

ATTACHMENT 1

Checklist of Metrolinx' adherence to Markham's comments on Green Papers and White Papers in the DRTP

Markham's comments on the Green Papers are shown below:

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|---|---|
| Green Paper #1 – Towards Sustainable Transportation | | |
| 1. A section or paragraph is needed regarding the definition of the "Region", and jurisdictions comprised in the study area to create the Regional Transportation Plan. | √ | √ |
| 2. Climate change and vehicles emissions should be one of the most important problems that the RTP should address and the Green Paper should be strengthened to reflect such. | √ people, environment & economy are 3 bottom- line goals of the RTP | √ |
| 3. Metrolinx should analyze the current commuter travel time and distance trends and evaluate how much more the overall transportation system can allow before breaking down. | X | X However, key indicators including reduced travel time for the DRTP success are presented |
| 4. Travel to and from the GTHA and outlying areas have not been accounted for, for example travel to and from GTHA and Simcoe County, Waterloo Region etc. A significant portion of commuter travel includes trips to and from outlying areas and should be included. Most of the traffic information currently presented is only across Steeles Avenue. More clarification and data is required on the remaining interregional trips. Metrolinx should co-ordinate traffic data collection across other jurisdictional boundaries. | ? Indirectly addressed | ? Indirectly addressed through a Regional connection map |
| 5. Concern that transit is still not an affordable solution for residents and that more government financial support will be needed in the future. | ? Fare integration has been addressed | ? Fare integration has been addressed, but a true zone based fare system is yet undecided |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|---|---|
| 6. The need for a strong economy and corresponding transportation system improvements should also be strengthened. | √ people, environment & economy are 3 bottom-line goals of the RTP | √ |
| 7. The comparison of resident costs for both vehicle ownership and transit use should be made, with the objective of making transit more affordable than car ownership. | X | ? Comparison on cost estimates have been made to bring a perspective on funding the infrastructure; however, nothing has been discussed on the goal of making transit a more affordable option |

| Green Paper #2 – Mobility Hubs | | |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Seamless, integrated and coordinated transit system across municipal jurisdictions should be the key criteria for selection, integration and development of mobility hubs. | √ Metrolinx has committed to fare integration | √ |
| 2. Metrolinx should clarify the “Don Mills” and “Markville” mobility hubs, in terms of location and policy context. | X | X Not identified, however, Metrolinx may identify additional gateway hubs in consultation with municipalities and transit agencies |
| 3. The paper needs to be amended to address “secondary” Mobility Hubs in Markham, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Box Grove / Cornell ○ Mount Joy ○ Milliken – GO/Steeles ○ Steeles/CP Havelock ○ Future subway stations and Highway 407 Transitway stations ○ John Street / Richmond Hill GO Transit Hub. | X | See above |
| 4. There should be a provision for additional future secondary and tertiary Mobility Hubs at intensification areas to be identified through the Region of York and Markham Transportation Studies and Growth Management Strategy including the Intensification Study. | X | See above |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| Green Paper #3 – Active Transportation | | |
| 1. Seamless integration and co-ordination between municipalities and regions is a key requirement that should be included. | √ | √ |
| 2. Markham needs commitment for long term funding of integrated Active Transportation infrastructure as identified in Markham’s Transportation Strategic Plan (MTSP); and Cycling and Pathways Master Plans. | X | √ provincial funding commitment to be increased over time to at least \$20 million per year for municipalities |
| 3. Active transportation infrastructure should include requirements and proper investment for ancillary facilities, such as showers, bike storage etc. | X | √ |

