



**Alexandra Bridge Replacement Project  
Public Advisory Group Meeting 4  
Meeting Minutes**

**June 12, 2025  
Virtual Meeting**

**PARTICIPANTS**

**Project Team:**

- Cédric Williams, NCC (Moderator)
- Heather Thomson, NCC (Observer)
- Paul Lebrun PSPC, (Co-chair)
- Matt Carter, ARUP (Subject Expert)
- Matthieu Galland, ARUP (Subject Expert)
- Sophie Wilkin, Provencher Roy (Subject Expert)
- Brittany Anne Bose, ERA Architects (Observer)
- Victoria Angel, ERA Architects (Subject Expert)
- Ian Dance, Dillon Consulting Limited (Subject Expert)
- Aliyah Fraser, Dillon Consulting Limited (Minutes)

**Online Attendees:**

- Kelly Haussler, Ottawa Tourism (Co-chair)
- Arto Keklikian, Heritage Ottawa
- Josiah Firth, Lowertown Community Association
- Claude Royer, Association des résidents de l'île-de-Hull
- Patrick-Robert Meunier, MOBI-O (alternate)
- David Jeanes, Transport Action Canada
- Philippe Deschamps, Vision Centre-Ville (alternate)
- Stephane Cousineau, Hull Marina
- Brian Corbishley, Hull Marina (alternate)
- Glenn Crawford, The Village Legacy Project
- Jerry Fiori, Ottawa Disability Coalition
- Guillaume Gaillard, Bike Ottawa
- Frederique Henry, Tourisme Outaouais



## DETAILED AGENDA AND PRESENTATION ITEMS

The fourth meeting of the Public Advisory Group (PAG) for the Alexandra Bridge Replacement Project was held virtually and focused on providing project updates, presenting consultation topics, and reviewing the Interpretation and Commemoration Plan. The session included a video rendering of the preferred concept and two discussion periods: one on design-related consultation topics and another dedicated to the Interpretation and Commemoration Plan. The meeting was co-chaired by Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) and Ottawa Tourism and facilitated by the National Capital Commission (NCC). Technical experts from ARUP, Provencher\_Roy, ERA Architects, and Dillon Consulting contributed to the presentations and discussions.

#	Member	Item
<b>Part 1: Introduction</b>		
	PSPC and NCC	Welcome and introductions a. Land acknowledgement b. Meeting instructions c. Agenda overview
<b>Part 2: Project Update</b>		
	PSPC	a. Preferred concept selection process b. Project Schedule and key milestones
<b>Part 3: Preferred Concept</b>		
	PSPC and NCC	a. Visual overview of the preferred concept b. Public participation topics: i. Safety and separation of transportation modes ii. Furnishings and seasonal comfort iii. Universal access iv. Shoreline connectivity
<b>Part 4: Discussion Period #1</b>		
	PSPC and NCC	Gather feedback on the updated preferred concept design, including whether it adequately addresses user needs such as commuting, safety, accessibility, and connectivity, and identifying any additional improvements or barriers that should be addressed
<b>Part 5: Interpretation and Commemoration Plan</b>		
	ERA	a. Overview of the plan's purpose and approach b. Key Themes; Crossing, Gathering, Reflecting c. Interpretation zones and opportunities
<b>Part 6: Discussion period #2</b>		
	ERA and NCC	Gather feedback on the Interpretation and Commemoration Plan, focusing on key stories to highlight, where interpretive or commemorative elements could be integrated, and types of elements that could encourage engagement.
<b>Part 7: Next Steps</b>		

