

BRIEF TO THE BAPE CONCERNING THE TURCOT INTERCHANGE PROJECT

SUBMITTED 19JUNE09

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction: The two problems and having a proper park

Effects and Costs: The negative effect of the proposal on a properly contiguous park.

Alternative Solution: Using the old infrastructure for the new highway while minimizing disruption and creating green space.

Conclusions: Using another plan creates better solutions for all parties.

BRIEF:

Introduction: My name is Ron Goes and I claim no special expertise in this matter. I have been and continue to be in the aviation side of transportation, past member of Transport 2000, rail enthusiast but I appear as a person.

My motivation for appearing is to explain two of my concerns for parts of the project and how it can be improved. One, is the separation of the escarpment from the projected park below by the new 'parkway' and two concerns calls to convert the new section of Autoroute 20 into urban boulevard.

Effects and Costs: It is quite obvious that the new A-20 realignment will separate the projected park in two because it's at the foot of the escarpment. It is quite obvious that the plan will cause the movement of the CN main line at a cost of much disruption to the National transportation system across the whole country including Halifax, Chicago and Vancouver. Putting the A-20 at the foot of the escarpment will create gradient problems from A-15S and the Girouard entrance from lower NDG to the westbound highway.

There is also a push from outside to turn the new section into urban boulevard. I urge you to resist all calls for this for many reasons. For one, safety; whatever the alignment, mixing vehicles and pedestrians in this context is a lethal mix. There is also the question of turn-offs and possible t-boning collisions that can be fatal. We should also have A-20 as an uninterrupted freeway from the Ontario border to the New Brunswick border. Critics, such as the doctors, acknowledge the north-south aspect of this node. The east-west aspect is just as important. If you allow it to happen surely congestion will result. There is also the requirement of grade separation over the rail main line and

transit way. Certainly overpasses will be required. So they may as well do double duty passing over the freeway and rail line at the same time; as you will see in my solution in the next section.

Alternative Solution: Maintain the current A-20 alignment along the current eastbound lane. The construction staging would be as follows:

- build new westbound lanes just north of the current eastbound lanes.
- build the permanent connections to those lanes.
- temporarily connect the eastbound traffic to the now redundant old westbound lanes
- rebuild the old eastbound lanes and reconnect them permanently to the interchange.
- stay within the existing footprint.
- rehabilitate the Angrignon overpass.
- build a new overpass in the east section of this segment.
- The old westbound lanes become ROW (right of way) for whatever transit you might place there.

As an aside, it is not clear where the construction will stop in the lowering of A-15, A-20 south of the interchange.

Conclusions: A rebuild is necessary but can be accomplished using the existing infrastructure without disturbing the CN ROW. Maintenance of A-20 as freeway quality highway is essential to the national character and safety of that transportation node. The solution that I propose conserves the contiguity of the escarpment with the proposed green space below and does not interfere with CN operations. It also increases the safety of the project and minimizes the effects on nearby residents.

Ron Goes
As a person