| Green Paper #4 – Transportation Demand Management | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. We are supportive of most Bold Initiatives. However, further discussion is needed regarding the following initiatives: | Not addressed so far | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free transit passes for most employees and students | X | X |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolls on provincial highway and arterials, revenue used for transportation | X | √ to be reviewed in 2013 report |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance based vehicle registration and insurance | X | √ to be reviewed in 2013 report |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking reform: Most paid, zoning maximums, no surface lots near rapid transit, commercial tax, employee cash-out. | X | √ Suggested changes in or adjoining mobility hub master plans |
| 2. Commitment for long-term funding for TDM/TMA initiatives is required. | No commitment so far | √ |
| 3. Need to address and promote shuttle buses and vanpooling. | X | ? Indirectly addressed |
| 4. Provincial direction is needed for parking and related zoning matters. Municipalities should standardize certain policies/objectives related to parking and not compete against each other to get businesses. It is counterproductive if one municipality takes bold initiatives (e.g. limits or caps on parking) and starts losing prospective Institutional, Commercial, Industrial opportunities because parking regulations are looser in other municipalities. | ? No specific directions so far | √ Metrolinx role includes setting common standards |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|--|--|
| 5. Review transit tickets based on time and distance and not jurisdictions; address smart cards and fare integration. | √ Metrolinx has verbally committed but this needs to be in writing | X? The Draft RTP does not address fare integration to eliminate double fares. However, the RTP model is based on elimination of double fares for short cross border trips |
| 6. Seamless connection between local and regional transit is essential. | √ | √ |
| 7. Address bike share and auto share. | X | √ |
| 8. Greater emphasis should be on promotion of shuttle buses and local transit to transport passengers from their houses to higher order transit systems rather than use of vehicles | X | X |
| 9. Increase parking availability and requirements at hubs. | X White Paper 2 establishes need for reduced parking at mobility hubs | X On the contrary, the RTP aims a parking reduction strategy, including a scheduled transition from free surface parking to a limited supply of fairly priced, structured parking, and policies to set aside reserved parking spaces for carpool and car sharing vehicles at mobility hubs; |
| 10. Strengthen technology such as smart cards. | √ | √ |
| 11. What utilization of carbon taxes is being considered? | X | X |
| 12. Goal should be to make TDM and other transit initiatives more economical than vehicle use. | ? No direct mention | √ |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|--|---|
| Green Paper #5 – Moving Goods and Delivering Services | | |
| 1. Metrolinx needs to identify bottlenecks and missing corridors and identify a plan to address such. | ? only somewhat addressed | √ Metrolinx suggests development of a comprehensive goods movement strategy that will address this requirement |
| 2. High airport landing fees for cargo, rail options, and limited usability of St. Lawrence Seaway, should be addressed to promote non-truck goods delivery. Emission control being the priority, the provincial government should promote and provide incentives to utilize the railway and/or seaway corridors. Currently the railroads are under utilized for moving goods and services within the GTHA. | ?X Direction is towards truck based goods movement only | ?√ The comprehensive goods movements strategy will look into rail and sea shipping plus active transportation |
| 3. A universal solution is not recommended because in the case of Markham and other similar municipalities, there is not much demand for heavy trucks. On the other hand, Markham's needs for smaller trucks, vans and taxicabs serving the service sector should be considered. | X | ?√ Somewhat addressed through urban freight movements such as urban logistics centres, "packstations", centralized lock boxes for end consumer deliveries, and shared urban freight and delivery centres |
| 4. Co-ordination of the initiatives will be important in order to provide a seamless service for goods and services. HOV lanes going southbound on Highway 404 disappearing at the start of Don Valley Parkway is not an integrated and seamless solution. | X | ?√ Somewhat addressed through a commitment of more than 350 kms of HOV lanes on 400 series highways by 2031 including carpool and parking at strategic locations |
| 5. Assistance or subsidy for trucks on toll highways should be reviewed to encourage them to use these roads. | X | X |
| 6. Truck routes need to be identified and coordinated. | X Not identified | ?√ The pending goods movement strategy will address this |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|--|---|
| 7. Metrolinx should identify the weaknesses in linkages between suppliers and consumers and address them. | ? General comments on improving goods movement infrastructure, not specific | √ Identified at many levels plus a commitment of comprehensive goods movement strategy |
| 8. In addition to regional freight centres such as the Airport and intermodal freight stations there may be a need for smaller/ intermediate facilities in the GTHA. Metrolinx should address the efficiency of mega distribution centres versus smaller local centres. | X | √ |
| 9. In order to allow efficient utilization of the existing infrastructure, Metrolinx should look into opportunities for restricting trucks during the peak congestion periods. | √ | X |
| 10. There must be more support and incentives for locally produced goods and services to reduce long distance transport. | √ | √? Somewhat addressed |
| 11. Metrolinx should work with the private sector on just in time delivery. | X | √ |
| 12. How would Goods and Services delivery be provided to Pickering Airport? | X | √ |
| 13. Metrolinx should review European examples as to Goods and Services movements. | √ | √ |

