I do appreciate the letter to inform us on the idea. I thank you for caring about our transportation but I can't accept the fact that you are killing more of the green belt we love and care for so much. Thank you for you time and please think about the enviromment as much as you care for the people in Ottawa.

A teen that cares,

Live connected. Get Hotmail & Messenger for mobile.

Original Message:

I want to express our families views on this issue.
We actually think that the least disruptive approach would be Corridor 6 -Duck Island but instead of ruining that end of the Parkway we don't know why it couldn't come across between Greens Creek and the small commercial district off Shefford Road. This would seem least disruptive to any home owners and the Greenbelt. If this isn't practical, than we believe Corridor 5 is the best answer.

Of course no bridge makes sense unless it is brought on line simultaneously with completed improvements to traffic circulation on Highway 417 and I'm not sure all the jurisdictions are capable of that level of planning.

De:
Envoyé: 16 avril 2010 11:44
À: IP Bridge Study
Objet: Comments on Phase 2A Interprovincial Bridge Study
Pièces jointes: Apr2010 Comments on Phase 2A(2).doc

Dear Study Team -

Below and attached, please find Comments on Study Phase 2A - Study Area and Evaluation Factors.

Thank-you for the opportunity to contribute comments. We hope they will be considered thoughtfully, as several comments present concepts which are shifts in commonly-held views.

If you have any questions, we would be pleased to respond.

Sincerely,

Study Areas:

Point #1:

We think the Site Study Areas defined for the three corridors are an improvement over definitions in Phase 1. In particular, the Site Study Area for Corridor 6 appears to encompass green space east of the Robert Pickard Sewage Treatment Plant. We think this area merits further study and we are pleased to see it included in the defined Study Area.

Point #2:

We see the Site Study Areas for Corridors 6 and 7 include Hwy 174 to the junction with the 417 (the "Split"). Although the connection of provincial highway systems is an important criterion for the project, we are concerned how this criterion will implemented. In our opinion, including Hwy 174 to the Split has the potential to bias corridor evaluation to the location closest to the Split.

Considering that this east end crossing location will serve the region for many, many decades, during which time, development and densities in the east end will increase, and considering that during this time, a ring road system will likely take shape outside the current urban boundary, is it reasonable to compare 3 adjacent corridors using an endpoint of the Split?

We think the more important comparison criterion is a location which more effectively links the new inter-provincial crossing and its bridge access roads to controlled access highways (whether regional, provincial, or national), which are, or can reasonably expected to be, part of a regional transportation system for goods movement over the next 50 years.

Choosing the "Split" as an end point to defined Study Areas may be necessary, because of associated adjustments of Hwy 174 and the Split to accommodate changes imposed by bridge construction, and their costs. But we think great care will be needed to ensure that comparative evaluations of corridors are not biased towards the more central corridor because of the endpoint being the "Split".

Associated with this concept is the view that the three corridors under consideration have already been determined to be acceptable options for a near east end bridge – they are acceptable by virtue of their high rankings in the Phase 1 Study, and by virtue of their being further studied in Phase 2. Therefore, it is posited that their geographic position relative to downtown ("proximity factor") should not be allowed to bias comparative evaluations of the 3 options, because each has already been considered "acceptable". Indeed, the 100 year time frame in which the bridge is expected to provide service, combined with projected population growth in the City in the coming years, further suggest that all 3 corridors are essentially equal in providing a near east end crossing option.

Factor 1 – Traffic and Transportation

Point #1.1 - Truck Traffic Sub-Factor

The category of “truck traffic” is too broad. We think there should be differentiation between larger trucks which are typically used for longer-distance and larger volume shipments, and smaller trucks which are typically used for local deliveries. For purposes of assessment, it may be best to have category differentiation on the basis of both vehicle size and trip distance.

