



## Sudbury Cyclists Union

September 30, 2013

To:

David Shelsted, Director of Roads

MMM Group

Tony Cecutti, GM Infrastructure Services

CGS Mayor & Council

Re: City of Greater Sudbury Transportation Study

The Sudbury Cyclists Union (SCU) has met several times to review the large amount of information that was presented at the Transportation Study public open house on June 19, 2013. We are enclosing general comments on the information presented at the open house, as well as comments on some of the infrastructure that was proposed for Sudbury's Active Transportation Network.

While we are providing some feedback, we have many questions that will be difficult to answer without additional consultation. We have a number of concerns about the process involved, the context of the study, the specific routes, and the suggested bicycle facilities for these routes.

Our number one concern is that the impact of approving the Network without a guiding framework means that there is no guidance for ensuring that the plans are actually implemented.

After hearing comments by City staff at the open house that the proposed Active Transportation Network would probably not be completed by 2031, cyclists are finding it difficult to believe that the plans suggested at the open house will ever come to fruition.

We are also concerned that the City does not yet seem to understand that cycling is integral to our transportation infrastructure. At the Finance Committee meeting on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013, we heard how City staff cautioned the committee and stated that investing in cycling infrastructure would take monies away from planned transportation budgets. Cycling infrastructure is transportation infrastructure, and along with pedestrian infrastructure, it is part of the City's current infrastructure deficit that we must address.

Along with finalizing the Active Transportation Network design, the City needs to implement a number of initiatives in order to demonstrate its commitment to cycling infrastructure in Sudbury.

### **1. Complete Streets**

We applaud entrenching a Complete Streets policy into the Official Plan as recommended at the public input session.

We need to ensure that the implementation of the policy adheres to its 10 policy elements. (see <http://completestreetsforcanada.ca/policy-elements>).

This would ensure that the development and maintenance of all roads address the needs of all road users.

## **2. Cycling Strategy**

We need to create and implement a Sudbury Cycling Strategy that provides the framework for current and future transportation infrastructure work as it relates to cycling. This strategy would provide a cycling vision, strategic directions, guiding principles, goals, and a commitment to future action plans. It would also identify areas for action that would be used to develop yearly plans and budgets.

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation released its Cycling Strategy (#CyclingON) at the end of August 2013 (see <http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/pubs/cycling-guide/pdfs/MTO-CycleON-EN.pdf>). It will guide the development of provincial implementation plans, which are due to be released in spring 2014. This strategy was developed in consultation with a large number of community partners and the public at large, who were provided with many opportunities for dialogue. The SCU provided a lengthy commentary and we are very pleased with the outcome of the consultation.

The Strategy speaks to partnerships with other Ministries, with municipalities, and with other organizations. The Province has made it clear that it wants to support those communities that include Complete Streets principles in their Official Plans, as well as cycling master plans.

Implementation plans will no doubt include provincial funding for cycling infrastructure. We need to demonstrate that we have plans in place to implement cycling infrastructure if we want to be in a position to take advantage of those opportunities.

As well, in 2010, the Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel presented its Sustainable Mobility Plan (SMP), which included excellent recommendations. The report was presented to the City, but it was never formerly approved. Strategies were not developed from its recommendations.

We suggest that the City use #CyclingON and the SMP as a basis for developing a Cycling Strategy for Sudbury. It took the province of Ontario only 3 months to develop its final Strategy after the end of the public input process. We should strive to have one in place in time to drive, at the latest, 2015-2016 budget decisions.

## **3. Implementation Plans**

Once a broad strategy has been approved, additional policies and implementation plans need to be developed. Public open house documents indicate that these were to be developed as part of Phase 3. However, these were not presented. Plans should include measurable long- and short-term goals, targets, and budgets.

A main action area in our Cycling Strategy should be to develop cycling infrastructure in all areas of the City. We need to do this in three ways:

- Yearly proactive investment to complete the approved Active Transportation Network as prioritized in the strategy and its accompanying implementation plans
- Mandated cycling infrastructure when there are new subdivision developments
- Mandated cycling infrastructure during yearly roadwork projects that typically address only sections of roads

We are very pleased that the City wants to implement a line item in the budget that clearly identifies dollars to be spent on developing new cycling routes. We would also suggest that the City provide a complete picture of cycling infrastructure spending by identifying cycling infrastructure related dollars when individual roads projects are planned and executed.

We are greatly encouraged by Council's commitment to starting to construct routes in 2014-2015. It would have been beneficial to have a Cycling Strategy and corresponding implementation plans to guide this allocation. Since that is not the case, we ask that targets are identified in consultation with all stakeholders.

#### **4. Active Transportation Network (AT Network)**

We agreed with the following statement that appears on the Active Transportation maps: *"A design feasibility study will be required prior to implementation of active transportation facilities in order to confirm the recommended facility type for each route segment. The outcome of the feasibility study may be a change in facility type or a recommendation to consider an alternative route."*

A steering committee should be appointed to guide the feasibility study, comprised of community stakeholders as well as Council and city staff representatives. At a minimum, representation should include Rainbow Routes, the Sustainable Mobility Panel and citizens who actively cycle on our roads. The SCU would like to have representation.