| Green Paper #6 – Roads and Highways | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1. In this paper, Metrolinx should identify the shortfall in overall transportation capacity for people in the GTHA wide corridors and define potential improvements. Instead of roads, highways or transit only discrete undertakings, a prioritized list of candidate corridors should be prepared that require overall congestion management solutions. The congestion management solutions should favour sustainable alternatives, such as transit. | ? Somewhat mentioned throughout the White Paper, although test concepts only show transit | √ |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 2. Identify discontinuity in highway network and develop sustainable strategies to allow connectivity for all modes of travel including signalling improvements and optimizations, TDM, HOV, transit, road pricing, information and technology, new infrastructure, road networks etc. | X | ?√ The Benefits case analysis will look into all possible alternatives through the triple bottom-line approach of economic, environmental and social impacts |
| 3. The TDM, HOV, Transit and other sustainable initiative should have priority and be considered as more preferable alternatives over road widenings. | √ | See above |
| 4. Impact on regional arterials and town collector roads with tolling 400 series highways has to be evaluated, especially as it relates to transfer of traffic and infiltration into communities. | X | ? |
| 5. Metrolinx should act as a forum where municipal jurisdictional, co-ordination and other issues of interregional connectivity could be resolved (including Donald Cousens Parkway, Highway 404/ DVP and Steeles Avenue etc.). | X | X |
| 6. The RTP needs to address the future of the Don Valley Parkway and its shortfall of people capacity. Could the DVP be a potential higher order transit corridor? | √ Previously abandoned ROW | √ |
| 7. Promotion of smaller vehicles, and the development of size standards for the GTHA, should be considered. Provision of incentives to smaller and efficient vehicles (i.e. small trucks, smart cars and hybrids etc.) should be encouraged. | X | X |
| 8. Metrolinx should present a future plan for interregional highways and freeways. There is no mention of these initiatives. To this extent and beyond, there needs be a clarification of the role of Metrolinx versus the Ministry of Transportation. Before further extensions and widenings of highways, serious thought is needed for higher order transit along these highways and higher order transit in existing highway corridors and arterials. | X | √ |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| 9. Projects should only go forward if there is a co-ordination and common goal among the concerned municipalities. There are numerous examples where limited or no co-ordination has led to wastage of resources and infrastructure. | X | √ for transit, bike facilities aaa7 infrastructure X for roadways |
| 10. At key transit hubs, improved intermodal connectivity and parking facilities should be considered. | X | √ |