Point #1.2 – Truck Traffic and Traffic Operations Sub-Factors

We question trip distance, time and fuel consumption as primary measures for comparing these 3 corridors. Although they are common measures for transportation infrastructure, they will bias any selection towards the more central corridor, because that’s where current density and employment destinations are found. Indeed, if trip distance and time were the only factors considered, a new bridge might be built beside the existing downtown bridge. Recall that the 3 corridors under consideration are all considered acceptable near east end options.

As stated in the Study Area Comment section –

...it is posited that their geographic position relative to downtown (“proximity factor”) should not be allowed to bias comparative evaluations of the 3 options, because each has already been considered “acceptable”. Indeed, the 100 year time frame in which the bridge is expected to provide service, combined with projected population growth in the City in the coming years, further suggest that all 3 corridors are essentially equal in providing a near east end crossing option.

Instead of (or in addition to) trip distance and time (truck traffic sub-factor), we think any comparative measure of predicted movement of goods should incorporate sub-factors representing future potential for goods shipping centres and transfer points, including inter-modal. This is a transportation planning issue as well as an economic development issue, but the two are not the same, so the concept of locations to best serve relocated and expanded trucking facilities needs representation in the “Transportation” factor. We therefore encourage a comparative sub-factor to represent the vision of a bridge as a motivator to the transportation industry and a catalyst to land use planning.

Point #1.3 – Truck Traffic and Traffic Operations Sub-Factors

We think if differential trip distance is used as a sub-factor on which the 3 options are being compared, the measures should be normalized by total trip distance. It seems to be an important (and over-looked) factor in comparative assessments that, for longer trips and regional movement of goods and people, the differential impact of the 3 adjacent corridor options is smaller than for the 5 km local delivery trip.

And in the larger perspective and long-term vision for our Region, is it appropriate to put so much focus on small differences between 3 adjacent east end corridors in trip distance and time for regional movement of goods and people?

Point #1.4 - Truck Traffic and Traffic Operations Sub-Factors

This corridor comparative assessment must have input from a regional interprovincial goods movement and transportation plan. If a regional plan is not available, one must be developed.

Point #1.5 – Transit Operations Sub-Factor

This is a very important sub-factor for the movement of people, for the public good, and for environmental sustainability. Therefore, it is important that its evaluation metrics be appropriately balanced with other sub-factors under consideration. And it is important to ensure there are metric(s)

which give adequate representation to a vision of transit linkage potential over the longer term and beyond the current planning view,

Point #1.6 – Connectivity to Non-Motorized Infrastructure Sub-Factor

It is unclear how this sub-factor, as described (yes-no measure), will differentiate the 3 corridor options. Therefore, we hope for a better metric(s) to adequately represent a vision of a potential extensive urban cycling system in the future. The NCC's CEO, Marie Lemay is encouraging public discussion of this cycling vision (see Ottawa Citizen 2 April-print and 15 April-web). As with other transportation sub-factors, input from regional interprovincial planning is needed.

Factor 2 – Natural Environment

Sub-Factor 2.2 - Air Quality

Point #2.1 - Total Emission Burden for Criteria Contaminants and GHG

Will emission estimates take into consideration the grade differences of each corridor?

Will emission estimates for Options 6 and 7 include travel along the controlled access Hwy 174 to the Split? We think including this component is inappropriate as this will tend to bias corridor selection to the option closest to downtown. We think this sub-factor should only measure emissions during travel on bridge access roads and the bridge itself, not on current controlled access highway (the society-approved location for regional and high speed traffic).

Factor 2 – Natural Environment

Sub-Factor 2.3 - Fish Habitat

Point #2.2 - Elements 10-15

There are 6 measurable elements described for fish habitat. Care will be needed to ensure that the presence of 6 measurable elements for fish does not create an imbalance among sub-factors.

Point #2.3 – Elements 10-15

When assessing impacts on fish habitats, we think it will be important to differentiate between permanent losses and recoveries or adaptations, as well as construction phase effects and long-term effects.

