

Notes of Meeting

Subject:	Interprovincial Crossings Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Date:	September, 29 2008
Time:	6:30 - 8:30 pm
Location:	NCC 3 rd Floor, Room 324
Purpose:	To review technical evaluation and comments received at PCS No. 4
Meeting:	PCG Meeting No. 6

Attendees / Étaient présents

Name/Nom	Organization / Organisation	Name / Nom	Organization / Organisation
Arto Keklikian	NCC	Michel Vallee	Lower Town Community Association
Gabrielle Simonyi	NCC	Ruth Tremblay	Lakeview/Crystal Beach Community Association
Mike Moroz	NCC	Kate Twiss	Lakeview/Crystal Beach Community Association
Kaurie Carreau	MTO	Paul Williams	Lakeview/Crystal Beach Community Association
Dave McAvoy	MTO	Iain McGilveray	Lakeview/Crystal Beach Community Association
Glenn Higgins	MTO	Don Lishman	Manor Park Community
Phil Pawliuk	MTO	John Forsey	Manor Park Community Association
Hanako Cardinal	MTQ	Judy Makin	March Rural Community Association
Paul Baby	MTQ	Meredith Brown	Ottawa River keeper
Alex Cullen	City of Ottawa	John Murray	Rockcliffe Yacht Club
Andrew Hope	RCMP	Nick Leadbetter	Rockcliffe Park Community Association
Bill Fenton	Crystal Beach and Britannia yacht club	Raynald Ledoux	ROCHE/NCE JV
Bruce Baker	Lower town Community Association	Steve Taylor	ROCHE/NCE JV

Item		Assigned
1.0	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Purpose of Meeting - To review technical evaluation and comments received at PCS No. 4</p> <p>The notes of PCG Meeting No. 5 were distributed and no comments were received. It was clarified that the record of the meeting is described as “notes of meeting” rather than minutes to reflect that the record of the discussion is the consultant’s interpretation of the dialogue that took place.</p>	<p>NCC</p> <p>Roche-NCE</p>
2.0	<p>Review of Technical Evaluation</p> <p>The consultant provided an overview of the results of the technical evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation was completed by an evaluation committee including a combination of consultant technical specialists, and Study Team and key agency participants. This group was responsible for reviewing all technical reports and the Study Areas of all crossings being evaluated. This diverse group of technical experts, described as the Evaluation Committee, provided a Technically Preferred Ranking of the corridors and technology.</p> <p>The weighting process was reviewed and the final measurements were presented. Kettle Island was ranked the No. 1 alternative, rating significantly higher than any other alternative. This was validated by sensitivity tests. Sensitivity testing looked at competing tradeoffs and tested the high and low range of the weights of the evaluation committee (i.e. the range of perspectives of committee members) to see if it would make a difference to the results. In every test Kettle Island came in first. This demonstrates that the Kettle Island crossing is a robust solution.</p> <p>Kettle Island has the best ranking for serving vehicular traffic and attracts 30% of total trucks and 40% of trucks from the Macdonald Cartier Bridge. Kettle Island is located in the area where origins and destinations of trucking occur. It would naturally attract approximately 30% of all commercial goods movements.</p> <p>A question was raised on the impact of moving the crossing further east. Moving the crossing east would make the crossing less attractive to trucks. Trucks would have to be prohibited from using the Macdonald Cartier bridge and Chaudière Bridge to force 100% of commercial vehicles to an easterly bridge that is further away from their origins and/or destinations.</p> <p>The consultant’s advice is not to remove all of the commercial vehicles from the downtown. Forcing all trucks to one crossing would not be good planning. The study has not considered that there will be closures to any of the existing crossings.</p> <p>A west end corridor has not been identified to be carried forward to Phase 2 but we are encouraging the cities to work</p>	<p>All</p>