| Green Paper #7 – Transit | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Metrolinx should review its mandate with respect to the formation of an overall transit authority in the GTHA and integration of transit commissions across the Region and/or resolution of various issues among the transit commissions including integration, priorities, fare pricing, timings etc. | X | ? Metrolinx recommends the Province to give it the authority to integrate transit services across the region, including integration of fare systems, and ensuring compatibility of technologies |
| 2. Municipal and Regional input is vital for prioritization of links and transit technology (BRT and LRT). | X | √ |
| 3. We need to protect property (ROW) now for future transit services. | X | X |
| 4. Sustainable funding sources are required. | ? | √ |
| 5. Metrolinx should identify and protect a new transit corridor running East/ West between 16th Avenue and Elgin Mills Road. | √ | √ Major Mackenzie Dr |
| 6. The Highway 404 HOV lane should be extended from Highway 7 to Elgin Mills Road. | X | ? Somewhat addressed through a commitment of more than 350 kms of HOV lanes on 400 series highways by 2031 |
| 7. Metrolinx should re-evaluate the GO Transit proposal regarding service and stops (e.g. need for station at John Street and Bayview Avenue). | X | X |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|---|---|
| 8. Of the 52 projects identified in the MoveOntario 2020 initiative, it is not clear if the Highway 407 Transitway is included. The Highway 407 Transitway should be one of the higher priority projects to provide a much needed east-west inter-regional transit alternative to commuters, and should be accelerated. | √ MoveOntario 2020 and Metrolinx Test concepts includes this project | √ The Highway 407 Transitway project is proposed at 16-25 year plan |
| 9. There has to be coordination and cooperation between the Province, the Federal Government and municipalities on the new GO rail Havelock line. | ? No specific mention | √ All projects are subject to approval from all levels of government. This project falls in the first 15-year plan |
| 10. Priority projects should include a Steeles rapid transit route from Yonge Street to Havelock / Steeles transit hub. | ? Complete Steeles line is shown only in Web Concept | √ Steeles rapid transit project from York University to Taunton Road in Pickering is in the 16-25 year plan |
| 11. Metrolinx should eliminate barriers created at Steeles Avenue that are stopping many commuters from efficiently utilizing the transit across it. There is an immediate need for improved transit integration with City of Toronto. | √ | ? The “integration” of fares is committed. However, the strict zone based fare system is still undecided |
| 12. Yonge subway extension north is a top priority. Construction for the Yonge subway extension to Richmond Hill should be started immediately. | √ Included in BAU MO2020 and all test concepts | √ Included in the priority projects: 15 year plan |
| 13. Metrolinx should review the necessity of BRT from Finch to Highway 7, given that the subway extension has been announced. | √ | √ Not in the list of projects, however, funding has been secured through the Quick Wins Tranche 2, that will most likely go towards funding the subway |
| 14. Protect a North/ South transit route on Markham Road from at least Highway 407 south to connect to the extended SRT at Sheppard Avenue. | √ Included in linear and radial concepts | ?X Not on Markham Road; however, McCowan Road Rapid Transit has been included in the Metrolinx DRTP’s 16-25 year plan |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|---|---|
| 15. Complete the Sheppard subway to connect to Scarborough Town Centre. | √ Included in radial and web concepts | X Surface rapid transit will instead connect to Scarborough Town Centre, as per the 15-year plan |
| 16. Convert the Scarborough RT line to an extension of the Bloor-Danforth line to McCowan. | X | X There will be an upgraded rapid transit line to connect to STC and to Malvern Town Centre |
| 17. Provide for other transit routes as identified in the Region of York and Town's transportation studies. | X | X |
| 18. The Presto Fare Card should be overhauled to include fares based on time and distance. | ? Should be included according to the future direction | ? Not clear |
| 19. For efficient use of transit, billing by time and distance and not municipal jurisdictions needs to be considered. | √ | ? Not clear |
| 20. Transit is still not an affordable alternative. The goal should be to attract more people from cars to transit, and not be seen as just a break-even or often a more expensive alternative to cars. YRT, TTC and other transit should put a moratorium on fare hike, or even lower fares. The Province should provide fare subsidy to the transit authorities. | X | X |
| 21. Give competitive pricing and travel time advantage to transit users. | ? Indirect mention | ? Through both carrots to transit and sticks to personal vehicle approach |
| 22. The long distance bus transit (Greyhound) hub should be moved from downtown Toronto to a more accessible transit hub. | X | X |
| 23. There is a need for a higher order dedicated transit line that connects the Pearson Airport to various municipalities. | √ Mentioned in various test concepts | √ One of the 8 big moves |

| Green Paper Comments | Addressed in White Papers? | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| 24. Parking at various transit hubs, especially at suburban locations, is deficient. More local transit/shuttle buses are also required to avoid bigger parking lots. | X | √ the RTP aims a parking reduction strategy at mobility hubs |
| 25. Transit providers need to include university students and family travel on their discounted fare lists. It is easier to switch these groups to transit. Also review possibilities for other incentives and subsidies. | X | X The fare structure is still decided by individual transit providers |
| 26. The GO lines and bus routes should be integrated with other modes of transit. | √ | √ |
| 27. Higher order transit systems should precede intensification recommended in the places to grow and not the other way. | X | ? Metrolinx suggests Transportation planning and land use planning should go simultaneously |
| 28. A competitive “Buy Canadian” purchasing policy for transit infrastructure should be promoted. | X | X |
| 29. Metrolinx should be a forum to coordinate inter-municipal transit network. | X | ? |

