



Complete Table of Sustainable Development Indicators

Supplement to the
Sustainable Development Report
2009

As at December 31, 2009
Publication date: June 15, 2010

About this document

We have decided to include in the *Sustainable Development Report 2009* only those indicators that are the most representative, in our opinion, of the performance of a Québec public transit corporation. In this way, we have avoided burdening the report itself with a long table, and have followed through on a recommendation made by several stakeholders.

However, to document our sustainable development performance properly and comprehensively, and keep a record of it over time, we considered it necessary to publish a separate document presenting all the indicators that we use.

The STM tracks dozens of sustainable development indicators. In selecting them, we look at indicators specific to public transit (such as those of the International Association of Public Transport), those recommended by the Global Reporting Initiative and those used to measure the company's progress in terms of its 2007–2011 business plan. We also take the concerns expressed by some of our stakeholders into account.

On page 8 of the [Sustainable Development Report 2009](#), the STM declares that the report complies with application level C of the Global Reporting Initiative's G3 guidelines. That declaration is based on the set of indicators presented here.

In the following pages, the indicators are grouped under each of the strategic objectives laid out in our Sustainable Development Action Plan 2007–2011. Readers will find a full description of the three focus areas, 12 objectives and actions related to the Action Plan in the *Sustainable Development Report 2009*.

About the explanatory notes

In compiling the data for the *Sustainable Development Report 2009*, we found that some of those published in the 2008 report (for the years 2006, 2007 and 2008) were in need of correction. In addition, a number of significant variations, both positive and negative, between the results for 2008 and 2009 required explanation. These corrections and variations are explained in the notes provided at the back of this document. The notes also appear when the reader clicks on the note indicator.

Table of Contents

Objective 1	Contribute to the fight against global warming and to improving the environment and quality of life	4
Objective 2	Apply universal accessibility measures	5
Objective 3	Contribute to economic vitality at the local, regional and provincial levels	6
Objective 4	Influence urban planning and management to better integrate public transit	7
Objective 5	Manage environmental impacts	8
Objective 6	Improve the energy efficiency of assets	11
Objective 8	Plan, design and carry out projects while taking their environmental, social and economic impacts into account	12
Objective 9	Aim for recognition of the STM as an employer of choice, both by its employees and by job seekers.....	13
Objective 10	Increase employee awareness of sustainable development	15
Objective 11	Position the STM as a responsible, committed company	15

AREA 1 – SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY

Objective 1 Contribute to the fight against global warming and to improving the environment and quality of life

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Service provided (thousands of kilometres travelled)	129,629 Note 1	134,513 Note 1	147,860 Note 1	153,673	4%	19%	+16% relative to 2006	2011	LT3
Bus	69,790 Note 2	69,721 Note 2	72,144 Note 2	77,335	7%	11%			LT3
Metro	59,839	64,792	75,715	76,338	1%	28%			LT3
Passenger-kilometres (millions)	2,820	2,852	2,969	2,971	0%	5%			LT3
Number of trips (ridership) (millions)	363.3	367.5	382.5	382.8	0%	5%	+ 8% relative to 2006	2011	LT3
Number of reduced-fare or free trips (millions)	121	121	120	114	-5% Note 3	-6%			EC8
Number of free trips (millions)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.7 Note 4	N/A	N/A			EC8
Network coverage rate (% of dwellings within 500 m)									LT3
Morning rush hour	99.0% (2003)		To come Note 5						
Day	98.5% (2003)								
Evening	98.4% (2003)								
Saturday	98.4% (2003)								
Sunday	98.4% (2003)								
Night (within 1,000 m)	91.2% (2003)								
Modal share of public transit by island of Montréal residents, morning rush hour (2003 and 2008 Origin-Destination surveys)	32% (2003)		36% (2008)			4%			LT3
Modal share of public transit towards downtown, morning rush hour (Origin-Destination survey)	58% (2003) Note 6		66% (2008)						LT3
Number of routes on which Navette Or service is offered	0	0	3	7	133% Note 7	N/A			EC8

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 1 – SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY

