

DEVELOPMENT OF A REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR THE
GREATER TORONTO and HAMILTON AREA

TOWARDS
SUSTAINABLE
TRANSPORTATION



TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION

THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Stakeholder
White Paper Workshop Summary

May 26 – June 12, 2008

Table of Contents

1. Context	3
2. Commentary	4
2.1 Vision	4
2.2 Goals and Objectives	5
2.3 Indicators	6
2.4 Preliminary Directions	8
New Ideas	
Priority Directions	
2.5 Test Concepts	10
Priority Linkages	
Other Considerations	
Appendix A – Stakeholder Workshop Questions	14
Appendix B – Dotmocracy Results	15

This report summarizes the feedback received via the six stakeholder workshops convened by Metrolinx in late May and early June to discuss *White Paper 1: Vision, Goals and Objectives* and *White Paper 2: Preliminary Directions and Concepts*.

1. Context

On April 25, the Board of Metrolinx approved two White Papers prepared by Metrolinx staff as part of the process to draft a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Thereafter, Metrolinx convened six workshops—one each in Oshawa, Hamilton, Burlington, Toronto, Mississauga and Markham—to introduce the White Papers to stakeholders and elicit their responses to them. The stakeholder workshops are part of a broader consultative effort including an announcement on the Environmental Bill of Rights registry, the Metrolinx web portal for comments, and outreach to and meetings with municipalities.

Over 200 participants attended the stakeholder workshops from a diverse range of backgrounds, including municipalities, provincial ministries, industry and citizen groups, environmental groups, business improvement areas, non-governmental organizations, chambers of commerce and others.

At the workshops, Metrolinx staff provided an overview of the White Papers in three presentations:

- First discussing the proposed vision, goals and objectives introduced in White Paper 1;
- Next discussing the preliminary policy and program directions introduced in White Paper 2; and
- Finally discussing the test network concepts introduced in White Paper 2.

At the end of each presentation, workshop participants were asked specific questions pertaining to the material that had just been introduced and Metrolinx staff facilitated and documented the ensuing small group discussions. The questions asked of workshop participants are attached as Appendix A.

Workshop participants were also invited to participate in a “dotmocracy exercise,” wherein “votes” could be cast for or against the preliminary policy and program ideas introduced in the White Papers. A total of 2,065 votes were cast. More details about the dotmocracy exercise are included in Section 2.4 and Appendix B, below.

Finally, workshop participants were also encouraged to submit comments via the workbook each was given upon registering.

This report summarizes the content of all three sources of stakeholder input: small-group discussions; the dotmocracy exercise; and workbook submissions. This input will be considered by Metrolinx as part of the process of drafting the RTP.

2. Commentary

Stakeholder response to the White Papers was generally very positive. Having reviewed the feedback received from the workshop participants, several recurring general themes are clear. These are dealt with first before considering other, more specific comments in greater detail in Sections 2.1 through 2.5.

Be Bold

Above all, the stakeholders urged Metrolinx to be bold in its plans. In keeping with this sentiment, large numbers of them expressed a preference for Test Concept C, the most ambitious of the transportation networks modeled for White Paper 2. Stakeholders also expressed appreciation for Metrolinx's initial forays into the realm beyond traditional "predict-and-provide" transportation planning through the consideration of the impacts of transportation decisions on human health, the natural environment and the economy.

Link Land Use and Transportation Planning

In recognition of the fact that the transportation choices individuals make are very closely related to land use decisions that governments make, particular support was expressed for the integration of land use and transportation planning. There was widespread agreement among the stakeholders about the need for mixed land uses and higher densities as key strategies to reduce trip lengths, for example.

Focus on Sustainable Modes of Transportation

Stakeholders expressed strong support for the multi-modal focus of the White Papers and the goal implicit in the proposed transportation hierarchy a shift *toward* more-sustainable transportation modes, such as walking, bicycling and transit, and *away from* less-sustainable modes, such as single occupancy motor vehicles (SOVs). In fact, majority sentiment appeared to be that the goal of modal shift should be made more explicit in the draft RTP.