Item		Assigned
3.0	<p>together to protect for an eventual crossing in the west for implementation beyond the official plan horizon.</p> <p>Update of Recent Activities</p> <p><u>PCS No. 4 Gatineau – September 23, 2008</u> <u>PCS No. 4 Ottawa – September 24, 2008</u></p> <p>Statistics from the Gatineau session (as of September 29, 2008):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance: 57 • Comments sheets: 8 <p>Statistics from the Ottawa session (as of September 29, 2008):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance: 874 • Comments sheets: 206 <p>The most common concerns raised by the public included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighting Committee: community should have been represented, names of members and discussions should be public • Impacts on communities: air quality, noise, through traffic (including trucks), recreational facilities • Propose a regional ring road, a bridge further east (Alternatives 6 and 7 or others), improving public transit • Trucks should be removed from downtown Ottawa • Do not support the Kettle Island corridor (Ottawa residents living in the close proximity to the proposed corridor mostly) • Support for Kettle Island corridor (Gatineau residents mostly) 	
4.0	<p>Proponency</p> <p>A meeting was held with the Environmental authorities in Ontario and Quebec. The consultant recommended that this should be a federal project with the NCC being the responsible authority.</p> <p>It is our recommendation that the project not be “piece-mealed”. It is also the consultant’s recommendation that all downstream effects should be included in the federal project to avoid piece-mealing.</p>	
6.0	<p>Project Schedule and Process (no items)</p>	NCC

Item		Assigned
7.0	<p>Future Activities</p> <p>Future activities were discussed; they will include presentations to each City. The dates of these meetings are to be confirmed.</p>	ALL
9.0	<p>Comments and Questions from PCG Members</p> <p>Question (Q) - How can you have 2031 population employment numbers? Response (R) - The future population and employment forecasts have been provided by the planning departments of the City of Ottawa and the City of Gatineau. These reflect the expected development that corresponds with the approved official plans.</p> <p>Q - Have you deliberately excluded the communities from the Evaluation Committee? R – The Evaluation Committee has been designed to be an unbiased, objective panel of participants. The perspective of the general public has been documented and provided to the Evaluation Committee. This is included in reports for each of the PCS events, petitions and the general public’s prioritization of the factor groups as documented on PCS No. 3 comment sheets.</p> <p>Q - Can you provide a comment on the accuracy of the model? R – The transportation model is a state-of-the-art forecasting technique that is used worldwide. It has included significant funding through the TRANS group and has had decades of validation. It is the best tool available for traffic forecasting.</p> <p>Comment (C)- Paul Williams believes that the interpretation of the model output data is wrong. R – The consultant explained that the interpretation of PCG members of a Synchro output for the Acres Road crossing was misinterpreted.</p> <p>Q - How can the crossing service future demand? R - Crossings that are situated in areas where future development will occur are good locations. In fact, both official plans are predicated on land use activity being intensified closer to the downtown. The Kettle Island, Corridor 5 Crossing reflects the best transportation link to accommodate these land use objectives.</p> <p>Q - Have you defined the different types of trucks that will cross the Kettle Island bridge? R- All commercial goods movements have been captured in the 2007 origins and destinations survey. To date, the modelling has been completed for all commercial goods movements. Model runs for each vehicle type will be considered for a Phase 2 activity.</p> <p>Q - Did you take the 1999 OMB ruling into account that there would be no more large trucks on King Edward Avenue?</p>	

Item		Assigned
	<p>R – The federal government will be the proponent for the project and is not bound by the OMB. This project is trying to come up with the best possible location to accommodate trucks while balancing other competing interests. The consultant’s advice is to wait until this project is implemented and then assess future measures. Glenn Higgins added that the OMB ruling is 10 years old. This study is looking at new data and a new timeline. The OMB ruling is not set in stone and we cannot assume that a decision that has been made in the past will bind future decisions indefinitely.</p> <p>The integrity of this study has been criticized, but the same models have been used for many studies which included the OMB. The planning being done today has to reflect what is needed today and 20-30 years in the future.</p> <p>Q - With respect to the use of the bridge, I thought the purpose was to take 18 wheelers away from the city centres. Who was involved in making the decision that 18 wheelers will be allowed on the new crossing.</p> <p>R - We are looking for public input. Our purpose was to allow for alternative routes. What is being carried forward to date is that the trucks will be spread out between the 3 bridges. Again, the Kettle island crossing is the best location to attract commercial vehicles from the 2 existing truck routes. It will attract approximately 30% of all goods movement and approximately 40% of the trucking from the King Edward corridor.</p> <p>Q: If you have 1000 trucks on the bridge at one time you would need to design a different structure of bridge. How you do plan for this?</p> <p>R – The bridge will be designed using the Canadian Bridge Code. The code can accommodate all vehicle types and spacing.</p> <p>Q - When we had PCS 1 several of the residents questioned the formulation for the Terms of Reference to take out some of the trucks. We were under the impression that you were willing to amend the ToR to say all of the trucks would be removed from the Macdonald Cartier Bridge.</p> <p>R - These comments were reviewed by all Study Partners and it was decided that we would not modify the text. This reflects current NCC white paper strategic view that the NCC supports the examination of additional options for interprovincial heavy truck routes to avoid the core area, and therefore will cooperate with other levels of government and the freight transport industry in studies and other efforts to relocate interprovincial heavy truck transport from the core area, in the context of new interprovincial crossings.). Again, the consultant’s advice is that is more desirable and more efficient to have several crossing locations available for goods movement which distributes any negative effects to multiple corridors. No crossing location considered did not have adjacent communities.</p> <p>Q - Is this evaluation available for us to see?</p> <p>R - The Analysis and Evaluation Report is available on the public website.</p> <p>Q - Can you provide the identity of the individuals on the Evaluation Committee?</p> <p>R – The names of individuals have not been provided. Request for personal identities will have to be made to each of the individual organizations. The names of the organizations who participated on the Evaluation Committee are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Capital Commission 	<p style="text-align: right;">ROCHE-NCE</p>