Objective 2 Apply universal accessibility measures

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Number of metro stations with elevators (out of 68 stations)	0	3	3	6	100% Note 8	N/A	8	2010	EC8
Number of metro stations with escalators (out of 68 stations)	57	60	60	60	0% Note 9	5%			EC8
Percentage of metro stations with warning tiles on the platforms	0%	4%	12%	35%	23% Note 10	35%	100%	2011	EC8
Number of visually impaired or intellectually disabled customers on the regular network that obtained a free pass for their personal attendant	121	143	135	95	-30% Note 11	-21%			EC8
Percentage of Web sites that meet international accessibility standards	0%	0%	0%	50%	50% Note 12	50%			
Percentage of buses with low floor or front ramp	65%	69%	73%	79%	7% Note 13	14%	100%		EC8
Total number of bus routes in the network	192	190	196	202	3%	5%			EC8
Number of wheelchair-accessible bus routes	154	154	154	155	1%	1%			EC8
Percentage of wheelchair-accessible bus routes	80%	81%	79%	77%	-2%	-3%			EC8
Paratransit service – total number of trips	1,941,066 Note 14	2,084,909 Note 14	2,257,459 Note 14	2,411,208	7% Note 15	24%			EC8
By minibus	403,839 Note 16	393,702 Note 16	400,157	414,590	4%	3%			
By accessible taxi	215,170 Note 17	301,767 Note 17	382,289 Note 17	423,115	11%	97%			
By taxi	1,322,057 Note 18	1,389,440 Note 18	1,475,013 Note 18	1,573,503	7%	19%			

AREA 1 – SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
Paratransit service – total number of customers	12,338	13,516	14,609	15,647	7%	27%			EC8
With a motor disability	8,684	9,716	10,617	11,475	8%	32%			
With an intellectual disability	2,110	2,111	2,152	2,140	-1%	1%			
With a psychological disability	802	882	969	1,069	10%	33%			
With a visual impairment	742	807	871	963	11%	30%			
Paratransit service – number of trips by type of disability	1,940,066	2,084,743	2,257,424	2,411,195	7%	24%			EC8
Motor disability	1,063,612	1,208,366	1,342,082	1,448,612	8%	36%			
Intellectual disability	681,340	662,211	682,468	699,269	2%	3%			
Psychological disability	107,774	116,380	126,496	139,798	11%	30%			
Visual impairment	87,340	97,786	106,378	123,516	16%	41%			

Objective 3 Contribute to economic vitality at the local, regional and provincial levels

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Acquisitions of goods and services (\$M)	380	397	526	622	18% Note 19	63%			EC1
Operations	171	177	213	244	15%	42%			
Investments	209	220	314	378	21%	81%			
Acquisitions of goods and services in Québec (\$M)	170	178	260 Note 20	263	1%	55%			EC6
Percentage of acquisitions from Québec companies (based on monetary value of contracts)	45%	45%	49% Note 20	42%	-7% Note 21	-2%			EC6
Number of jobs sustained by acquisitions of goods and services	2,163	2,369	2,942	3,011	2%	39%			EC6

AREA 1 – SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Tax spinoffs attributable to acquisitions of goods and services (\$M)	46 Note 22	45 Note 22	57 Note 22	61	8%	35%			EC1
Tax spinoffs attributable to employee salaries (\$M)	120	117	113	115	2%	-4%			EC1
Total operating revenues (\$M)	801	866	931	1,002	8%	25%			EC1
Clients	394.7	415.7	444.7	463.2	4%	17%			EC1
Contribution from the Montréal Urban Agglomeration	278.0	306.0	323.7	350.9	8%	26%			EC4
Subsidies from the Government of Québec	45.3	55.4	74.8	94.8	27%	109%			EC4
Regional contributions	52.2	53.4	53.2	53.2	0%	2%			EC4
Contributions from municipalities outside the Montréal Urban Agglomeration	1.8	3.9	4.3	5.4	24%	199%			EC4
Other revenues	29.2	32.0	30.2	34.8	15%	19%			EC4

Objective 4 Influence urban planning and management to better integrate public transit

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Average commercial speed (km/h)	17.8	17.8	17.8	17.8	0%	0%			LT3
Reserved-lane bus network (km)	75	75	77	95	24 Note 23 %	28%	240 Note 24	2018 Note 24	LT6

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

Objective 5 Manage environmental impacts ([Note 25](#))