Markham's comments on the White Papers are shown below:

| White Paper 1 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|--|
| 1. The many goals, objectives and indicators create high expectations | √ Number of objectives have been reduced from 40 to 13 |
| 2. Not all indicators are measurable or realistic | X |
| 3. Need to identify and prioritize key indicators | X |
| 4. Who will measure the indicators | X |
| 5. How to ensure consistent measurement | X |
| 6. Time frames for measuring indicators need to be established | X |
| 7. Link between transportation and land use needs to be a major goal | √ Metrolinx has identified one of its major roles will be to influence Municipal land use planning |
| 8. Coordination and prioritization of goals, objectives and indicators with other provincial policies and initiatives (i.e. Growth Plan) are needed | ? √ Metrolinx is recommending a legislative framework that will align the RTP with other provincial initiatives, plus conformity of the RTP with municipal OP's |

| White Paper 2 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|---|
| 9. Very long list – dilutes effort; need focus, priority setting, organization framework and timeline on implementation | √ 100 recommended actions |
| 10. Virtually exclusive focus on transit improvements is not consistent with mandated requirement (Bill 104) to develop an integrated, multi-modal transportation network conforming to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe | ? √ While the major focus and funding remains to wards, the 8 big moves also include strategies for goods movement, TDM, mobility hubs, walking and cycling etc. |
| 11. A 5-year priority implementation plan is needed on top of a long term vision | √ DRTP recommends development of a rolling 15, 10 and 5-year rolling capital plan for implementation for individual projects |
| 12. The White Paper goals and objectives are very general in nature, and will need a massive effort to make them policy specific | √ The goals and objectives lead to 15 strategic directions that are more policy specific |

| White Paper 2 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|---|
| 13. Fare integration needs fuller discussion among the various transit authorities | X The Draft RTP does not address fare integration to incorporate zone based fares or eliminate double fares for short cross border trips |
| 14. A stronger technology & ITS role will be needed | √ The Draft RTP recommends creating an ITS strategy for the GTHA |
| 15. More emphasis on importance of goods movement needed | √ |
| 16. Minor mobility hubs have not been shown in the white papers and should be identified | X |
| 17. Corridors are equally important to mobility hubs | √ Higher densities along the higher order transit corridors have been identified in the modelling methodology backgrounder |
| 18. Needs to be some sense of financial viability for each network | √ Metrolinx will conduct benefits case analysis for each project with the triple bottom-line evaluation of environmental, economic and social concerns |
| 19. Operating costs should be addressed (who pays?) | X |
| 20. Metrolinx is influencing the Regional Growth Strategy, and land use coordination at mobility hubs. Metrolinx should present more rigorous and universal land use guidelines | ? √ Land use and master planning guidelines have been presented, for mobility hubs in particular |
| 21. P. 30 – Urban development agency – What is it? | X |
| 22. Total passenger experience needs to be considered and included in design of transportation network | √ Passenger comfort and convenience is one of the 13 objectives and has been modelled with respect to timing, zone based fares etc. |
| 23. Need expedited corridor protection for highways and rapid transit lines | X |
| 24. A strong sustainability direction is required related to growth, transportation, environment, economy & funding | √ Benefits case analysis will be conducted for each project |
| 25. Municipal funding sources (e.g. development charges) needs more clarity | X |