Factor 2 – Natural Environment

Sub-Factor 2.5 – Terrestrial

Point #2.4 –Elements 21 and 23

With reference to element 21 "Undesignated woodland habitat including hydrogeological features ..." and element 23 "...habitat not covered under provincially or regionally significant areas including...".

—
We are concerned that the evidentiary basis for these evaluation elements is not demonstrated in peer-reviewed assessment or other robust determination of importance. The descriptions sound like our back yard (literally). Therefore, we question the merit and fairness of these in a factor category with elements that rely on regulation and designation.

Factor 3 – Cultural Environment

Sub-Factor 3.1 – Heritage and Archeology

Point #2.5 – Element 26 - Cultural Landscape Features

This element seems to describe impact on views and scenic areas. As such, it is an important feature is the vision, design, and location of a bridge. But it is unclear how this element will be described in a way that provides reasonable measure of significant impact on people.

Factor 4 – Social Environment

Point #2.5 – Element 29 - Visual Intrusion

This element appears to be redundant to Element 26 – Cultural Landscape features. We think it is important and appropriate to include and assess impacts on (intrusion into) public views and waterscapes. Public views and waterscapes are a public asset, and as such, should be protected. That is done with the inclusion of Element 26.

But is it appropriate to include an additional consideration of the view intrusion of the waterscape (the result of a bridge), this time inside privately-owned dwelling units?

We question the inclusion of a “viewscape” evaluation element for private properties. However, if this element were to go forward, we would also question the fairness in this element (as described) of excluding dwelling units from the “visual intrusion” metric if the road is not new or closer than an existing road. In fairness, visual intrusion occurs not just with steel, mortar and asphalt; visual intrusion also occurs with large and sudden increases in vehicular traffic, especially large trucks. An empty road is visually very different from one filled with traffic, especially fast-moving traffic.

Factor 4 – Social Environment

Sub-Factor 4.1 – Human Health

Point #2.6 – Element 31 – Noise Impacts

Description here is inadequate to assess community noise impacts of transportation infrastructure. Important measures include daytime Leq, nighttime Leq, nighttime peak levels and frequency of occurrence at sensitive receptors. Nighttime peak levels are particularly important because of truck traffic. Therefore, comparative assessment and mitigation measures in corridors should consider population affected, degree of impact (increase in background Leq levels, peak levels and frequency of occurrence). It should also be noted that an increase of 3dB is a doubling of noise; using a guideline or a “gate” of this kind might be misleading.

Factor 4 – Social Environment

Sub-Factor 4.1 – Human Health

Point #2.7 – Element 32 – Vibration Impacts

We think that vibration impacts should be assessed for all facilities, not just residences. The measurement metric of “number and severity” is likely inadequate to assess impact of vibration on some facilities, such as the Montfort Hospital or Pickard Sewage Treatment Plant..

Factor 4 – Social Environment

Sub-Factor 4.2 – Recreation

Point 2.8 – Element 35 - Boating Activities

Should there be similar consideration of flying activities from the Rockcliffe Airport? We note that float plane activity is covered under the Water Use Factor, and airport airspace use is covered under the Land Use Factor.

Factor 6 – Economic Environment

We encourage integrating a metric to represent a vision of future potential economic development, not yet represented in municipal official plans. Potential opportunities are often visible long before any become reality in Official Plans.

Factor 7 – Land Use

Point #2.9 – Impacts to Rockcliffe Airport

We strongly disagree with the “no net impacts” of runway movement to the east. The community to the east of the runway is impacted now by aircraft noise, despite the 11 degree turning rule. If the

runway is moved further east, this impact will increase and can be expected to generate considerably more noise complaints and problems than currently exist. The buffer zone between the airport and the community to the east is highly valued as a noise buffer as well as a natural area.

Thank-you for the opportunity to contribute comments. We hope they will be considered thoughtfully, as several comments describe concepts which are shifts in commonly-held views.

If you have any questions, we would be pleased to respond.

Sincerely,

Stay in touch. [Get Hotmail & Messenger on your phone.](#)