Environment, Quality of Life and Fiscal Responsibility

Support was also strong for the White Papers' focus on quality of life issues, including those related to improved customer service and reduced trip times; its focus on environmental goals, such as the reduction of greenhouse gas emission and the preservation of agricultural and natural areas; and its focus on fiscal responsibility.

2.1 Vision

White Paper 1 proposed the vision that will guide Metrolinx's efforts in preparing the RTP. Workshop participants were asked to what degree the vision reflected their aspirations for the GTHA's transportation system and what revisions or refinements they would suggest.

The majority of those who expressed an opinion said they liked the vision, but some suggested that it was too broad or vague. A few suggested that the vision needed punch, that it wasn't visionary enough; for example, at one table it was suggested that the vision should be for a transportation system that is "best in class."

There was some debate among the stakeholders about whether the three pillars of the vision—a high quality of life; a thriving, healthy and protected environment; and a strong, prosperous and competitive economy—should be weighted equally or have varying levels of priority. This issue is examined in greater detail in Section 2.2, below.

There was strong support among workshop participants for the multi-modal nature of the vision, with several suggesting that the integration of the different transportation modes and service providers actually needed to be underlined.

Participants at every workshop expressed support for the vision's focus on complete communities. Several even suggested that the link between transportation and land use needed to be made more explicit.

Many comments were received about the term "diverse needs" in the vision. Several observers interpreted this as a reference to the special needs of persons with disabilities and asked that the vision be more explicit about serving this group. Others noted that lack of affordability could be a barrier to access, as well, and asked that the phrase "diverse needs" be clarified and expanded on.

Workshop participants expressed support for the inclusion of an explicit mention of goods movement in the vision. The perceived lack of attention paid to goods movement in the White Papers came up repeatedly in the various sessions of each workshop and will be explored in greater detail below.

Finally, workshop participants expressed support for the idea of improving transit until it is competitive with automobiles. A few noted that the goal of a mode shift was implicit in the vision and suggested that it be made explicit instead.

2.2 Goals and Objectives

In White Paper 1, 19 goals and 41 objectives were presented as possible options for the RTP, grouped under three pillars:

- A high quality of life;
- A thriving, healthy and protected environment; and
- A strong, prosperous and competitive economy.

With this in mind, workshop participants were asked for their best advice about what the RTP should focus on.

Environment

Though the White Papers' environmental goals and objectives were most often cited as the number one priority among workshop participants, they were less discussed than the goals and objectives related to quality of life and the economy.

There was clear support for Goal J, however, regarding the reduction of land consumption for urban development. Some observers suggested that the efficiency benefits of more compact, more complete communities should be emphasized.

Support for Objective 17, regarding the reduction of GHGs, was also clear and raised at almost every workshop. Among the refinements suggested by workshop participants was an emissions cap and trade system for transportation providers in the GTHA.

Quality of Life

The goals and objectives related to quality of life in White Paper 1 were discussed at great length at the workshops.

Strongest support was expressed for a more comfortable and convenient transportation system. The focus of the comments in this regard was primarily transit with many stakeholders expressing a desire for faster, more frequent and less crowded service. A few also suggested that trip-planning and real-time information would increase the convenience of this mode.

Stakeholders at every workshop expressed support for an increase in the range of transportation choices available in the GTHA—not only for passenger travel, but for goods movement, as well. While a shift from SOVs to other modes is implicit in the goal, several workshop participants suggested that it should be made explicit as a separate goal.

The goal of improved travel time reliability also received significant support, with one stakeholder adding that "reliably slow" would not be acceptable.

Economy

Though few stakeholders flagged the White Paper's economic goals and objectives as the number one priority, they still occasioned heavy discussion at the workshops.

Several stakeholders asked that goals and objectives with focus on goods movement be added to the RTP. Support for this idea was most pronounced among those at the Durham, Peel and York workshops.