| White Paper 2 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|---|
| 26. Timing, prioritization, coordination, continuity and funding are key criteria | ? |
| 27. Metrolinx should provide the necessary base for the various levels of government for a coordinated land use / transportation / financing strategy | ? Being somewhat addressed through Metrolinx land use planning and financing strategy |
| 28. Clarify socially disadvantaged areas (Page 16) | X |
| 29. The Paper should encourage the shift in the mindset of transit authorities from cost recovery to a socially and environmentally responsible agency | X |
| 30. The Business As Usual (BAU) case should include the MoveOntario 2020 projects. As we understand, Metrolinx has confirmed that the BAU case does include the MoveOntario 2020 projects | X The DRTP shows modifications from the MO2020 projects |
| 31. The White Paper should be amended to include Anchor/Gateway/Destination/Higher order stations at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Box Grove / Cornell; Mount Joy; Milliken – GO/Steeles; Steeles/CP Havelock; Future subway stations and Highway 407 Transitway stations; John Street / Richmond Hill GO Transit Hub | X |
| 32. The Paper should have associated the costs associated with gridlock, loss of businesses, healthcare, energy, environment etc. so as to provide a better comparison among the test concepts and the status quo | ? Somewhat addressed through presenting dollar value of status quo related congestion, emissions, but no value associated for healthcare costs |
| 33. The East/ West rapid transit corridor on Major Mackenzie should be extended to Highway 48/Markham Road and then extend southwards to join to the Scarborough RT | ? Include in the 25+ year plan. No corridors of connection to Hwy 7 and beyond has been shown |
| 34. If Major Mackenzie is slated to become a rapid transit corridor, then the widening of Major Mackenzie should be carried out simultaneously with the LRT/BRT implementation | X |
| 35. Appropriate rapid transit technology (BRT/LRT) should be consistent along continuous corridors across municipal boundaries. (For example the Don Mills LRT rapid transit should be extended into Markham) | √ |

| White Paper 2 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|---|--|
| 36. The Highway 404 HOV lane should be extended from Highway 7 to 19th Avenue | ? Not clear; however, MTO plans a network of more than 350 km of HOV lanes in place by 2031, on 400-series highways in the GTHA |
| 37. The test concepts are not very clearly presented or differentiated, and can be easily misunderstood | √ |
| 38. Meeting with Metrolinx required to clarify scenarios and assumptions | On-going |
| 39. More clarifications required on commuter rail service linkages outside the GTHA as mentioned in the Test Concepts A, B and C | √ A regional connection to other parts of Ontario and beyond has been presented |
| 40. More clarifications required on shared HOV lanes with Express Bus and/or BRT/LRT | X |
| 41. Feasibility Analysis of the plans and concepts should be completed based on sustainable growth management, transportation, environment, economy and financial aspects | √ Metrolinx Benefits Case Analysis |
| 42. Metrolinx is requested to confirm growth assumptions for the white belt lands, as well as services for possible additional development in the white belt | X |
| 43. Services for white belt areas are under-represented. The plan should be in conformity with the Growth Plan and therefore address both intensification and white belt development. If the white belt development is approved, the high order transit should be denoted and precede the development and occupancy of the white belt. There should be initiatives/incentives for residents to use transit before they need to use their car on the future white belt areas | ? Somewhat addressed through the planned BRT implementation on Major Mackenzie Dr. However, the timing of implementation needs to be in coordination with Metrolinx land use and transportation planning initiative |
| 44. Town requests travel demand forecasts for Markham, on which the modelling is based | ? Somewhat addressed through presentation of population and employment projections at Anchor hubs and rapid transit corridors. However, a formal request for full info will be made |
| 45. Population /Employment forecasts may not be current and should be updated | ? |

| White Paper 2 Comments | Addressed in DRTP? |
|--|---|
| 46. Goods movement need to be tested as part of network analysis | <p style="text-align: center;">?√</p> <p>The DRTP recommends a developing a comprehensive goods movement strategy for GTHA that will test networks and gaps</p> |
| 47. Transit service levels (headways) mentioned on Page 30 may be too aggressive and impractical | <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p>This has been addressed in the modelling methodology backgrounder</p> |
| 48. Operating speed (p.30 of the hardcopy version) assumptions are too high | <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> <p>This has been addressed in the modelling methodology backgrounder</p> |
| 49. No data has been presented for average time of travel changes | <p style="text-align: center;">√</p> |
| 50. There should be a potential carbon tax factored into the cost of driving a Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV). | <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> |
| 51. There should also be a triple bottom line analysis of auto vs. transit vs. active transportation. What are the social, environmental and economic impacts of each model? | <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>However, the benefits case analysis recommended in the DRTP for each project should analyze the impacts</p> |

Legend:

- √ Clear mention in the Papers or DRTP addressing our concerns
- ? Somewhat indirectly mentioned with unclear directions
- X No mention in the Papers or DRTP. Need additional meetings with Metrolinx to understand their position on the issue

Q:\Development\Engineering\TRANSPLAN\Metrolinx\White Papers\ATTACHMENT 2-Metrolinx White Paper comments.doc