

Brampton Mobility Plan HEAT Analysis

Key Messages

Evidence suggests that investing in active transportation infrastructure supports an increase in physical activity and improves road safety, which can prevent premature mortality and have significant societal and economic value.

A health economic assessment¹ was conducted by Peel Public Health to estimate² the potential health impacts and economic value³ of three alternatives within the Brampton Mobility Plan, which aims to increase active transportation mode share and improve road safety.

The results 4 of the health economic assessment suggest:

- The **Bold Moves scenario** is considered the most preferred alternative where the achievement of its mode share targets resulted in an estimated 3.7-4 premature deaths prevented per year and an associated economic value of \$24.4M-\$25.8M per year.
- The **Brampton Plan scenario** is considered a preferred alternative where the achievement of its mode share targets resulted in an estimated 3.5-3.7 premature deaths prevented per year and an associated economic value of \$22.5M-\$23.7M per year.
- The **As-Is scenario**, which reflects no further investments to active transportation infrastructure and assumes no change to mode share or walking/cycling fatality rates, did not result in any premature deaths prevented. Instead, the analysis resulted in an overall negative economic value associated with additional premature mortality.

¹ The analysis uses the World Health Organization's "Health Economic Assessment Tool for Walking and Cycling" which is an evidence-based tool, representing international standards with input from an expert panel.

² The analysis is limited to assessing mortality/fatality impacts of physical activity and crash risk among Brampton residents (age 20-64/74) and is based on several assumptions.

³ The economic value is based on a Canadian specific "Value of Statistical Life" estimate from 2007.

⁴ Disclaimer: HEAT does not calculate risk reductions for individual persons but an average across the population under study.

Background

The City of Brampton is updating its Master Transportation Plan. The revised Brampton Mobility Plan (BMP) will guide the City's investment in transportation infrastructure to support future growth to the 2051 horizon, working towards the City's vision of being "a mosaic of safe integrated transportation choices and new modes, contributing to civic sustainability, and emphasizing walking, cycling, and transit". One of the BMP's guiding principles is to protect public health and safety by enhancing the well-being of the community and improving road safety. These objectives align with public health efforts to reduce chronic disease, prevent injury, and enhance health equity. In line with this, evidence suggests that improvements to active transportation (AT) infrastructure and access to a connected AT network can contribute to an increase in physical activity and reduce injuries/fatalities for vulnerable road users.

Purpose

A health economic assessment was conducted by the Peel Public Health - Built Environment Team to compare three proposed alternatives within the BMP in terms of health outcomes and associated economic value based on a value of statistical life. The mode share targets associated with each alternative were used to compare health impacts (premature mortality) of walking and cycling in terms of physical activity and crash risk.

Description of Analysis

The analysis was conducted using the World Health Organization's <u>Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) for Walking and Cycling</u>, a web-based tool used to estimate health and societal economic impacts of increased walking and cycling. Overall, the HEAT applies a comparative risk assessment approach, where the difference in premature mortality is calculated between a reference case and comparison case. These effects are quantified as relative risks (RR), comparing the risk among people who walk or cycle with the risk among people who do not. The HEAT analysis focused on physical activity and crash risk outcomes in alignment with the BMP's aim to increase AT and improve road safety.

The general parameters of the analysis were limited to mortality outcomes related to physical activity and crash risk for transportation-related walking and cycling among adults (ages 20-74 for walking, ages 20-64 for cycling) residing in Brampton. The three BMP scenarios being compared were:

- **As-Is:** This scenario provides a baseline for comparison.
- **Brampton Plan**: This scenario represents the City's new official plan that recognized limited opportunities to expand the road network and places more emphasis on sustainable modes such as transit, walking and cycling.
- Bold Moves: This scenario represents significant investment in higher order transit, complete streets, active transportation, and emerging mobility technologies.

A total of 18 simulations were completed, using the mode share targets associated with each of the three scenarios. For each scenario, a sensitivity analysis was completed for three road safety and two population growth estimates.