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Number of annual targets set in the Environmental Protection Plan 2007–2011	N/A	9	22	23	5%	N/A	89	2011	EN26 LT7 - 8
Number of targets reached during the year	N/A	6	15	8	-47% Note 26	N/A			
Overall success rate of the Environmental Protection Plan	N/A	7%	24%	33%	9%	N/A	100%	2011	
Number of buses equipped with non-spill fuel delivery systems	491	703	1,166	1,280	10% Note 27	161%			EN23
Percentage of buses equipped with non-spill fuel delivery systems	31%	44%	70%	76%	6%	45%			EN23
Number of accidental spills reported during the year	2	0	4	0	-100%	-100%			EN23
Residual hazardous materials (RHMs) recovered (tonnes)	2,494	2,586	2,120	2,758	30% Note 28	11% Note 28			EN22
Used detergent solutions	1,400	1,405	1,087	1,444	33%	3%			
Sludge from drainage system maintenance	520	507	361	611	69%	18%			
Used oil and solvents, oily water in tanks	305	363	348	381	9%	25%			
RHMs in containers (solvents, antifreeze, paint, etc.)	113	121	129	150	16%	32%			
Lead storage batteries	82	87	122	89	-27%	9%			
Oil filters and aerosols	23	30	35	45	30%	97%			
Fluorescents	24	21	29	25	-12%	6%			
Alkaline electrolytes	20	39	2	1	-50%	-95%			
Nickel-cadmium storage batteries	6	10	0	8	100%	36%			
Batteries	2	3	7	4	-41%	95%			

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
Residual materials recovered (tonnes)	1,959	1,577	3,168 Note 29	3,083	-3% Note 28	57% Note 28			EN22
Plastic	4	9	5	2	-62%	-53%			
Paper	30	43	46	79	72%	163%			
Cardboard	30	53	46	100	117%	233%			
Wood (palettes)	N/A	N/A	136 Note 29	60	-56%	N/A			
Metal	1,143	533	1,871	1,736	-7%	52%			
Metro tires	82	119	97	79	-18%	-4%			
Bus and car tires	170	170	170	223	31%	31%			
Newspapers in the metro	500	650	797	804	1%	61%			
Residual materials sent to landfill (tonnes)	N/A	2,277	2,220	2,160	-3%	N/A			EN22
Recovery rate of tracked residual non-hazardous materials	N/A	41%	59%	59%	0%	N/A	70%	2015	EN22
Paper consumption (20-lb.) (tonnes)	N/A	N/A	71	72	1% Note 30	N/A			EN1
Average paper consumption per employee (20-lb.) (kg)	N/A	N/A	8.5	8.4	-2% Note 30	N/A			EN1
Direct emissions of airborne contaminants (tonnes)									EN20
NOx from stationary sources	20	21	21	23	7% Note 31	17%			
NOx from mobile sources	968	919	950	1,020	7% Note 32	5%			
Percentage of NOx emissions from mobile sources	98%	98%	98%	98%	0%	N/A			
SOx from stationary sources	0.23	0.20	0.23	0.26	11% Note 31	11%			
SOx from mobile sources	13.8	13.0	13.5	14.5	7% Note 32	5%			
Percentage of SOx emissions from mobile sources	98%	98%	98%	98%	0%	N/A			

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target	GRI indicator
VOCs from stationary sources	27 Note 34	24 Note 34	21 Note 34	24	11% Note 35	-13%		
VOCs from mobile sources	36	38	37	39	6% Note 32	9%		
Percentage of VOC emissions from mobile sources	57%	62%	63%	62%	-1%	5%		
CO from stationary sources	15	17	17	18	7% Note 31	21%		
CO from mobile sources	298 Note 36	312	323	335	4% Note 32	12%		
Percentage of CO emissions from mobile sources	95%	95%	95%	95%	0%	0%		
Total particulate matter (total PM) from stationary sources	0.49	0.47	0.49	0.54	10% Note 31	10%		
Total particulate matter (total PM) from mobile sources	40.3	38.1	39.4	42.2	7% Note 32	5%		
Percentage of total PM emissions from mobile sources	99%	99%	99%	99%	0%	0%		
Particulate matter (PM ₁₀) from stationary sources	0.49	0.47	0.49	0.54	10% Note 31	10%		
Particulate matter (PM ₁₀) from mobile sources	40.2	38.0	39.4	42.2	7% Note 32	5%		
Percentage of PM ₁₀ emissions from mobile sources	99%	99%	99%	99%	0%	0%		
Particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) from stationary sources	0.49	0.47	0.49	0.54	10% Note 31	10%		
Particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) from mobile sources	36.3	34.3	35.5	38.0	7% Note 32	5%		
Percentage of PM _{2.5} emissions from mobile sources	99%	99%	99%	99%	0%	0%		
Number of complaints related to the environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	167	N/A	N/A		
Number of legal non-compliance notices related to the environment	0	1	3	0	-100	N/A		EN28

