

Mme VERONICA CRESPO :

335 Non, non, non, c'est beau. Euh... je suis confuse sur la question. Donc, mon argument est que ce projet va générer de la pollution. Et la pollution est une violation des droits humains et avoir de l'eau – *clean water is a human right in itself*. So, that's one of the reasons I'm against this project.

340 **LA PRÉSIDENTE :**

Oui, d'accord. Ça va. As-tu autre chose? Alors, ça va aller. Je vous remercie beaucoup. Alors, vous communiquez avec Stéphanie. Maintenant, monsieur Thomas Schwalb. Allez-y, oui.

345

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

Bonsoir, Mesdames, Messieurs! J'espère vous me permettrez de faire cette présentation en anglais. Je suis plus à l'aise.

350

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

Fine. That's fine.

355 **M. THOMAS SCHWALB :**

I'm not sure you will be able to see my slides.

M. JOSHUA WOLF, commissaire :

360

We have a screen there.

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

365 Oh, you have a screen. O.K. all right. O.K. My intention is I'm going to go through the
memoire that I have submitted and I'll just go quickly through it and leave some time for
questions and also go through some of the things I did not put on paper.

370 So, this project looks very environmental, very attractive, practical and esthetic. And it's
a very nice project but it doesn't quite belong in the area that is proposed to be, because there
are very many issues that are problematic.

375 So, I'm going to look at a lot of these issues in this brief. The location of the project was
zoned as agricultural in the past and this was changed to residential despite the objections of
the OCPM itself. And this was to enable development of the vacant land, except for the fact
that this is not really vacant but it's an ecosystem that provides services to the environment
and the people around it. And it includes pollution remediation of air and water, and therefore
has health effects. According to a study that was done on this area, there are 759,000 \$ per
380 year of environmental services that are provided and in actual capital. Putting a development
in this area would destroy that.

385 Now, we have heard that 40% of the area would be preserved, but I bring to your
attention this table here and this is a graph of the eco services provided by area. And you will
notice that it's not a linear graph. It's parabolic, exponential in that if you save 40% of the land
area, you're not getting 40% of the entire area of eco services, because you need a larger area
and it will provide more. For example, deer will not go into a very small area. So, if you have
10%, you are not going to have 10% of the deer. You will have no deer. O.k., because it's
exponential.

390 So, the development would remove a large area of actual green space to be replaced
by asphalt, buildings and concrete. And, at the same time, it would add new sources of
pollution, from the automobiles and the greenhouse gasses.

395 So, one of the first elements that we discussed is biodiversity. And to most people, biodiversity means having animals, fish, insects and birds in the world. However, to some people, it seems to mean Hondas, Fords, and Fiats, because they only just don't get it. On a particular subspecies level, genetic diversity means... sorry, biodiversity means genetic diversity. And this is what gives the organism a capability to survive environmental challenges and it also gives it more susceptible capability against pathogens which can lead to extinction if
400 the genetic diversity is very limited.

405 So, you need a large genetic diversity for a population to be able to thrive. Now, the best factor of genetic diversity is population numbers. So, generally the larger a specie is, the better is the genetic diversity. Threatened species are automatically down at the bottom of the genetic diversity scale. So, as the species get threatened, it's really threatened with extinction, it can't cope with climatic changes or pathogenic changes. So it's really at risk.

410 Now, on a higher level, on the species level, it means various types of life, each having its own niche in the environment in terms of its food, and how it interacts with the environment. And sometimes, these are very complex relationships. We can't tell ahead of time what this specie actually does. But every specie has a role in our environment. There's no specie that has no role. It's impossible. Now, the problem is that we only understand less than 1% of these relationships. They only become evident when they are threatened or they stop their functioning in that environment.
415

420 And a few of the examples, if you wipe out milkweed, which has been seen as just a weed, you wipe out the Monarch butterfly, which has happened in Montreal. If you remove the deer, the forest will change over time because that's how deer interact with the forest. They chew the little sapins, and so it changes the whole effect on the forest. If you destroy bees, you will affect our agriculture, which is actually starting to happen. And then you endanger our food supply. So, again, reducing the biodiversity will reduce our quality of life in unimaginable ways, we can't even figure out what that's going to do to us but it's going to be pretty extreme.