Item	Assigned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport Canada • Department of Fisheries and Oceans • Ministry of Natural Resources • Ministry of Transportation Quebec • Ministry of Transportation Ontario • City of Ottawa • City of Gatineau • Mississippi Valley Conservation • South Nation Conservation Authority • CREDDO • Transport 2000 • STO <p>Q – In what other studies did you use this type of evaluation?</p> <p>R – This evaluation methodology has been used by the consultant for approximately 20 years and is a computer based decision making evaluation technique that has been used worldwide when making decisions for public infrastructure. Significant local examples include Highway 417 widening from Antrim to Arnprior and Arnprior to Renfrew, Highway 7 Expansion from Highway 417 to Carleton Place and the Innes Walkley Hunt Club Connection.</p> <p>Q – Is the weighting final or open for discussion?</p> <p>R - The weighting will not be altered but we are taking comments on perspectives and issues from the public. All comments will be taken back to the study partners.</p> <p>Q – Will you change the weights following receiving comments from 900 people that you didn't account for communities?</p> <p>R - We reviewed the criteria and the entire regional communities' perspective on weights at PCS No. 3. We will review the comments and document any issues identified by the public including any issue that has not been considered by this study. However, to date there has been no issue identified that was not considered before the evaluation exercise. It was clarified by the consultant that over 40 of the 90 evaluation criteria related to the quality of life of humans.</p> <p>C - The opinion of one PCG member was that the utility score for sailing on Lac Deschenes was correctly defined by the consultant team. However, the weight for sailing should have been higher.</p> <p>C – Another PCG member noted that although the utility scores for sailing were both low for Corridors 4 and 5, they both should have been rated as zero i.e. Corridor 4 is as poor as Corridor 5.</p> <p>Q - Why was Andrew Haydon Park only considered in 1 criteria?</p>