Mode Share Scenarios

Change in physical activity was estimated by comparing the baseline walking and cycling mode share (2016) to the 2051 mode share targets for each alternative. Since BMP mode share targets were based on AM peak period mode share and reflected the entire population, relative data from 2016 was used to convert to estimate age-standardized rates and total trips over a 24-hour period (see Table 1). This assumes that the relative relationship between 2016 AM peak trips and total trips over 24 hours can be applied to 2050, and that age distribution in 2050 will be the same as in 2016. Data from 2016 suggest that walking and cycling mode share is lower among adults compared to children and seniors, and across a 24hr period compared to AM peak period.

Table 1. BMP Alternative Scenarios and Mode Share Conversions

| | Baseline - Target Walking Mode Share | | Baseline - Target Cycling Mode Share | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Scenario | Entire Population, AM Peak Period | Ages 20-74, 24hr period | Entire Population, AM peak period | Ages 20-64, 24hr period | |
| 1. As-Is | 7.53% - 7.53% | 2.06% - 2.06% | 0.56% - 0.56% | 0.24%- 0.24% | |
| 2. Brampton Plan | 7.53% - 8% | 2.06% - 2.19% | 0.56% - 3% | 0.24%- 1.27% | |
| 3. Bold Moves | 7.53% - 8.5% | 2.06% - 2.32% | 0.56% - 4% | 0.24%- 1.69% | |

Sensitivity Analysis

Population Growth Projections

A sensitivity analysis was conducted for each scenario using general and high growth population growth projections for 2051. The general population growth forecasts are a conservative estimate, whereas the high growth forecasts used in the BMP are for capacity planning.

Crash Risk

A sensitivity analysis was conducted for each scenario to determine a range of results depending on potential changes to crash risk over time. A 50% reduction in exposure-based walking and cycling fatality rates is reasonable and in line with current road safety trends.

- High fatality rate = fatality rates remain the same as 2016 rates
- Moderate fatality rate = a 50% reduction in the 2016 fatality rates
- Low fatality rate = fatality rate of 0 assuming Vision Zero objectives are met

Data Inputs

Brampton-specific data inputs were included wherever possible (see Table 2). In general, the most recent Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS, 2016) provided baseline travel data and the BMP outlined future mode share targets.