425 Having said all that, most people especially our politicians, will still ignore the
consequences and they'll think "well, someone else will deal with this problem. I won't deal
with it, someone else will." O.K. However, we must note that Montreal has chosen to sign
Biodiversity conventions, and in fact hosts the Office of the Secretariat of the Convention on
Biological Diversity. However, with what is going on around Montreal with all the development,
it looks like this is only a public relation stunt, because we're just talking biodiversity, we don't
430 really have strategies to implement it. And so, unfortunately, it seems to be green washing. In
reality, Montreal is breaking its commitments by not implementing and executing these
biodiversity strategies and is the host of this office under false pretenses.

435 So now, if we look at the project that we are talking about, this area in question is
inhabited, so it's not vacant. And it is visited by many species, some on the threatened list.
This is the largest green space left on the island of Montreal, along with the greatest
biodiversity. There are turtles, and there are salamanders, and birds, deer, they all depend on
this green space. If it is developed, some of them will move to the protected area, but some of
them will leave the region all together. And in that case, they may find another region to live in
440 or they may just perish. It's very difficult to understand how this is not in direct contravention of
the stated aims of the say, of biodiversity and also the international commitments that Montreal
has undertaken.

445 If we look at air pollution next. Air pollution in the modern world – that has been
mentioned as being mainly caused by human activity and the main sources are transportation,
industry and heating. Air pollution has many components. There are greenhouse gases which
have climate change effects. There are harmful gases, such as sulfur dioxide. Some of the
gases are normal and natural, like ozone, except there are at a much higher quantity than is
naturally seen. And their concentration will actually lead to harm.

450 Then, there are the particulates. Particulates less than 10 microns and especially 2.5
microns pose a serious risk to health. They enter through your lungs, some of them stay in
your lungs the rest of them go into the rest of your body, where they stay. They are very
difficult to clean out. They are trapped there and can cause serious, serious illness.

455 Unfortunately, while you can change your air furnace filter, you can't change your lung filter. You are doomed to live with that the rest of your life. This is not conjecture, but is proven fact, as is shown on the slide over here, and this slide is from the *Agence de la santé et des services sociaux de Montréal* – so this is not conjecture. And recently, the Agence estimated that there are more than 1500 deaths a year in Montreal due to air pollution.

460
465
470 Now, think about this number: 1500 people. That is five airplanes crashing in Dorval, every year. What effect would that have on the population and the politicians if that would happen? But because this is from air pollution and its distributed through Montreal and it's immediately not seen as due and coupled to air pollution, nothing seems to happen. But this is a health crisis, and I do not understand how politicians can let this go on. This death toll is sure to rise with the increased pollution sources of urban sprawl development and, as urban sprawl goes on, you actually – you're decreasing the area of green spaces that can mitigate this pollution. So you are really unbalancing the system. So this is a health crisis and this number does not even include the many more than tens of thousands of people who are sickened but not killed yet and out rated.

475
480 The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that outdoor air pollution causes 3 million premature deaths worldwide per year. And this is mainly due to exposure of small particulate matter of 10 microns or less in diameter. It's very important to know that there is no safe threshold of particulate matter. Every little particulate in the air is bad for you, it's just a question of statistics and luck if it's going to make you sick. Obviously, the more there is, the better the chance is that you're going to get sick. But there is no safe threshold. And other pollutants, such as ozone, nitrogen and sulfur dioxides also cause lots of sickness.

485
480 Now, here there is a graph that is compiled by a company called PlumeAir. And this is a year's worth of data, and as you can see, on February 21st, there was a level of 58. This corresponds to the World Health Organization's limits of 20 and 50. And the 50 is the line on the top, and on February 21st, we went over that level. But that's not bad for once in a year. So that's pretty acceptable.

However if you look at this graph, there's two other very bad elements in there. There is a line along the bottom – that are midway – where the light blue and the dark blue meet, and that is the long-term risk exposure level. So, if you are above that second line from the top, then you are above the level for chronic exposure. And if you look at this graph, this is chronic exposure.
490 Most of the time, we are above that level. So we are exceeding the World Health Organization's limits for chronic exposure to air pollutants.