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

Objective 6 Improve the energy efficiency of assets

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Direct GHG emissions from stationary sources (t CO ₂ eq.)	20,608	25,528 Note 37	25,810 Note 37	27,841	8%	35%			EN16
Direct GHG emissions from mobile sources (t CO ₂ eq.)	126,310	120,014 Note 38	120,699 Note 38	128,819	7%	2%			EN16
Total direct GHG emissions (t CO₂ eq.)	146,918	145,542	146,509	156,660	7% Note 39	7%			EN16
Per km travelled (g CO ₂ eq.)	1,133	1,082	991	1,019	3%	-10%			EN16
Per passenger-km (g CO ₂ eq.)	52	51	49	53	8%	2%	45	2020	EN16
Total number of buses in fleet	1,591	1,589	1,671	1,680	1%	6%			LT2
Hybrid buses	0	0	8	8	0%	N/A			EN18 LT3
Articulated buses	0	0	0	22	N/A	N/A	202	2012	EN18 LT3
Initiatives to reduce GHG emissions and reductions achieved									EN18 LT5
Percentage of drivers trained in green driving	60%	78%	77%	Note 40					EN18 LT5
Reduction in emissions through green driving (t CO ₂ eq.)	1,673	1,702	3,210						EN18 LT5
Through the use of biodiesel (t CO ₂ eq.)	N/A	100	3,574	4,560	28%	N/A			EN18 LT5
Through the use of hybrid buses (t CO ₂ eq.)	N/A	N/A	300	300	0%	N/A			EN18 LT5
Through TopoDyn transmission programmer (pilot project) (t CO ₂ eq.)	N/A	N/A	40	70	75%	N/A			EN18 LT5
Through the use of EMP electric fans (pilot project) (t CO ₂ eq.)	N/A	N/A	20	20	0%	N/A			EN18 LT5

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Total GHG reductions through various initiatives (t CO ₂ eq.)	1,673	1,802	7,143	Note 40					EN18 LT5
Estimated fuel savings from GHG emission reduction initiatives (GJ - 10 ⁹ joules)	24,047	25,903	102,679						EN5
Total energy consumption (PJ - 10¹⁵ joules)	3.1 Note 41	3.4	3.6	3.8	4%	23%			EN3
From renewable sources	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.3	-1%	27%			EN3 LT4
From non-renewable sources	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.4	7% Note 42	21%			EN3
Percentage of energy consumed from renewable sources	34%	36%	38%	36%	-2%	1%			EN3 LT4
Total consumption per million km travelled (GJ - 10 ⁹ joules)	23,712 Note 43	25,538 Note 43	24,440 Note 43	24,533	0%	3%			EN3 - LT
Total consumption per million passenger-km (MJ - 10 ⁶ joules)	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.3	4%	16%			EN3 – LT
Average age of bus fleet (years)	8.3	8.8	8.8	8.5	-0.3 year	0.2 year			LT2
Average age of metro cars (years)	35	36	37	38	1 year	3 years			LT2

Objective 8 Plan, design and carry out projects while taking their environmental, social and economic impacts into account

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Number of projects in progress during the year that underwent a sustainable development (SD) assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	32	N/A	N/A			
Percentage of projects in progress during the year that underwent an SD assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	27%	N/A	N/A	100%	2011	

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Number of projects authorized by the Board of Directors during the year that underwent an SD assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	N/A			
Percentage of projects authorized by the Board of Directors during the year that underwent an SD impact assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	56%	N/A	N/A	100%	2011	

Objective 9 Aim for recognition of the STM as an employer of choice, both by its employees and by job seekers