Goal Q (Efficiency and Fiscal Responsibility) and the closely related Objective 32, "Better reflect the costs of transportation services in the prices paid by users," were at the center of some of the most wide-ranging discussion. Several stakeholders pointed out that because transit benefits society—reducing GHGs, for example—it should be *less* reliant on recouping costs directly from users than it is currently.

Finally, many stakeholders, particularly at the Halton, Peel and York workshops, recommended that the integration of land use and transportation planning be made one of the RTP's goals.

2.3 Indicators

One-hundred-and-twenty (120) potential indicators were introduced in White Paper 1, grouped under the three aforementioned pillars. With the indicators in mind, workshop participants were asked how they would judge whether the RTP was successful and what would be tangible signs of progress.

Some of the discussion referenced specific performance indicators, but much of it was more general in nature. The over-arching comment received was that there were too

many indicators and prioritization between them was needed. To that end, several workshop participants questioned using indicators with indirect links to transportation—particularly those related to air quality and/or health, both of which are influenced by many other factors in addition to transportation choices and impacts.

On the other hand, there was unanimity among workshop participants that the mode split would be a key indicator of RTP success: specifically a shift from SOVs to walking, biking and transit. A number of commentators expanded on this idea, suggesting that the mode split be tracked on different days, at different times and for different trip purposes; further, that all segments of a trip should be tracked to avoid under-representing walking, which is a part of almost every trip. A few also suggested that the mode split for goods movement should be tracked to identify if there is a shift from less- to more-sustainable modes.

Decreasing trip time was also flagged as an indicator of success at every workshop. The general tenor of the discussion was that trip times on transit should be improved until they are similar to trips times by automobile for comparable trips. There was some support for a commute time threshold of 30 to 45 minutes as an indicator: i.e. per cent of households within 30 to 45 minutes of place of work.

Decreasing trip length was also seen as an important sign of success. A specific indicator of this, vehicle-kilometres travelled per capita, was suggested by some workshop participants.

The per cent of residents working within their region of residence, which is closely related to both trip time and length, was also raised as a potential performance indicator, particularly in Hamilton and Durham.

There was broad support for an indicator related to energy use and emission of GHGs, but also considerable debate. Given the RTP's scope, workshop participants suggested that any such indicator only measure energy use and emission of GHGs related to transportation. Since there is a direct relationship between the quantities of energy used and GHGs emitted, indicators such as litres/KWH/m³ of energy consumed per passenger kilometre (or per capita) were offered as options.

Several workshop participants suggested that the existence and convenience of alternatives to SOVs would be a tangible sign of progress, but were not generally specific about how this should be measured. While some commentators suggested "distance to transit" as an indicator, because the quality of transit varies others countered that a better indicator might be "distance to higher-order transit."

Support for "vehicle occupancy rate" as an indicator was solid and fairly evenly distributed geographically.

As eluded to above, there was much debate about the appropriateness of using indicators related to air quality and human health given that transportation is not the only contributing factor to either problem and that the other variables are beyond the RTP's scope. Notwithstanding this, there was a fair amount of support for an air quality/human health indicator— number of smog days per year, perhaps, or hospital admissions due to asthma.

There was also a fair amount of support for an indicator related to customer satisfaction. Surveys of residents and visitors alike about their experience with all modes of transportation in the GTHA were suggested to gauge public perceptions of comfort, cleanliness, ease of use and other factors.

Finally, while economic indicators were less-commonly-cited, cost of transportation—per passenger-km or tonne-km, or as a per cent of household costs—was suggested, as an important indicator. Regarding congestion and travel time reliability, however, there was debate about desired end state. Some commentators took the position that holding congestion steady would be an effective way to encourage a modal shift away from SOVs. Others argued that reducing congestion would improve the reliability of goods movement.

2.4 Preliminary Directions

White Paper 2 introduced 45 policies, programs, legislative changes and other initiatives for potential inclusion in the RTP. These preliminary directions were organized into six thematic groups:

- A System for Complete Mobility;
- Placemaking and Mobility Hubs;
- Excellent Customer Service;
- Sustainable Financing;
- Innovation through Research; and
- Partnerships and Decision-Making.