Another element that comes out of this graph, if you notice, there is a slight uphill slant to this graph. So when you start off on the left, you are tending to be below the first line, and as
495 you go towards the right, most of it is above the line, which means over the year, this is increasing. And I would bet as we take it on into the future, this amount of air pollution just increases constantly. So, we have a health crisis here that has grown. And what is the strategy of dealing with this. Well, nature has a strategy and it's called trees. And trees and their environmental role is my next topic. And I would like to point out that, while I mention trees, it
500 includes other vegetation, shrubs, etc. to a lesser extent.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

Monsieur Schwalb, est-ce que vous allez nous laisser un petit peu de temps pour vous
505 poser des questions, vous avez un mémoire très, très bien documenté, puis qui a soulevé beaucoup de questions.

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

O.K. Je vais regarder les prochains graphs... O.K. here we have a graph of the
510 pollutants in the air and the efficiency which trees remove these pollutants. And if you look on the bottom right hand, you will see that, for particulate matter, it's 61%, that trees will remove it. You remove the trees, and these particulates will stay in your air and in your lungs. We also hear that, by planting 375,000 trees, Montreal is going to eliminate the problem of cutting trees.
515 So this avoids any problems. But this is not quite true because if you look at this graph, you'll

see that a small tree is not very efficient at removing the pollutants. So, it will take 25 to 50 years for a tree to get to that point.

520 O.K. I won't go into sustainable development which you can read my brief. It's obviously not sustainable development. And I have a couple of nice pictures to show you, none sustainable development: one is Youngstown, Ohio and the other one is Baltimore, Maryland. And if you take a look at the Baltimore picture at the bottom, you will see a tree growing out of a window. That's a new definition of an urban forest. So, this is not sustainable development.

525 And also, there is a commitment by Montreal to join the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), which is for sustainable development. As I've shown in by brief in previous page, this is not sustainable development.

530 If we look at transport, this project seems to be built that the REM is going to be there. The REM is controversial. It may not happen and may not happen in the way it's supposed to happen. Or it may not happen in time. If it happens, this is what I calculated to take a person to travel from Cap Nature to downtown and basically, it's an hour and a half one way, or two hours off peak. So you have a commute time of three to four hours, which is not acceptable. This is urban sprawl. This is going to lead to massive traffic jams, lots of automobile traffic. But
535 we have a solution, we have the North South road, the boulevard that we are going to put into place. And the wonderful thing about this boulevard is that it doesn't go anywhere. It goes to the westbound service road which is great way to get to Toronto but it's not a great way to get to downtown Montreal. So, this is not a solution. So we do not have a viable transportation plan. And if we do not have a viable transportation plan, we do not have a viable project.

540 Finally, we will get to alternatives, and brownfield versus green space development. And if you have a choice – which we do have here – of developing green space or brown space – let's say philosophically we will just in principle going to develop one of them, so the other one will stay as it is – which one of these would you prefer to have remaining as an asset
545 to your community? Is it this, or is it this? It's not much really of a decision. Really.

550 So, the conclusion, basically, is that this project is not consistent with the environmental and strategic interests of the public nor the City's stated objectives and commitments, and therefore it needs to be built somewhere else, if at all, with a more ecologically sensitive planning process.

555 And there is one more thing I just don't want to skip over, but we are always reminded by politicians and developers that there is a given right to develop and any encroachment of that right is grown for a law suit. However this is not quite correct. Jurisprudence would seem to say that a permit does not have to be issued if it is not deemed to be in the public interest. And this project is clearly not in the public interest. Thank you.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

560 Merci beaucoup, Monsieur.

M. JOSHUA WOLF, commissaire :

565 Je pense c'est madame Raphaël qui veut commencer.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

Oui, madame Raphaël va commencer.

570 **Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :**

Oui, une question technique : le tableau à la page 10 du temps de transport...

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

575 Oui...

Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :

580 ...de connaître la provenance, s'il vous plaît du tableau? Les calculs?

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

C'est moi. C'est moi-même.

585

Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :

C'est vous qui l'avez calculé?