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Workforce	7,932	7,996	8,398	8,603	2%	8%			LA1
Permanent	7,495	7,606	8,036	8,247	3%	10%			
Temporary	437	390	362	356	-2%	-19%			
Percentage of permanent workforce	94%	95%	96%	96%	0%	2%			
Diversity of workforce									LA13
Percentage of women	22%	23%	23%	23%	0%	1%	31%		
Percentage of visible and ethnic minorities	12%	14%	16%	17%	1%	5%	10%		
Payroll (\$M)	573.1	590.2	619.9	661.5	8%	15%			EC1
Average length of employment (years)	13.7	13.3	12.4	11.4	-105%	-236%			LA2
Turnover rate (% of employees who leave the STM)	6%	7%	7%	6%	-1%	-1%			LA2
Percentage of unionized employees	92%	91%	91%	90%	-2%	-2%			LA4
Workplace health and safety: work-related accident frequency	11.0	10.0	9.4	7.7	-18%	-30%			LA7

Table of STM Sustainable Development Indicators
(as at December 31, 2009)

AREA 2 – SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Workplace health and safety: work-related accident gravity	310.6	331.8	332.2	281.2	-15%	-9%			LA7
Percentage of employees with access to flextime programs	39%	40%	40%	40%	-1%	0%			
Employee training (person-hours)	171,215	212,332	233,146	219,800	-6%	28%			LA10
Expenditure devoted to training (\$M)	11.0	11.0	10.9	10.4	-4%	-5%			
Percentage of payroll devoted to training	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%			LA10

AREA 3 – PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Objective 10 Increase employee awareness of sustainable development

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Donations distributed by employees (\$)	670,037	760,109	819,431	892,041	9%	33%			SO1

Objective 11 Position the STM as a responsible, committed company

INDICATOR (unit of measure)	2006	2007	2008	2009	Change 2008–2009	Change 2006–2009	Target		GRI indicator
							Value	Horizon	
Customer satisfaction (% of satisfied and very satisfied customers)	84%	82%	82%	86%	4%	2%	87%	2011	PR5

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. The data have been adjusted following an audit by the Ministère des Transports du Québec.
(in thousands of km travelled)
2006: $129,615 + 14 = 129,629$
2007: $134,805 - 292 = 134,513$
2008: $148,520 - 660 = 147,860$
2. The data have been adjusted following an audit by the Ministère des Transports du Québec.
(in thousands of km travelled)
2006: $69,776 + 14 = 69,790$
2007: $70,014 - 293 = 69,721$
2008: $72,805 - 661 = 72,144$
3. The change is related to the rollout of the Opus card, which allows greater control over the use of reduced fares.
4. The Family Outings Program, which allows up to five children under the age of 12 to travel for free with an adult holding a valid ticket on weekends and holidays, was introduced in 2009.
5. The Origin-Destination (O-D) survey is conducted every five years. The coverage rates will be based on the analysis of data from the latest survey (2008), which will be available in 2010.
6. Due to a change in the method of calculating the modal share in the O-D 2008 survey compared with O-D 2003, the information published last year has been revised (64%).
7. Four new Navette Or shuttles were added in 2009, allowing seniors to take advantage of public transit with routes and schedules tailored to their needs.
8. Under the Réno-Systèmes program, elevators were added to Lionel-Groulx, Berri-UQAM and Bonaventure stations in 2009.
9. According to STM standards in effect at the time of construction, eight metro stations did not have the required depth for the installation of escalators. Today's metro design standards and criteria, revised in 2008, call for escalators in all new stations, regardless of depth.
10. Under the Réno-Stations program, warning tiles for people with visual limitations were installed in 25 stations.
11. The number of passes issued is based on demand.
12. STM has two Web sites. The Web site www.mouvementcollectif.org meets standards for universal accessibility.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