## MEETING MINUTES



#	Member	Question/comment	Project Team Response
<b>Preferred Concept</b>			
1.	<b>G. Guillaume</b>	How did public consultation impact the selection of the preferred concept?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation factored into the design but was not the only criteria considered.</li> </ul>
2.	<b>C. Royer</b>	Can you explain what criteria lead to the selection of Motion as the preferred concept?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The designs were evaluated based on PAG input, public consultation, stakeholders, Indigenous engagement, GBA+ engagement, experts and a multi-criteria assessment (MCA). Overall, a combination of criteria led to the decision.</li> </ul>
3.	<b>J. Firth</b>	When the PAG last met, Motion was the least popular. Can you explain the criteria that were considered in coming to this decision?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The seven criteria from the MCA were evaluated by a variety of groups. Many comments were received and all of them factored into the decision to choose Motion.</li> </ul>
4.	<b>D. Jeanes</b>	Are all the bridge's arches the same size?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No there is a slightly larger one in the middle and two that are smaller on each side.</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion #1 – General Feedback</b>			
5.	<b>J. Fiori</b>	<p>Met with Dillon last week and explained accessibility considerations. No parking nearby so people with limited mobility issues cannot get to the bridge. Maintaining everything on the Ontario side but there is no plan to drop off people to get close to the bridge. This is a concern for people with accessibility needs. How will people with disabilities be able to enjoy the bridge. Need to look at the journey to get to the bridge as well as the experience on the bridge. Will be difficult for those with mobility challenges to access the viewpoints</p> <p>Additional concern that pedestrians will walk into the bicycle path.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
6.	<b>P-R. Meunier</b>	<p>Is the path for the cyclist 4 metres wide? Was it increased?</p> <p>For cyclists, are there only two access points to pedestrian areas? And for the rest of the time will they not be able to access the pedestrian areas? It would be nice if there were other access points than just the two that are provided.</p> <p>Concerned that there will be cyclists that want to stop and dismount who won't be able to do so.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, the space for cyclists was increased.</li> <li>There are four locations for cyclists to dismount and safely enter the pedestrian path.</li> </ul>



#	Member	Question/comment	Project Team Response
		There is a unique opportunity to create a bridge where there are no cars. Closing the bridge to vehicles is a good idea.	
7.	C. Royer	<p>There are no criteria in the MCA that correspond to commemoration. Was the Echo design (being reminiscent of the old bridge) evaluated on these merits?</p> <p>Is it possible to receive the matrix for the criteria of choosing each bridge?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commemoration of the current bridge was considered unto the Bridge Expression criteria. Echo being similar to the current bridge was considered and there were comments from the public that indicated that people liked Echo for this reason.</li> <li>Each bridge design was considered based on its impact on the cultural landscape. Echo, being reminiscent of the current bridge, Motion being similar to the form of the form of the American eel</li> <li>There was a history and commemorative elements to each design. Each design presented opportunities for interpretation and commemoration.</li> <li>Will come back to the question of the matrix</li> </ul>
8.	G. Gaillard	<p>Enormous opportunity to turn the bridge into an active transportation route. Would like to see the cycling path be bigger than it is. Roadway seems large. Could it be reduced? And how will speed be controlled?</p> <p>How will the bridge be cleared in the winter?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic calming measures are being considered especially close to the pedestrian viewpoints. Thought is being put into the visual perception to make it seem more street-like than like a fast road. May include implements that tell drivers their speed and/or other measures to slow them down.</li> <li>Widths of the roadway are dictated by regulations but there may be opportunities to make it smaller. Motion was the concept that had no large physical structure separating the bridge which leaves it open to future change. Eventually there may be a tram running where the cars are now.</li> <li>Cycling lanes will be cleared during the winter.</li> </ul>
9.	C. Royer	<p>Regarding museum access, will pedestrians and trucks be separated?</p> <p>Would like to see a plan of the whole bridge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, they will be separated.</li> </ul>
10.	B. Corbishley	<p>Would appreciate more precision on the construction schedule.</p> <p>Wondering what the process is to get clarity on the next steps on implementation. Need to know what to do to adjust.</p> <p>Looking for more detail and a definitive answer on construction timeline and funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intention is that construction would start in 2028 but will need to provide temporary facilities for the boating association (wharf/launch/parking). This will be constructed in 2027 so that the temporary facilities can be used in 2028. Current facilities would fall within construction area. Building next to marina would remain in service and access to boat slips maintained.</li> <li>Will provide more information and have a dedicated conversation when more</li> </ul>