New Ideas

Workshop participants were asked whether any important potential directions had been missed in White Paper 2.

At several tables in every workshop, discussion focused on the need for sustained funding from senior levels of government for both capital and operating costs related to transportation.

The idea of amalgamating the GTHA's nine transit systems was raised as a potential direction by a few commentators, but opinion on the issue was split, with some expressing concern that the loss of local control might worsen local service.

A number of participants suggested that a direction reducing highway speeds would actually increase highway capacity because at lower speeds safe following distances can be shorter. This, it was noted, would lead to the more efficient use of existing highway infrastructure and may reduce emissions, as well.

A few participants commented on a perceived lack of directions related to the environment, but few clear options were suggested.

For the most part, responses to this question served more to elaborate the existing directions rather than present new ones. Regarding Direction 2.4-1, about true cost pricing of transportation, for example, a number of commentators suggested the adoption of a fare-by-distance or fare-by-zone arrangement, similar to the one used by GO Transit, for all GTHA transit systems.

Priority Directions

Workshop participants were asked which, of all the directions presented in White Paper 2, or identified during small group discussion earlier in the day, were most important. As noted above, they were also invited to participate in a dotmocracy exercise and “vote” for or against the preliminary policy and program ideas introduced in the White Papers. To this end, each was given ten green dots and five red dots upon registering for this purpose. A total of 1,650 green (yes) and 415 red (no) votes were cast.¹ A summary of the results of the voting is attached as Appendix B.

The most-discussed potential direction was one that was not explicitly in White Paper 2, but that was identified during small group discussions as a priority: i.e., the need for sustained funding from senior levels of government for both capital and operating costs.

The transportation hierarchy suggested to guide decision-making in Direction 2.1-1, with its emphasis on transportation demand management and active transportation, was well-supported and occasioned lively discussion. Some suggested that goods movement should be incorporated into the hierarchy, for example, or have a hierarchy of its own.

Very strong support was expressed for Direction 2.2-1 from White Paper 2: “Build complete communities that are pedestrian, cycling and transit-supportive.” Several workshop participants offered strategies to help achieve complete communities—among them addressing the risks and costs associated with brownfield redevelopment and directing public institutions to locate near higher-order transit. Direction 2.2-7, “Direct growth away from natural areas and agricultural land,” was also widely-supported.

Further to this end, some workshop participants suggested making transit service available in new developments as soon as they are occupied, so that residents/tenants do not feel the need to buy a second or third car. This argument was countered by other workshop participants who argued that transit investments should be made conditional on the achievement of density or other goals first.

Another widely-supported preliminary direction was Direction 2.6-1, “Coordinate transportation planning and delivery across governments, sectors and stakeholders,” for which support was fairly evenly distributed, geographically. Majority sentiment seemed to be that the RTP should have the status necessary to achieve its goals.

Direction 2.3-2, “Provide a seamless transit/transportation experience,” garnered a similar level of support. The most commonly cited strategy suggested for achieving the goal of a seamless transit/transportation experience was to increase the ease of fare payment through the implementation of a region-wide fare card for use on all GTHA transit systems. Other commentators suggested an end to closed-door policies which prevent vehicles from one transit system from picking up customers in another transit system’s service area.

Support for Direction 2.2-3, “Identify and incorporate mobility hubs into planning policy documents including Official Plans and Transportation Master Plans,” was strong in all regions.

¹ The total includes 12 green/yes votes and 8 red/no votes cast for “write-in” directions. These are not reflected in the table in Appendix B.

Support for Direction 2.4-1, “Better reflect the true cost of using the road system as a way of promoting more responsible transportation choices,” was also quite strong and did not vary greatly between more and less automobile-dependent regions..