Table 2. HEAT (Version 5.3.0) Data Inputs & Assumptions

| User Interface Options Flexible User Interface Active Travel Modes Cliny (Brampton) Local Traffic Conditions Geographic Level Local Traffic Conditions Geographic Level Local Traffic Conditions General Adjustments & Program Take up time for AT demand: 10 years Substitution of physical activity: 0 Dither Default Values Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Relative Ri | · | | a Inputs & Assumptior | 15 | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Active Travel Modes Georgraphic Level Georges Georgraphic Level Georges Georgraphic Level Georges Georgraphic Level Georges | Category | Option Selected | | | | | | |
| Geographic Level City (Brampton) Clasal Traffic Conditions Global urban average General Adjustments & Proportion excluded: 0 Take-up time for AT demand: 10 years substitution of physical activity: 0 Category Option Selected Data Inputs Come or Two Cases Two Cases Two Cases Physical Activity Crash Risk Trips per person/day all modes Category Option Selected Data Inputs Comparison Year: 2050 Total Years: 34 Comparison Year: 2050 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Course: Walking: 20-74 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling: 20-64 Cyc | | | | | | | | |
| Local Traffic Conditions Global urban average General Adjustments & Ceneral Care Provided Constructive Contracteristics Characteristics Characteristics Characteristics Characteristics Characteristics Characteristics Substitution of physical activity: 0 Population Selected Physical Activity Crash Risk Reference Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Walking and Cycling: 20-64 Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-74 Cycl | | | | | | | | |
| General Adjustments & Proportion excluded: 0 Characteristics Other Default Values (not customizable) Other Default Values (not customizable) Other Default Values (not customizable) Orne or Iwo Cases Orne or Iwo Cases Orne or Iwo Cases Iwo Cases Impacts to Consider Orne or Iwo Cases Orne or Orne or Iwo Cases Orne or Orne or Ivo Orne | | | | | | | | |
| Active Travel Take-up time for AT demand: 10 years Substitution of physical activity: 0 Other Default Values (not customizable) Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (walking) 0.89 Option Selected Data Inputs One or Two Cases Two Cases Two Cases Two Cases Two Cases Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Unit: Age range of the Bassessment population: Obta Source: Hypothetical Unit: Malking: 20-74 Malking: 20-84 Age range of the Bassessment population: Age 20-64 cycling: 29-84 Age range of the Bassessment population: Age 20-74 (75-43%) = Age 20-74 (75-74%) = A | | | | | | | | |
| Characteristics Take-up time for AT demands: 10 years Substitution of physical activity: 0 Cher Default Values (not customizable) Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (walking) 0.89 Category Option Selected Data Inputs Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Year: 2050 Comparison Year: 2050 Trips per person/day all modes Malking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-84 | General Adjustments & | Proportion exclud | Proportion excluded: 0 | | | | | |
| Other Default Values (not customizable) Category Option Selected Data Inputs One or Two Cases One or Two Cases Caregory Option Selected Data Inputs One or Two Cases Caregory Option Selected Data Inputs Category Option Selected Data Inputs Cases Category Option Selected Data Inputs Cases Category Option Selected Data Inputs Source Physical Activity Crash Risk Trips per person/day all modes Data Source: Walking and Cycling Data Source: Unit: Age range of the assessment Option Survey Walking: Age range of the Walking: 20-64 Cycling: 20-68 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-65 Sessment Oppulation: Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-65 Cycling: 20-6 | Active Travel | Temporal and spa | tial adjustment: 0 | | | | | |
| Other Default Values (not customizable) (not custom | Characteristics | Take-up time for A | T demand: 10 years | | | | | |
| Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Relative Risk (RR) for mortality (bike) 0.90 Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Pereir 2050 Impacts to Consider Physical Activity Crash Risk Trips per person/day all modes Age 20.74: 2.08 Age 20.64 - 2.17 Walking: Age range of the assessment population: Unit: Mode share: Walking and Cycling: Data Data Source: Walking and Cycling: Data Data Source: Walking and Cycling: Data Data Source: Walking: Walking: 20.74 Cycling: 20.64 Age range of the assessment population: Walking: 20.74 Age range of the Walking: 20.74 Age range of the Walking: 20.74 Age sassesment population: Mode share: Walking: 20.74 Age range of the Walking: 20.74 Age assessment population: Mode share: Walking: 20.74 Age 20.74 (75.43%) Age 20.74 (75. | | | | | | | | |
| Category One or Two Cases Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Year: 2050 Trotal Years: 34 Irips per person/day all modes Age 20-74: 2.08 Age 20-64 = 2.17 Mode Share: Outlit: Survey Mode Share: Outling: Occupitation: Occupitatio | Other Default Values | | | | | | | |
| One or Two Cases Two Cases Two Cases Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Year: 2050 Total Years: 34 HEAT is currently limited to assessments up to the year 2050 Air pollution and carbon emission components excluded modes Tis 7, 2016 Tis 7 | (not customizable) | | | | | | | |
| One or Two Cases Two Cases Reference Year: 2016 Comparison Year: 2050 Total Years: 34 Physical Activity Crash Risk Reference Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Hypothetical Unit: Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Hypothetical Unit: Age range of the Age sasessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Hypothetical Unit: Age range of the Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Hypothetical Walking: 20-74 Age Comparison Case: Walking: 20-74 Age assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Hypothetical Walking: 20-74 Age Comparison Case: Walking: 20-86 Cycling: 0.24% 2. Brampton Plan Scenario Walking: 2.19% Cycling: 1.69% Cycling: 1.69% Comparison Case: Walking: 20-74 Age 20-74 (75-43%) - 406,295 Age 20-74 (75-43% | | Relative Risk (RR) f | or mortality (walking) 0.89 | | | | | |
| Physical Activity Crash Risk Physical Activity Crash Risk Risk Risk Risk Risk Risk Risk Risk | Category | Option Selected | Data Inputs | Source | Assumptions & Other Notes | | | |