#	Member	Question/comment	Project Team Response
			information is available
11.	K. Haussler	Where are the runners going? No way that they will navigate the pedestrian zone. Would like to see the running population considered in the design. Could be signage or better separation of space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intention is to have runners on the pedestrian path. Will include signage indicating that this is a shared path</li> <li>• .</li> </ul>
12.	D. Jeanes	<p>The tramway project was previously proposed and would have been implemented if the bridge had remained. If the bridge is constructed as proposed, would it be possible to have a tram in the roadway?</p> <p>What would be the consequences of having the cycleway at a different height?</p> <p>On the heritage side – a lot of people were anxious that existing part of the bridge be conserved. Since there was a strong interest in commemoration of railway and engineering history will this be included?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge is being designed for possible one-way tram conversion as in the future.</li> <li>• Different height of cycling path is for design of future tram conversion. Would need to raise the roadway in that case to allow for the tram.</li> <li>• History of current bridge will be included in the interpretative and commemorative elements that are currently being considered.</li> </ul>
13.	J. Firth	<p>Main concern is the volume of traffic and that it does not exceed current conditions. Going from a divided road to an undivided road could lead to addition of a third lane?</p> <p>Curious about how Motion was selected from the concepts. Frustrated that they are not privy to data. Would like to better understand how choices were made.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plans to add a third lane in the future.</li> <li>• Multi-criteria selection process, based on engagement with indigenous communities, expert panels and public and stakeholder engagement. Everything was scored based on the MCA and engagement feedback and Motion was selected as the preferred concept.</li> </ul>
14.	C. Royer	<p>Usage of the south quay and would need to move around pillar?</p> <p>Will all access be maintained as it is today?</p> <p>Will the pavement need to be raised at a certain point?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You don't necessarily see it, but we will make sure that there is enough space to move boats to the other side.</li> <li>• West face will be able to be used by smaller boats but not big ones. Will have discussions with</li> <li>• There will be a slight lowering towards the river, but it will be the same</li> <li>• Pavement will not need to be raised until introduction of tram.</li> </ul>
15.	A. Keklikian	<p>concerned about preservation of heritage concept and preference to cars.</p> <p>The new bridge will carry cars even though they are only 10% of traffic. Were any studies completed to assess the demand for cars?</p> <p>Best way to calm traffic is to avoid traffic. Would prefer is bridge was closer to being green infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>



#	Member	Question/comment	Project Team Response
<b>Discussion #2 – Interpretation and Commemoration Plan</b>			
Discussion Questions			
What types of stories do you imagine being told at the site of the new bridge and its landings?			
Where do you imagine encountering interpretative or commemorative elements on the site (bridge and landings)?			
What types of elements might you encounter on your journey that would compel you to continue discovering/moving/pausing?			
16.	<b>G. Crawford</b>	<p>There was a murder that happened on this bridge that was an anti-gay hate crime. Would like to see some commemoration of that event and the discrimination the community has faces. Could be more than a plaque, like public art or something interactive</p> <p>Regarding lighting adding the colours of the rainbow flag during pride month in June or in August when Ottawa has its pride festival</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
17.	<b>D. Jeanes</b>	<p>Need to commemorate railways and engineering history with text and images</p> <p>Bridge is in a very significant spot for built and natural views of the capital. Need some type of interpretation to tell people what they are looking at.</p> <p>Would like to preserve historic plaques from Dominion Bridge and Engineering Plaques</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be trying to create a list of all known commemorative elements including the plaques from the former bridge</li> </ul>
18.	<b>C. Royer</b>	<p>Have you been in contact with the society of history for civil engineers?</p> <p>Can you tell us of the proportion of the budget for the new bridge will be allocated to commemoration?</p> <p>Sky is the limit for suggestions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will discuss this with the team but there haven't been any direct conversations at this point</li> <li>No answer to the question of proportion of budget at this point.</li> <li>ICP is an opportunity to provide input into what you'd like to see for consideration</li> </ul>
19.	<b>C. Royer</b>	Where can we find more information?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The different elements we presented are on the website and there are opportunities to provide comments online. If you'd like to share more, please send them to <a href="mailto:consultation@ncc.ca">consultation@ncc.ca</a></li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b>			
20.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will circulate Interpretation and Commemoration Plan questions to PAG members for responses and comments will be due July 7, 2025.</li> </ul>



NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION  
COMMISSION DE LA CAPITALE NATIONALE