Still, while more green dots were placed next to Direction 2.4-1 than any of the other financial directions, Direction 2.4-5, “Ensure that new development pays its fair share of costs for all modes of transportation,” was actually more discussed. Stakeholders suggested the Development Charges Act be amended to allow levies supporting:

- GO Transit as well as local transit systems;
- active transportation infrastructure, such as sidewalks and bike lanes; and
- improvement of these networks, not just their extension at existing levels to new areas.

There was also substantial support for Direction 2.1-3, “Promote active transportation,” particularly in Toronto. Further on the subject, a number of participants noted that 400-series highways are a barrier to walking and cycling and that pedestrian and bicycle crossings should be constructed over, under or around them.

Support for Direction 2.1-4, “Build a comprehensive regional transit network that provides new services and enhances existing services,” was solid, as well, with commentators urging all-day, two-way service in more corridors. Some participants, particularly among those at the Halton, Peel and York workshops, voiced the opinion that the road network merited more attention.

Directions 2.1-9, about the improvement of incident clearing procedures, and 2.6-2, about expanding the role of municipal transportation advisory committees, were two of the few directions that received fairly consistent negative responses. With regard to the former, several participants noted that the traffic delays created by incidents acted as an incentive for people to switch from SOVs to transit or other modes. With regard to the latter, participants expressed concern that advisory committees could potentially delay the implementation of much-needed transit improvements if they became more of a venue for “NIMBY” opposition.

Finally, Direction 2.4-3, “Eliminate free and subsidized parking,” was easily the most contentious of all directions discussed. Several stakeholders suggested a compromise position: not to *eliminate* free and subsidized parking, but to *manage* it. At the regional level, this would involve ensuring that charges do not discourage people from parking their cars and getting onto regional transit. At the local level, this would involve charging for parking only once local transit service is a viable alternative to driving. Particularly in relation to this item, but as an undercurrent of much of the discussion, stakeholders expressed the opinion that the RTP should have varied priorities appropriate for varied local contexts.

2.5 Test Concepts

Three hypothetical future transportation networks or “test concepts” were introduced in White Paper 2 along with the results of a modelling exercise based on each. Workshop participants were asked for their comments on the test concepts. In particular, they were

asked to identify the region's most important nodes and corridors and whether any had been missed in White Paper 2.

Priority Linkages

Support for a regional transit network, in general, was very strong and many ideas were tabled regarding what the key linkages should be.

The destination most discussed by workshop participants, by far, was Pearson Airport and its surrounding employment lands. Support for improved linkages to this area was universal and fairly evenly distributed geographically. Links were suggested from several origins, most notably Union Station and Etobicoke City Centre.

In Hamilton, the strongest support was expressed for higher-order transit service in the downtown core, with support also strong for transit connections to Hamilton International Airport, Toronto and the rest of the GTA.

In Halton, the strongest support was expressed for east-west rapid transit service on Dundas Street and faster, more frequent connections to downtown Toronto. Support was also expressed for a north-south rapid transit line on Trafalgar from Oakville to Milton and beyond. There was debate about the feasibility of providing rapid transit service on Trafalgar south of the Queen Elizabeth Way in downtown Oakville, however, where some argued that the right-of-way is too narrow.

In Peel, workshop participants expressed the strongest support for improved transit service to Pearson Airport and the surrounding employment lands and to/through Toronto. Support was also expressed for north-south service along the Hurontario/Main corridor connecting Mississauga City Centre with Downtown Brampton, and east-west along the borders of Brampton and Caledon. The extension of Highway 427 also garnered some support.

In Toronto, as in Peel, the strongest support was expressed for extending rapid transit to the airport. Support was also expressed for east-west rapid transit in a corridor north of the downtown, with Eglinton, Sheppard and Finch among the possible alignments suggested. More so than for most other projects discussed at the workshops, support for a Finch-Sheppard project came from several regions: while strongest in Toronto and York, the proposal also drew support in Halton and Peel. Support was also expressed for an east-west rapid transit line in downtown Toronto and generally for the other proposed Transit City projects.