13. All new buses will be equipped with front ramps.
14. The data for the number of trips have been adjusted.
2006: $1,940,066 + 1,000 = 1,941,066$
2007: $2,084,745 + 164 = 2,084,909$
2008: $2,257,424 + 35 = 2,257,459$
15. The increase is attributable to the zero refusal policy for individual transportation requests received by 9:30 p.m. the day before.
16. The data for the number of trips by minibus have been adjusted
2006: $403,631 + 208 = 403,839$
2007: $393,607 + 95 = 393,702$
17. The data for the number of trips by accessible taxi have been adjusted
2006: $215,059 + 111 = 215,170$
2007: $301,755 + 12 = 301,767$
2008: $382,257 + 32 = 382,289$
18. The data for the number of trips by taxi have been adjusted
2006: $1,321,376 + 681 = 1,322,057$
2007: $1,389,383 + 57 = 1,389,440$
2008: $1,475,010 + 3 = 1,475,013$
19. The increase is proportional to the STM's stepped-up efforts to improve both short-term service (leading to higher operating expenses) and long-term service (capital expenditure for bus fleet renewal and infrastructure maintenance, among other things).
20. The data published in 2008 contained an error in calculation for the year 2008.
They were:
Acquisitions of goods and services in Québec (\$M) = 294.1
Percentage of acquisitions from Québec companies = 55.9%
21. Construction contracts, which are nearly all awarded to Québec companies, formed a lower proportion in 2009.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

22. As of 2009, sales taxes on capital expenditure are included in our calculations of economic spinoffs. The data published in 2008 have been adjusted as follows:
2006: $31.7 + 13.9$ (taxes) (\$M) = 45.6
2007: $31.1 + 14.3$ (taxes) (\$M) = 45.4
2008: $35.8 + 20.8$ (taxes) (\$M) = 56.6
23. Preferential measures for buses have been implemented, as per the Montréal Transportation Plan.
24. The method of calculating the target has been revised to avoid counting both sides of the street twice (morning and afternoon).
25. The data collection systems currently in place do not allow us to capture all sources for residual materials, residual hazardous materials, paper consumption and some emissions of airborne contaminants such as VOCs and particulate matter (PM). However, we consider the reliability rate of the data shown to be approximately 90%.
26. The objectives and targets in the Environmental Protection Plan were prioritized at the end of 2009.
27. All new buses are equipped with non-spill fuel delivery systems.
28. The annual changes in the quantities of residual materials and residual hazardous materials recovered are directly related to the nature and number of activities carried out by the STM over the years and to the introduction of recovery infrastructure at the various facilities.
29. Quantities of wood pallets recovered have been added to the data published in 2008.
2008: $3,032 + 136 = 3,168$ tonnes
30. The quantities indicated refer to printing paper use only.
31. The increase in CO, NO_x, SO_x and PM emissions is mainly due to the opening of the Legendre bus body shop.
32. The increase in emissions from mobile sources is due to the 7% growth in bus service in 2009.
33. Due to an error in data transcription, the 2008 Sustainable Development Report (SDR) indicated SO_x emissions of 14.01 tonnes from mobile sources in 2006.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

34. Emissions from building painting operations have been added to the figures published in the 2008 SDR, and total emissions from the major overhauls shop have been revised downward.
2006: $23.996 + 3.513 - 0.194 = 27.31$
2007: $21.18 + 2.629 - 0.304 = 23.50$
2008: $19.29 + 3.361 - 1.303 = 21.35$
35. The increase in VOC emissions from stationary sources is due to a wide-ranging graffiti clean-up operation in our metro stations.
36. Due to an error in data transcription, the 2008 SDR indicated emissions of 312.9 tonnes in 2006.
37. Emissions produced by air conditioners at the Saint-Michel transportation centre and heat pumps at the Legendre transportation centre have been added to the figures in the 2008 SDR for 2007 and 2008.
2007: $25,514.2 + 13.4 = 25,527.8$
2008: $25,796.1 + 13.4 = 25,809.5$
38. The data for 2007 and 2008 have been adjusted to reflect actual emissions from road service vehicles and service vehicles used in tunnels.
2007: $120,180 - 166 = 120,014$
2008: $120,865 - 166 = 120,699$
39. The increase in GHG emissions is due to the growth in bus service.
40. Due to a flaw in the measurement system, we are unable to obtain reliable data for 2009. We will publish the revised data in the next SDR.
41. In the 2008 SDR, consumption of natural gas (PJ) for 2006 in surface and tunnel facilities was counted twice.
2006: $3.28 - 0.2 = 3.07$
42. The increase in fuel consumption is due to the growth in bus service.
43. The data have been adjusted following an audit by the Ministère des Transports du Québec (see notes 1 and 2).