| Impacts to Consider Physical Activity Crash Risk Reference Case: Walking and Cycling Data Source: Unit: Age range of the assessment Population: Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Source: Unit: Age range of the population: Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: | One or Two Cases | | | | | | | |
| Impacts to Consider Crash Risk Reference Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Unit: Age 20-46 4 = 2.17 Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Survey Mode share Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Survey Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Comparison Case: Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Cycli | | | | | , | | | |
| Impacts to Consider Physical Activity Crash Risk | | | · · | | | | | |
| Crash Risk Trips per person/day all modes Trips per person/day all person Trips | Impacts to Consider | Physical Activity | | | Air pollution and carbon emission | | | |
| Reference Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Data Source: Unit: Survey Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Data Source: Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Census, 20-64 Census, 20-64 Census, 20-64 Census, 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cyclin | | , | | | The state of the s | | | |
| Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Population Survey Malking: 20-74 modes Age 20-74: 2.08 Age 20-64 = 2.17 cycling for transportation and not for recreational purposes Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Age 20-64 = 2.17 Walking: 20-74 Age range of the Walking: 20-74 Age 20-64 = 2.17 Age 20-64 (S.24%) Assumes: Assumes: Assumes: Population distribution remains the same on comparison case as it was in reference case Assumes: Population distribution remains the same on comparison case as it was in reference case Assumes: Population distribution remains the same on comparison case as it was in reference case Population distribution remains the same of the Walking: 20-74 Assumes: Population distribution remains the same targets Population distribution remains the same targets are achieved *TTS mode share targets are achieved *TT | Reference Case: | Ordon Mok | Trins per person/day all | TTS 2016 | | | | |
| Data Data Source: Population Survey Age range of the assessment Population: Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 | | | | . 13, 2010 | | | | |
| Data Source: Unit: Walking: Mode share Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Source: Walking and Cycling Data Source: Walking: 20-74 Age range of the Age range of the Walking: 20-64 Hypothetical Mode share Walking: 2.04% Cycling: 2.06% Cycling: 2.04% Cycling: 2.06% Cycl | | | | | | | | |
| Unit: Age range of the Mode share sasessment Valking: 20-74 (Cycling: 20-64 Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Hypothetical Mode share: Making: 2.05% (Cycling: 0.24% Data Source: Hypothetical Mode share: Making: 2.05% (Cycling: 0.24% Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population distribution remains the same in comparison case Population distribution comparison case Population distribution comparison case Population distribution comparison case Population distrib | | Population | | | lor recreational purposes | | | |
| Age range of the assessment population: Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling: 20-64 Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Hypothetical Unit: Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-74 Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 344,282 | | | | | | | | |
| Assumes: Malking: 20-74 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-24% | | _ | | | | | | |
| Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling: Data Data Source: Unit: Mode share: Walking: 2.04% Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-44 Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 20-74 Cycling: 20-74 Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for creference & comparison Cycling: 225 Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: | | | | | | | | |
| Avg Trīp Length:3.6km Mode Share: 0.24% Walking and Cycling Data Data Source: Unit: Age range of the assessment population: Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Walking: 20-74 (75.43%) = 406,295 (2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for reference & comparison case Walking: 255 (Cycling: 255 (Cycling: 255) Walking: 21-9% Cycling: 1.69% Population size for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking: 255 (Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate 38.5/100M km Moderate 38.5/100M km Low = 0/100M km Assumes: Population distribution remains the same in comparison case it was in reference as it was in reference as it was in reference as twas in comparison case in twas in reference as it was in reference as twas in the same in comparison case in twas in reference as it was in reference as twas in the same in comparison case in twas in reference as it was in reference as twas in the same in reference as it was in refer | | | | | | | | |
| Mode Share: 0.24% I, AS IS Scenario Walking: 2.06% Cycling: 0.24% Data Source: Hypothetical Mode share Mode share Walking: 2.064 Senario Share targets Malking: 2.064 Short targets Malking: 2.17% Shold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Shold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Shold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Cycling: 1.29% C | population. | Cycling. 20-04 | | | | | | |
| Comparison Case: Walking and Cycling Data Data Data Source: Hypothetical Mode share Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 0.24% Data Source: Walking: 20.74 Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Data Source: Walking: 20.74 Data Source: Walking: 20.75 Data Source: W | | | | | | | | |
| Walking and Cycling Data Walking: 2.06% Cycling: 0.24% based on BMP mode share Walking: 20-74 assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Estimated based on BMP mode share the same in comparison case as it was in reference case with was in reference as with was in reference with was in reference as was in was in reference as was in was in reference as was in was in reference as was with was in reference as was in was in reference as was with was in reference as was in was in reference as was with was in reference as was in was in reference as was with was in reference as was with was in reference as was with was in reference as with was in reference as was with was in reference as with was in reference as was with was in reference as wond this passing was with was in reference as was with was in reference as was whith was in reference as was was withing as was possible range in comparison case was proved for 2050 population distribution remains the same in comparison was | Comparison Casa: | | | | Assumass | | | |