Item		Assigned
	<p>R: - This was the same approach used for all parks in all crossing locations. This sub factor measured a number of different effects to each park and these were considered by the evaluation committee during their site inspection at each of the parks. At Andrew Haydon Park, the effects included a number of issues such as loss of light, potential impact to commemorative trees, the fact that this is a significant walk-in park facility for the community in this area, division of the park, park activities that are undertaken in the area of the crossing etc.</p> <p>Q – How did you decide on the locations where tunnels were evaluated? Was it based on the Golders memos? R – The choice of tunnels was based on engineering feasibility. Golders provided input on geotechnical constraints.</p> <p>Q - How did you select the global weights? R - Each Evaluation Committee member had to understand the 90 sub factors and field reviewed each of the constraints in the competing corridors. Initially the evaluation committee members completed an exercise to divide 100 points among the sub factors in each factor group. Then the evaluation committee members divided 100 points among the competing factor groups by considering the utility scores, delta of measured effects, ability to mitigate effects, perspectives of the public, short term or long term effects and understanding whether these were local or global issues before selecting their weights. The values of weights were debated and discussed during the evaluation meeting including input from expert specialists in different fields.</p> <p>Q – Are you channelizing all traffic in the downtown? R - Crossing No. 5 reflects a location that is very near the centroid of forecast travel demand although this may appear to be a more central crossing location; it in fact is one that reflects the land use plan of the two cities and their intensification objectives. This approach reduces the likelihood for urban sprawl and provides a transportation network that harmonizes with the land use plans currently in the two official plans.</p> <p>Q - Why does the city of Ottawa have an issue with implementing a ring road? R - Alex Cullen responded that a ring road is not an identified need within the City of Ottawa. In the OMB it was said that a ring road would be the subject of a future EA.</p> <p>The consultant explained that in the late 1990's the Interprovincial Transportation Concept Plan was developed that suggested that new Interprovincial Crossings in the east and the west could provide a roadway network that would provide a loop within the cities i.e. connect to both Autoroute 50 and Highway 417/174. This would provide a more efficient transportation network where trips can utilize freeways on either side of the river to distribute traffic and avoid events such as collisions or temporary construction. This type of plan accommodates urban trips, whereas the concept of a ring road is seen as servicing trips that want to drive around the National Capital Region (NCR). In fact, very few trips have origins and destinations that do not stop within the NCR. Therefore, a loop system would be desirable for the region, which crossings in the east and the west will accommodate, but the need for a bypass is not necessary to serve the traffic demand in the NCR.</p> <p>Q - This study is all about people living in Québec and travelling to Ottawa to work?</p>	

Item	Assigned
<p>R - The consultant explained that there are several objectives to this study including improving commercial goods movements, reduction of congestion, improving tourism, reducing airborne emissions and improving the quality of life for residents in the National Capital Region. Reducing congestion for travel both northbound and southbound is a goal that is part of a balanced transportation plan that includes transit, walking, bicycling and strategic links for commercial vehicle movement. The transportation plan has to reflect the demand of future population employment that will occur in our Region.</p> <p>Q – Is Kettle Island a political decision? R – The technical recommendation that selected Corridor 5 as the best balanced solution has weighed the competing effects of all the competing evaluation criteria. Although it does have some effects in the corridor, the evaluation committee has determined this to be the best solution for the overall community. There has been no political input into the evaluation committee’s ranking of the 12 alternatives.</p> <p>Q - Why don't you carry more alternatives to Phase 2? Then when the political decision is made we have a starting place to go forward with another alternative. Set a standard that anything that rates over a certain mark be carried forward to Phase 2. The way that it was presented now residents of Lower Town are stuck with 30% of the trucks. We understand the criteria but from public environment there may be some better options so why not look at these other options. R – It was considered prudent that all feasible crossings should undergo a detailed technical evaluation. In fact, 12 alternatives were carried forward for such a detailed comparison. This was the step that was completed in Phase 1 of the study. Phase 2 of the study will focus on any residual effects within Corridor 5 and consider mitigation for these effects. Should significant issues be identified in Phase 2, then other options may be considered. However, it is the consultants advice (subject to reviewing the comments from PCS 4) that Corridor 5 be carried forward for the Phase 2 work program.</p> <p>With respect to trucking, no other corridor can relieve commercial goods movements from the downtown as well as Corridor 5.</p> <p>Q - What did you do with all of the other factors when you did the sensitivity test? R - They are pro-rated to keep the same proportions.</p> <p>Q - What is the difference between Alternatives 5 and 6? R – The transportation performance of Corridor 6 is close to Corridor 5 because it is geographically closer to the centroid of traffic demand; however, Corridor 6 has significantly greater land use impacts because it utilizes an older arterial road corridor that is quite narrow and passes through established communities. The horizontal and vertical alignment of Corridor 6 would have to be improved to accommodate a 4-lane cross section in Gatineau to provide a link to Autoroute 50. In doing so, the cultural effects of Corridor 6 would be much greater. It would require 79 buyouts in Gatineau.</p>	

Item **Assigned**

Q - Why do Alternatives 3 and 4 rank better in terms of cost than Alternatives 1 and 2 when the river is widest at Alternatives 3 and 4?
 R – Corridors 3 and 4 do rank poorer with respect to cost for the western crossings. The table below quantifies both the estimated construction cost and utility scores for all the western options. Because the cost of a tunnel alternative is a magnitude greater than the bridge options, this results in closer utility scores for the four western bridges. However, the wider crossings for Corridors 3 and 4 are reflected in lower utility scores than for bridges at Corridors 1 and 2.

