

document, the information it contains and the information and basis on which it relies, are subject to changes that are beyond the control of the author. The information provided by others is believed to be accurate but has not been verified.

## Addenda – Nov. 17, 2021

*Following the completion of this brief, further analysis has been completed to refine the results. First, updated transportation data was provided, specifically modal share projections for internal and external trips for 2051 by zone. Second, interim projections (between 2016 and 2050) were removed to provide better comparability between the two scenarios. Third, commercial and industrial employment distributions were assumed to be the same in both scenarios. These changes had the impact of reducing the cumulative GHG impact (2021-2050) from 1 MtCO<sub>2e</sub> as described in this brief to 0.5 MtCO<sub>2e</sub>.*

*An analysis of the VKT reduction resulting from the NUE scenario narrowed the difference between SSG's analysis and the City's transportation analysis to 100 million annual VKT in 2050. This variance is the result of the modelling treatment of pass-through trips. From a GHG accounting perspective, pass through trips are not counted as part of the City's GHG inventory and are therefore not reflected in the CityInSight model.*

*This finding provides three insights additional to those described in the briefing:*

- *The size of the GHG benefit of the NUE scenario will be influenced by the timing of, and location of, urban expansion.*
- *The sectoral distribution of future employment between the two scenarios will also impact the difference in emissions (these have been held constant in the two scenarios). For example, if one scenario included more employment in low rise office versus high rise office, this will impact the emissions.*
- *There are additional GHG benefits from reduced passthrough trips which do not show up in the CityInSight analysis.*