In York, workshop participants expressed the strongest support for the extension of the Yonge subway into York Region, with some suggesting that it be looped to link up with the Spadina Subway, an idea also proposed at the Toronto workshop. Some, noting that the subway already has capacity problems, urged the expansion of the carrying capacity of this line, as well. Support was also expressed for east-west rapid transit in both the Highway 7 and 407 corridors within York, and for better connections north-south between the Town of Markham and the City of Toronto..

In Durham, many workshop participants argued for the extension of rapid transit service to Clarington. Some were specific in asking that this service be via a Highway 2 BRT

line, while others were not specific. The Steeles-Taunton corridor was also flagged as a critical corridor in Durham.

There was GTHA-wide support for expanding the capacity of the Lakeshore rail corridor.

Several workshop participants also expressed an interest in improved links with destinations beyond the boundaries of the GTHA—particularly with Niagara Region and Kitchener-Waterloo via Guelph.

Other Considerations

Although it was explained to participants at every workshop that the test concepts were not alternatives to be chosen from, many expressed a preference for one over the others nonetheless. While some characterized it as too bold and others as not bold enough, Test Concept C (also referred to as the “web concept”) was the clear favourite among those expressing an opinion. This opinion was fairly evenly distributed geographically, although a few workshop participants suggested that better use be made of existing transportation infrastructure, particularly rail infrastructure, before the construction of new facilities.

Though the focus of the test concepts was infrastructure of regional significance, many workshop participants—particularly among those in Durham and Halton—noted the need for improved *local* transit, as well, particularly in off-peak periods. On a related note, a number of workshop participants urged Metrolinx to take the steps necessary to ensure that local networks are able to link with the regional network. The accessibility of express rail stations in highway corridors was a particular concern, for example several questioned the viability and desirability of rapid transit along the Highway 401 corridor. A number of workshop participants used the discussion of the test concepts as an opportunity to underline the importance of minimizing transfers as a way to increase the attractiveness and increase the ridership of transit.

Workshop participants debated whether the test concepts were too Toronto-centric, where the majority of rapid transit overall was contemplated, or whether they were too 905-centric, where the majority of the new rapid transit lines were contemplated. There was also debate about whether the plan was too focussed on long-distance commuting, at the expense of shorter, local transit trips. There was also debate about whether the test concepts were too focused on transit at the expense of roads. Several workshop participants spoke of the need to improve infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists and of the importance of the continuity of this infrastructure. Several also suggested that marine transportation deserved more attention, particularly for goods movement.

Further on the subject of goods movement, Europe was raised as a potential case study for Metrolinx, with one workshop participant suggesting that 60% of goods movement in the European Union is via marine modes and another trumpeting the virtues of the Dutch freight movement system.

Workshop participants expressed support for the multi-modal nature of the mobility hub network proposed in White Paper 2 and for the web of transportation corridors connecting them. They urged Metrolinx to ensure that hubs are well-connected to the development that surrounds them, as well, suggesting short-cuts for pedestrians, for example.

The assumptions used in the model that was used to test the network concepts was the subject of some debate, as well. Some commentators suggested that the population growth projections were too high, while others suggested they were too low. Others suggested that the assumed peak period headway between transit vehicles was too short. The aspect of the model eliciting the most pitched debate, however, was its assumptions around automobile operating costs. (The model assumed a 100% increase in these costs between 2008 and 2031.) Participants argued for and against the premise that rising oil prices would increase automobile operating costs even more than 100%.

Appendix A – Stakeholder Workshop Questions

Session 1: Vision, Goals and Objectives for the RTP

Question 1: To what degree does the vision that is expressed in White Paper 1 reflect your aspirations for the GTHA's transportation system? What revisions or refinements would you suggest?

Question 2: White Paper 1 sets out a broad and comprehensive suite of goals and objectives, all based on the three pillars of: a high quality of life; a thriving, healthy and protected environment; and a strong, prosperous and competitive economy. What is your best advice about what the Regional Transportation Plan should focus on?