| Data Data Source: Hypothetical Mode share Walking: 20-74 assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population size for case Population size for comparison case Population size for case Population size for comparison case as it was in reference case wode share targets and size sampling data is reflective of the Brampton population trips per day for all modes and trip distance doesn't change over time Population size for comparison case Populati | | | | Catina at a al | | | | |
| Data Source: Unit: Mode share Mode share Walking: 20-74 Assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison for efference & comparison case All cause mortality rates for creference & comparison cyclists) All cause mortality rates for creference & comparison cyclists) Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 76.9/100M km Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 20-64 (67.63%) = 60.6238.730,450 All course for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Age 20-71 (75.43%) = 76.9/100M km Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 76 | | | | | | | | |
| Unit: Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Age range of the assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Age 20-64 Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Comparison All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking: 2.19% Walking: 2.19% Cycling: 1.69% Sa. Bold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Cycling: 2.59 Brampton GeoHub, 2016 2050 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 2051 population growth forecasts can be used as a proxy for 2050 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 2.59 Cycling: 2 | | Hypothotical | | | · | | | |
| Age range of the assessment population: Walking: 20-74 Cycling: 1.27% 3. Bold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Population size for reference case Population size for reference case Population size for case Population size for reference case Population size for reference case Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Census, 2016 Assumes: Population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Cycling: 1.69% Census, 2016 Assumes: Population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 Population growth forecasts can be used as a proxy for 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts Walking: 386 Cycling: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking: 2.19% Cycling: 1.27% 3. Bold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Census, 2016 Assumes: Population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 Population growth forecasts can be used as a proxy for 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts Walking: 386 Cycling: 2.25 WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case Walking Fatality rate 2016: 76.9 /100M km 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5 /100M km Low = 0 | | | | | | | | |
| assessment population: Cycling: 20-64 Cycling: 1.27% 3. Bold Moves Scenario Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Population size for reference case Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Age 20-7100M km Default Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 2.32% Census, 2016 Assumes: • population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population growth forecasts can be used as a proxy for 2050 2050 population range reflects general – high growth population forecasts WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case Walking: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking Fatality rate 2016:76.9 /100M km 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Aoderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Assumes mortality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | snare targets | | | | |
| Brampton population | | | | | | | | |
| Walking: 2.32% Cycling: 1.69% Population size for reference case Population size for reference case Population size for reference case Population size for Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 406,295 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate All cause and trip population of trips per day for all modes and trip distance doesn't change over time Census, 2016 Assumes: • population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population growth for 2050 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts Walking: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking Fatality rate 2016:76.9 /100M km 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Population distribution remains the trip distance doesn't change over time Ompoulation distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population growth forecasts ap every for 2050 • 2051 population forecasts ap every for 2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population forecasts ap every for 2050 • 2051 population forecasts aperacy for 2050 • 2051 population forecasts aperacy for 2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population forecasts aperacy for 2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population forecasts aperacy for 2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population growth for 2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 • 2051 population size for 2050 • 2051 population size for 2050 • 2051 population size for 2050 • 2051 population size | аѕѕеѕѕпент роригалон. | Cycling. 20-64 | | | | | | |
| Cycling: 1.69% Cycling: 1.69% Cycling: 1.69% Census, 2016 Assumes: | | | | | | | | |
| Population size for reference case Population size for reference case 2016 Total: 538,640 Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 406,295 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 406,295 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 All cause mortality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate 2016 Total: 538,640 Age 20-74 (75.43%) Brampton | | | | | | | | |
| Population size for reference case Age 20-74 (75.43%) | | | Cycling. 1.69% | | | | | |
| Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 406,295 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for crashes (comparison) Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Age 20-74 (75.43%) Brampton GeoHub, 2016 2051 population distribution remains the same 2016-2050 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case OMD, 2014- 2016 Avg fatality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| ## All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) ### All Cause mortality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) ### All Cause mortality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) ### All Cause mortality rate and comparison case ### All Cause mortality rates and comparison case #### All Cause mortality rates and comparison case #### All Cause mortality rates Default (Table 1) #### Walking: 386 ### Cycling: 225 #### Walking Fatality rate of crashes (Table 2) #### All Cause mortality rates for crashes (Table 2) #### Cycling: 225 #### Cycling: 235 #### Cycling: 245 #### Cycling: 245 | Population size for | | | Census, 2016 | | | | |
| Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 364,282 2050 (sensitivity analysis) Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 466.763% (100 M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0/100M km Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case OMD, 2014- 2016 Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | reterence case | | | | · · | | | |
| Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate (2016:76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Population size for (8 BMP for casts can be used as a proxy for 2050 2050 population range reflects general - high growth population forecasts WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case Walking Fatality rate 2016 2016:76.9 /100M km Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| Population size for comparison case Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate (2016:76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Make patality rate (2050) Walking Fatality rate (2016:76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Moderate=(50%) | | | _ | | | | | |
| Population size for comparison case Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate and comparison case Walking Fatality rate (2016: 76.9 /100M km (2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km (2060 Mm) Low = 0 /100M km (2050 Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| Age 20-74 (75.43%) = 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate (2016: 76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Malking Fatality rate general – high growth population forecasts WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case OMD, 2014- 2016 Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | & BMP | | | | |
| 743,029-814,642 Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates for reference & Cycling: 225 Walking Fatality rate (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km For reference & WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case WHO Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| Age 20-64 (67.63%) = 666,238-730,450 All cause mortality rates Default Walking: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking Fatality rate Cycling: 225 Som Case OMD, 2014- Cycling: 225 Avg fatality rate based on rolling Cyclists Cyclists Avg fatality rate based on rolling Cyclists Cyclists Avg fatality rate based on rolling Cyclists Cyclists Avg fatality rate based on rolling Cyclists Cyclists Cycling: 225 Sensitivity analysis estimates a Cycling: 225 Cycling: 24 Cycling: 24 Cycling: 25 Cycling | comparison case | | | | general - high growth population | | | |
| All cause mortality rates per crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate (2016:76.9 /100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Walking Fatality rate (2016:76.9 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Walking: 386 WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case OMD, 2014- Avg fatality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | forecasts | | | |
| All cause mortality rates for crashes for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) All cause mortality rates before the comparison with the cycling: 225 Walking: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking: 386 Cycling: 225 Walking Fatality rate 2016:76.9 /100M km 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km WHO Assumes mortality rate remains the same in reference and comparison case OMD, 2014- 2016 Avg fatality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| for reference & Cycling: 225 same in reference and comparison case Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate 2016:76.9 /100M km 2016 2016:76.9 /100M km 2016 Avg fatality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | | | | | | | | |
| comparison Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate | , | Default | | WHO | | | | |
| Fatality rates for crashes (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) Walking Fatality rate DMD, 2014- Avg fatality rate based on rolling average 2014-2016 for baseline 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km | for reference & | | Cycling: 225 | | same in reference and comparison | | | |
| (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Moderate=38.5/m Moderate=3 | comparison | | | | | | | |
| (traffic crashes involving pedestrians and cyclists) AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Low = 0 /100M km Moderate = 38.5/100M km Moderate = 38.5/10 | Fatality rates for crashes | | Walking Fatality rate | OMD, 2014- | Avg fatality rate based on rolling | | | |
| pedestrians and cyclists) AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | (traffic crashes involving | | 2016:76.9 /100M km | 2016 | average 2014-2016 for baseline | | | |
| AS IS = 76.9/100M km Moderate=38.5/100M km Low = 0 /100M km Sensitivity analysis estimates a possible range in crash risk rates from high (as-is), moderate (50%) | pedestrians and | | 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: | | | | | |
| Moderate=38.5/100M km possible range in crash risk rates Low = 0 /100M km from high (as-is), moderate (50% | cyclists) | | | | Sensitivity analysis estimates a | | | |
| Low = 0 /100M km from high (as-is), moderate (50% | | | Moderate=38.5/100M km | | | | | |
| | | | Low = 0 / 100M km | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | | Cycling Fatality rate | | |
|--------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------|--|
| | | 2016: 27.41 / 100M km | | Fatality rate reflects an exposure- |
| | | 2050 Sensitivity Analysis: | | based fatality rate (# fatality by |
| | | As-Is = 27.41 /100M km | | mode per 100M km travelled) |
| | | Moderate=13.7/100M km | | · |
| | | Low = 0 /100M km | | |
| Other: | Local currency | VSL: \$6.5million CAD | Gov. of | The Value of statistical life (VSL) is |
| | | | Canada, 2007 | derived from the method called |
| | | | | "willingness to pay" assessment and |
| | | Discount rate: 2.85% | Bank of | represents the average societal |
| | | Inflation rate: 2.91% | Canada, 2024 | economic value of reduced |
| | | | | premature mortality |