Alternative	Alt. 1 Crossing 1 Bridge	Alt. 2 Crossing 2 Bridge	Alt. 2T Crossing 2 Tunnel	Alt. 3 Crossing 3 Bridge	Alt. 4 Crossing 4 Bridge
Measurement	\$454,977,250.00	\$549,796,000.00	\$1,952,236,000	\$614,750,500.00	\$577,375,500.00
Utility Score (not rounded)	0.941	0.881	0.000	0.840	0.864
Weighted Score (not rounded)	16.6806	15.6243	0.0000	14.9006	15.3170

ROCHE-NCE

Q - Is there a cost report?

R - It will be a part of the final report.

Q - Will the final report have a paragraph saying that you can not use the EA information collected on the west end in a future EA?

R – The final report will say that the west end will be subject to a future EA. This information can be used as background information. New data will also have to be collected to form the baseline at a future date.

Q - Does this EA end in January?

R – The study will continue over the next two to three years to complete the Phase 2 portion of the Environmental Assessment.

Q - When does the Phase 2 start and has money been set aside by the proponents?

R -. Part of the funding has been budgeted but the Phase 2 work program and budget will require endorsement by the funding partners.

Q - Is a tunnel out of the question for phase 2?

R – Sub options will be considered for Corridor 5.

Q – Will the bridge be high enough to accommodate existing sailboats?

R - It will have to accommodate all marine traffic.

Item

Q: If you have a typical arched bridge you only have clearance in the middle.

R: The bridge will have a very flat vertical curve radius and the requirement for the maximum vertical clearance will be reviewed in Phase 2 including input from user groups and Transport Canada.

Q - Water use in the west end. Alternatives 3 and 4 should have been a higher number than for 1 and 2. We have sent in some material on this.

R - The effect to water uses was provided by a joint meeting of sailing clubs. From these discussions it was determined that Corridors 3 and 4 were judged as the poorest performing of any corridors considered as part of the study. As such, they have the lowest utility scores which reflect undesirable crossing locations from a water activity perspective.

Q - Is it possible to build a bridge that doesn't touch down on the island?

R: Yes, it would be possible to have a bridge alternative with no pier on the island. . It will depend on variables such as First Nations, fisheries, natural habitat constraints etc.

Q: Are First Nations being consulted separately?

R: The First Nation communities are being provided parallel opportunities for consultation. Their status is as a separate nation and as such the contact is from the Federal Government.

C - A PCG member canvassed the Kettle Island corridor on the Gatineau side and found that there are many opposed to this corridor.

Q - Is the data for detailed cost estimates available now?

R - The totals are on the website.

Q - Were the costs of changing the interchange at 417/416 included?

R - The cost for modifications to the Highway 417/416 interchange were included in the estimate (although only minor changes were included in this alternative). This corridor is not being carried forward. Costs will be included in the final report

Q - Where would traffic go if you had a crossing at Holly Acres? The 416 is already full.

R - The distribution of traffic goes to several roadways; these were documented in a standalone technical memorandum.

C - Amend the report to take traffic out of Corkstown Road. It is signed as not a through route.

R - The traffic analysis has documented the diversion of traffic, including a small portion onto Corkstown Road. Because this alternative is not being carried forward, no further analyses are going to be undertaken.

Item		Assigned
	<p>C – A PCG member suggested that the Britannia Water Treatment Plant should exclude Holly Acres as a crossing location. If the plant was to become contaminated, water supply could potentially be cut off.</p> <p>R – This study has considered potential effects to water intakes for all the alternatives. This is an effect that could be mitigated if a crossing was selected in proximity to the water intake. Moreover, provincial legislation does not apply to a federal project but the federal EA will consider the spirit of provincial legislation as part of the environment to be protected as part of a future project.</p> <p>C - A PCG member asked the consultant to write a paragraph in the final report on the water treatment plant if it is within a two hour flow area.</p>	
	<p>Other Business (no items)</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>10.0</p>	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>PCG Meeting No. 7 – to be scheduled in Phase 2</p>	
<p>11.0</p>	<p>Adjournment</p>	

Recorded by:

Steve Taylor