Question 3: Section 4 of White Paper 1 presents a series of possible indicators for measuring progress in achieving the goals and objectives. Ultimately, how will you judge whether the Regional Transportation Plan was successful? What would be the tangible signs of positive progress?

Session 2: Preliminary Directions for the RTP

Question 1: Are there any directions that you feel are important that are not reflected in Section 2 of White Paper 2?

Question 2: Of all the directions that are presented in White Paper 2, or that have been identified by your group in response to question 1, which in your opinion are relatively more important?

Session 3: Transportation System Test Concepts

Question 1: In your opinion, what are the most important places that need to be linked by the transportation system in your local area and throughout the GTHA? Looking at the three Test Concepts in Appendix C of White Paper 2, what in your opinion are the most critical linkages, and what is missing?

Session 3 – Question 2: Do you have any other comments or observations about any of the Test Concepts presented in White Paper 2?

Appendix B – Dotmocracy Results

Workshop participants were invited to participate in a “dotmocracy exercise,” wherein “votes” could be cast for or against the preliminary policy and program ideas introduced in the White Papers.

	Green (In Favour)	Red (Against)
2.1 Complete Mobility		
Direction 1: Transportation hierarchy	52	5
Direction 2: Ambitious TDM	34	1
Direction 3: Active transportation	51	0
Direction 4: Regional transit network	42	1
Direction 5: Improved local transit	38	1
Direction 6: Improve goods movement	30	1
Direction 7: Land protection and/or acquisition	23	13
Direction 8: Complete streets	27	6
Direction 9: Improve incident clearing procedures	10	31
Direction 10: Create new markets for transit	15	3
Direction 11: Promote ride-sharing and car-sharing	14	12
2.2 - Placemaking and Mobility Hubs		
Direction 1: Complete communities	107	1
Direction 2: Identify a system of mobility hubs	29	2
Direction 3: Incorporate mobility hubs into planning policy documents	55	0
Direction 4: Mobility hub master plans.	27	7
Direction 5: Enhance the roles of Union Station and Pearson Airport	31	22
Direction 6: Comprehensive parking strategies.	24	18
Direction 7: Direct growth away from natural areas and agricultural land	84	3
2.3 - Excellent Customer Service		
Direction 1: Online regional transportation information system	40	4
Direction 2: Seamless transit/transportation experience	82	0
Direction 3: Simplify the payment of transit fares	44	4
Direction 4: Establish region-wide transit service standards	39	17
Direction 5: Improve access for those with special needs	31	2
Direction 6: Direct marketing and promotions	22	8
Direction 7: Improve safety of all modes	18	8
2.4 - Sustainable Financing		
Direction 1: True cost pricing	70	8
Direction 2: Dedicated user-fees	37	4
Direction 3: Eliminate free and subsidized parking	59	52
Direction 4: Financial incentives to promote transit use	54	4
Direction 5: Developer-pay for all modes	51	10
Direction 6: Leverage private sector resources	32	10
Direction 7: Land value capture	20	21

continued on the next page...

Summary of Metrolinx White Paper Stakeholder Workshops, May 26 – June 12, 2008

	Green (In Favour)	Red (Against)
2.5 Innovation through Research		
Direction 1: Goods movement	43	1
Direction 2: Barriers to short sea shipping	20	14
Direction 3: Relationship between land use and transportation	21	6
Direction 4: Trends and opportunities in active transportation.	13	2
Direction 5: Inter-dependence between transportation and human health	22	5
Direction 6: Clean fuel technologies and green vehicles	24	23
Direction 7: Pilot and demonstration projects.	19	8
Direction 8: Transportation modelling	7	11
Direction 9: Specialized transit	17	7
2.6 - Partnerships and Decision-Making		
Direction 1: Coordinate transportation planning and delivery	90	0
Direction 2: Expand role of municipal transportation advisory committees	17	45
Direction 3: Informed decision-making	40	3
Direction 4: Best practices in transportation planning	13	3