Results

In general, findings from this analysis suggest overall population-level health benefits increase with higher walking and cycling moder share, if walking and cycling fatality rates are reduced by 50% or greater (moderate fatality rate from the sensitivity analysis). Both health and economic benefits increase considerably with improvements to road safety beyond a 50% reduction in fatalities and towards Vision Zero. Without improvements to current walking and cycling fatality rates, the analysis suggests there could be a net negative economic value associated with premature deaths. The range of results across all scenarios and sensitivity analyses are presented below in Table 3.

Table 3. Results including Sensitivity Analysis (HEAT version 5.3 - conducted Nov. 14, 2024)

| Table 5. Results including Sensitivity Analysis (TEAT version 5.5 - conducted Nov. 14, 2024) | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|--|
| Fatality Rates: | High Fatality Rate | | Moderate | Moderate Fatality Rate | | Low Fatality Rate | |
| Population Growth Projections: | General | High Growth | General | High Growth | General | High Growth | |
| Scenario 1: As-Is (Change in physic | al activity = | represents 0 m | nins per pers | on /day) | | | |
| Premature deaths prevented /yr | -1.2 | -1.4 | 2.9 | 3 | 6.9 | 7.4 | |
| Economic value/yr | -\$7.63M | -\$9.25M | \$18.6M | \$19.5M | \$44.8M | \$48.2M | |
| Scenario 2: Brampton Plan (Change in physical activity = represents 0.4 mins per person /day) | | | | | | | |
| Premature deaths prevented /yr | -3.1 | -3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 10 | 11 | |
| Economic value/yr | -\$20.3M | -\$22.7 | \$22.5M | \$23.7M | \$65.2M | \$70.6M | |
| Scenario 3: Bold Moves (Change in physical activity = represents 0.5 mins per person /day) | | | | | | | |
| Premature deaths prevented /yr | -4 | -4.5 | 3.7 | 4 | 11 | 12 | |
| Economic value/yr | -\$26M | -\$29.4M | \$24.4M | \$25.8M | \$74.7M | \$81M | |
| Note - bolded results represent the specific alternative scenarios from a health and safety perspective compared in table 4. | | | | | | | |
| Disclaimer - HEAT does not calculate risk reductions for individual persons but an average across the population under study. | | | | | | | |

The following three specific scenarios were chosen to represent the alternatives for comparison in the BMP evaluation (see Table 4). The *As-Is* alternative with no change to walking/cycling mode share or fatality rates represents a baseline for comparison. Taking a conservative approach, the general population growth projections and the moderate fatality rate were chosen as the specific *Brampton Plan* and *Bold Moves* alternatives for comparison. Although, evidence suggests higher investments in safe AT infrastructure (as proposed in the *Bold Moves* scenario) could result in additional road safety improvements for vulnerable road users. Overall, the *Brampton Plan* and *Bold Moves* were the top two preferred alternatives. Whereas the *As-Is* alternative was least preferred.