590

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

Oui, oui, c'est moi qui al calculé. J'ai basé ça, j'ai les *assumptions*. Il y a une partie qui vient de CDPQInfra pour le temps de 35 minutes. Le transfert, la correspondance entre le métro et le RIM, ça vient de Radio-Canada qui l'a mesurée. Une promenade de sept minutes pour arriver à l'autobus, c'est normal. C'est la moyenne, puis il faut attendre l'autobus, pas dans une direction mais à l'autre direction quand vous arrivez chez vous, c'est difficile de planifier ça. Et la plupart du monde ne travaille pas proche de la Gare Centrale. Ok c'est éloigné. Alors il faut prendre une autre façon de transport.

595

Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :

Je comprends. À la page 11, votre suggestion c'est que le projet, 90% du projet, demeure un espace vert protégé.

600

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

Oui.

605

Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :

610

Est-ce que vous avez une vision de l'aménagement de ce projet-là?

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

615

Ce qui est sauvé? Conservé?

Mme NADJA RAPHAËL, commissaire :

620

Oui, ce qui serait conservé. Oui.

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

625

Euh, non. Ma première priorité est de conservation. On peut parler de la planification après. Mais je veux que ce soit conservé.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

630

Mais si vous aviez, prenons l'hypothèse que c'est conservé, quelle genre de planification verriez-vous de l'aménagement de ce territoire-là?

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

635

Je préfère un accès aux citoyens mais pas avec des grandes pistes et des gros projets d'aménagement. Ça doit rester 80% naturel avec des activités pour les gens, pour participer dans la nature, pour voir la nature. Mais il faut garder la biodiversité et il faut garder l'efficacité de traiter la pollution. Alors, je préfère un minimum d'interventions. Mais je veux donner les accès aux citoyens.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

640

Merci.

M. JOSHUA WOLFE, commissaire :

645

Thank you. In that same paragraph, you mentioned and other of the briefs that we'll be looking at tonight and another nights, talk about alternate building sites in central and eastern Pierrefonds-Roxboro, alternative development that could occur there. As a Pierrefonds-Roxboro resident, what is your opinion in terms of how... the reaction of people who live in those districts now, how would they feel about this additional construction in their neighbourhoods?

650

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

655

Nobody likes construction noise. But I think it's important that we don't stop all development. I think development is necessary. People need a place to live, but it should be transit-oriented development. It has to be well planned, and I think people have to accept there will be development, but it has to be very well planned.

M. JOSHUA WOLFE, commissaire :

660

Would this be at a density higher than what exists in those neighbourhoods now?

M. THOMAS SCHWALB :

665

It probably would be. But I would think that if it's anywhere near the AMT stations, you need transit-oriented development and that means dense infrastructure and dense buildings. However, it's very important, especially with that kind of development, that you have a lot of green space outside that people can access, because, as I said in my brief – which I didn't discuss now – but if you don't provide for this, people will flee the city.

670 And this is not the strategy that has been elucidated by the city. They want to keep people here
and they say this is why they want to develop. But you have to develop with green space, with
parks. If you look at major cities around the world, they all have a lot of parks. Montreal is one
of the poorest in North America for parks. This is not how you keep families in the city.

675 **M. JOSHUA WOLFE, commissaire :**

Thank you.

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

680

Alors, il me reste à vous remercier. J'inviterais maintenant monsieur Jonathan Théorêt.
Allez-y, Monsieur Théorêt.

M. JONATHAN THÉORÊT :

685

Merci beaucoup. Mon nom, c'est Jonathan Théorêt, je suis directeur du GRAME qui est
le Groupe de recherche appliquée en macroécologie. »Le GRAME, c'est une organisation
environnementale qui existe depuis 1989 et qui intervient entre autres sur les enjeux de
macroécologie, dont l'étalement urbain, l'écofiscalité...

690

LA PRÉSIDENTE :

Je m'excuse juste une petite seconde. Est-ce que vous entendez bien à l'arrière? Non?

695 **M. JONATHAN THÉORÊT :**

Donc je disais que le GRAME s'intéresse à de nombreux enjeux macroécologiques dont
les enjeux des outils fiscaux en gestion environnementale et l'écofiscalité. La question des GES,
des transports durables notamment et l'étalement urbain depuis 1989. Le GRAME participe