

From Robert Hajaly

These in brief are my comments on the PUM 2050 project proposal document 3.2.

1. This proposal should cover all of Montreal Island, which is a unified economic and social whole, not just the city of Montreal, and so should be put forward by the Montreal agglomeration, not exclusively by the city of Montreal.
2. In proposing 15 minute walking communities, the proposal downplays the likely and frequent need for longer trips, whether for work, education, health care, or entertainment and recreation. And even if 78% of people may be within a 15 minute walk to the collective transport network, as aimed at by the proposal (page 14), many of these persons may still prefer to use their personal cars for their trips, so that altogether more than the only 31% of the people targeted by the proposal (page 13) may be using cars. Hence the greater importance of maintaining fluid car traffic than is given by this proposal, including to access the downtown city centre (map, page 8). In this regard the proposal should, but doesn't, propose the connection of the two parts of Cavendish Boulevard.
3. Nevertheless, I agree with the proposal that the improvement of the public transport network is important. In particular, I support the integration of the Metro, commuter railway lines and the REM into a single public transport system, with a single fare accessing all three, and their physical integration by additional stops, specifically, linking the Train de Nord with the REM at Canora station and with the west Orange line at Decarie Namur station, and by extending the west Orange line north at least to connect with the REM at Bois-Franc station. As well, to better serve the public, both the Train de Nord and the Vaudreuil-Hudson CP commuter line should stop at Cavendish Boulevard, the CP line at 32nd Avenue/Autoroute 13 in Lachine, and the Train de L'Est at Rodolfe-Forget Boulevard and Papineau Avenue.

With these additions, it may be justified only to extend the Blue Metro line westward only to Cavendish Boulevard, but more justified to extend the Green line westward and eastward, eastward particularly if Montreal East is to be developed residentially and industrially, as it should be. The so-called Rose line may be less justified if the Blue line is extended eastward to Pie-IX Boulevard and further to Anjou. Also, I'm against the proposed development of tramway lines (map, page 7), because of the way tramway cars block road traffic, their need for

overhead wires, and their considerable unnecessary cost. A better use of limited public money would be to create more frequent and reliable electric bus lines and covered bus stop shelters.

4. The densification map, page 15, does not include possible residential densification in the Montreal suburbs, including the Royalmount development in Town of Mount-Royal and development in the West Island suburbs; also doesn't allow enough more dense development in Saint-Laurent and LaSalle boroughs, and doesn't allow at all for residential development in the large former oil refinery area in Montreal East, which admittedly needs to first be decontaminated. Only one active refinery remains in this area. Montreal Island should contain at least one half of the residents of metropolitan Montreal to avoid excessive urban sprawl promoting car use, so I'm guessing maybe 2,950,000 residents by 2050; so we need to optimally develop as many Montreal Island spaces as possible to house this number of people.

5. Orientation 4, page 17 of the PUM 2050 proposal document, aims at a 20.5% increase in industrial use floor space, but offers no specific ideas as to how this increase may be achieved. In this regard I would like to suggest a few ideas. First, the St. Lawrence river channel leading to Montreal should be deepened to allow larger ocean-going ships (known as Panamax ships) to reach Montreal, therefore increasing the importance of its port and the scale of all related import and export activities. Second, to promote enterprise startups, a technology enterprise exchange should be created to systematically bring together researchers, entrepreneurs and venture capitalists with similar or related interests, and also a venture stock exchange to scale up these enterprises. Third, the large former oil refinery area in eastern Montreal should be decontaminated and opened up to industrial and housing construction activity.

6. Page 20 of the PUM 2050 document states a target that 70% of Montrealers should have quality access to a public library by 2050. Is it not possible to achieve a higher target for this desirable access by 2050, ideally 100% access?

7. Page 31 states an objective of giving back a place to active and collective mobility with regard to Mount Royal, but does not consider the contested issue of car access to it. In my view people should be able to access Mount Royal by car from both its east and west sides, but should not be permitted to use it as a traffic shortcut between these sides. Similarly, page 32 advocates privileging active and collective transport in Old Montreal. While I agree with this, I also think that there should also be limited car access to Old Montreal, since whether for reasons of limited mobility, very young children, carrying heavy packages or simply personal preference, car access may be needed or preferred. A major point here is not to limit access for anyone to this exceptional and valued part of Montreal.

8. Finally, the city of Montreal government should be required to publicly explain the reasons for its possibly rejecting any of the recommendations of the OCPM commission regarding the

PUM 2050 project; and also subsequently to present to the public a five year plan of action, with specific targets, to begin the realization of the legislated PUM 2050 project, and with a process of public accountability to judge the government's progress in achieving this plan of action, and also to judge if any changes need to be made to the PUM 2050's targets.

Yours sincerely, Robert Hajaly