Table 4. Comparison of BMP Alternatives

| Alternatives | Description & Assumptions | Evaluation |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------|

| As-Is | This scenario provides a baseline for comparison. on change in walking/cycling mode share or fatality rates | No premature deaths prevented, and a <u>negative economic value</u> associated with premature mortality. |
|------------------|--|--|
| Brampton Plan | This scenario represents direction from the City's new official plan that recognized limited opportunities to expand the road network and places more emphasis on sustainable modes such as transit, walking and cycling. • moderate increases in walking and cycling mode share, aligning with an overall 35% sustainable mode share target. • moderate improvements to road safety, a 50% reduction in walking/cycling fatalities. | Preferred Physical activity benefits would outweigh crash risk and result in the overall prevention of premature deaths (3.5-3.7 per year), along with a positive economic value of \$22.5M-\$23.7M per year. These results could be greater with further improvements to road safety. |
| Bold Moves | This scenario represents significant investment in higher order transit, complete streets, active transportation, and emerging mobility technologies. • moderate increases in walking and cycling mode share, aligning with an overall 45% sustainable mode share target. • moderate improvements to road safety, a 50% reduction in walking/cycling fatalities. | Physical activity benefits would outweigh crash risk and result in the greatest overall prevention of premature deaths (3.7-4 per year), along with a positive economic value of \$24.4M-\$25.8M per year. These results could be greater with further improvements to road safety. |

Limitations

HEAT-Specific Limitations:

- VSL does not assign a value to the life of one particular person but refers to an average value of a "statistical life".
- Applicable to adults only (ages 20-74 for walking, 20-64 for cycling).
- Focuses on all-cause mortality; excludes morbidity, changes to traffic conditions, crash injuries, or other physical activities.
- Results may be confounded by factors like leisure activities, transportation choices, and environmental conditions.
- Offers population-level estimates; does not adjust for individual's walking/cycling intensity.
- Active transportation take-up time is limited to 10 years.
- HEAT provides an approximation of the order of magnitude of the impacts.

TTS Data Limitations:

- Relies on self-reported data (e.g., TTS mode share data for Brampton).
- Only 50% of households were surveyed, limiting overall participation.
- Survey administered spring and fall and captures a 24-hour period, which may/may not reflect long-term travel habits and have potential seasonal biases.

Simulation-Specific Limitations:

- BMP mode share data was adjusted to better reflect adult populations (ages 20-74 for walking and ages 20-64 for cycling), though variations in travel across age groups may affect results.
- Simulation focused on the impacts of physical activity and crash risk for walkers and cyclists; carbon emissions and air pollution components were not included.
- Analysis was limited to physical activity and crash risk components. Air pollution and carbon emissions components were excluded. However, when air pollution is excluded, the RR in HEAT is adjusted to reflect the small amounts of air pollution present in the studies used to determine RR.

Summary

Evidence suggests that investing in active transportation infrastructure supports an increase in physical activity and improves road safety, which can prevent premature mortality and have significant societal and economic value.

A health economic assessment⁵ was conducted by Peel Public Health to estimate⁶ the potential health impacts and economic value⁷ of three alternatives within the Brampton Mobility Plan, which aims to increase active transportation mode share and improve road safety.

The results⁸ of the health economic assessment suggest:

- The **Bold Moves scenario** is considered the most preferred alternative where the achievement of its mode share targets resulted in an estimated 3.7-4 premature deaths prevented per year and an associated economic value of \$24.4M-\$25.8M per year.
- The **Brampton Plan scenario** is considered a preferred alternative where the achievement of its mode share targets resulted in an estimated 3.5-3.7 premature deaths prevented per year and an associated economic value of \$22.5M-\$23.7M per year.
- The *As-Is scenario*, which reflects no further investments to active transportation infrastructure and assumes no change to mode share or walking/cycling fatality rates, did not result in any premature deaths prevented. Instead, the analysis resulted in an overall negative economic value associated with additional premature mortality.

For more information visit **peelregion.ca**









⁵ The analysis uses the World Health Organization's "Health Economic Assessment Tool for Walking and Cycling" which is an evidence-based tool, representing international standards with input from an expert panel.

⁶ The analysis is limited to assessing mortality/fatality impacts of physical activity and crash risk among Brampton residents (age 20-64/74) and is based on several assumptions.

⁷ The economic value is based on a Canadian specific "Value of Statistical Life" estimate from 2007.

⁸ Disclaimer: HEAT does not calculate risk reductions for individual persons but an average across the population under study.