Stakeholder meetings need to be planned in the outlying communities, as well as in the city core, which should include several opportunities for two-way dialogue around specific routes and infrastructure recommendations.

We had thought that this would be done as part of the Transportation Study, especially since a consultant was hired to review and recommend the routes on the proposed Network. As this was not the case, we hope that this will be accomplished in time for the 2015-2016 budget.

We are assuming that as with most feasibility studies, a consultant will be hired to complete the study. Since the current proposals draw heavily on the previous excellent work by the Bicycle Advisory Panel and the Sustainable Advisory Panel, this should not be an onerous task.

However, the delay of almost 10 months in the Transportation Study process has meant that we've lost opportunities for the 2014-2015 budget. Let's insure that everything is in place so we have a prioritized framework for the 2015-2016 budget. And that the final feasibility study is done in an open, transparent, and consultative manner.

We look forward to your response on how we can proceed with further dialogue with the City on how we implement cycling infrastructure in all of the City of Greater Sudbury.

The Sudbury Cyclists Union

Encl.



## Transportation Study General Comments

The comments that follow are general in nature and speak to the process used for the development of the proposed routes, as well as the principles that guided the selection of specific routes. While we are also submitting comments on specific routes appearing on the maps, we would prefer to discuss specific route proposals directly with the City.

In this document, we refer to the materials that were presented in the two Transportation Study Open Houses and in the Draft Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18: Bicycle Facilities, which is used as a reference in the Open House materials.

<p><b>Guiding principles</b></p> <p>On page 2 of the materials provided in the June 2013 Open House, the 3 main principles are stated:</p> <p><b>Healthy Communities</b> To create complete streets that are designed, constructed and maintained to support all users and all modes of transportation</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b> To limit the vehicle kilometers travelled per year through integrated transportation and land use planning</p> <p><b>Economic Viability</b> To ensure that the transportation network supports mobility so that people and freight can access destinations with limited delay</p>	<p><i><b>The current study does not meet the principle of sustainability as stated in the materials because this study does not contain any information about public transit. How can a transportation study that is focused on “integrated transportation” not include transit? It is integral to changing how we look at the use and development of roads. There are many cyclists who use a combination of cycling/transit, especially those who live in outlying areas. A proper transportation study needs to look at how transit stops, hubs, and service affects the use of cycling infrastructure.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>We have heard that transit was not included because roads and transit are the responsibilities of different departments. We are extremely disappointed that such a critical study was diminished by excluding critical information due to this reason.</b></i></p>
<p><b>Designing for all users</b></p> <p>On page 9 of Book 18, the document discusses the need to plan for all users:</p> <p>2.1. User Characteristics A cycling network should provide a clear, well defined and comfortable environment for all anticipated users. Therefore, it is important to identify the primary target groups for whom the facility is being designed. Cyclists can generally be grouped according to age, skill level, comfort zone</p>	<p><i><b>The City of Greater Sudbury has many current and potential users of cycling infrastructure.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>Many of our members who currently use the roads cycle out of necessity because they don’t have access to motorized transportation. Statistics in the Sustainable Mobility Plan in fact indicate the 1/3 of our population does not own a car. This demographic has a right to safe transportation.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>We constantly hear that more people would</b></i></p>

<p>and trip purpose.</p> <p>Page 11 of the document charts the types of cyclists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1% strong and fearless</li> <li>- 7% enthused and confident</li> <li>- 32% no way, no how</li> <li>- 60% interested but concerned</li> </ul> <p>Page 12 defines 3 major trip purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Utilitarian</li> <li>- Recreational</li> <li>- Touring trips</li> </ul>	<p><i>cycle, but they don't because they think that cycling is too dangerous on our City roads. The statistics indicate that we have a pool of 92% of the population that could be encouraged to leave their cars at home and use active transportation for many types of trips, thus meeting the goal of the Sustainability guiding principle.</i></p> <p><i>This would save money as road maintenance would be less expensive, and it would make redundant the need to add more very expensive roads or to expand existing roads.</i></p> <p><i>Principles within Complete Streets and the 8-80 principle should be applied to all infrastructure design. (8-80 principle = infrastructure that can be used by people from 8 to 80 years of age).</i></p> <p><i>Skill and comfort levels can be enhanced with proper investment in cycling education for both cyclists and motorists.</i></p> <p><i>In order to encourage more cyclists, we need to change the attitudes of citizens, and of staff at the City, who remain convinced that our number one priority for roads is the vehicle – to the exclusion of cycling. Cycling infrastructure <u>is</u> transportation infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Trip purpose has not been given enough importance as an input for specific recommendations in the proposed network. Showing rough trails as the only option for some routes does not address the needs of the utilitarian cyclist.</i></p> <p><i>The design of City streets has evolved over the years, but it is still true that major arteries are often the only way to get from one neighbourhood to another. All major arteries should have cycling infrastructure if there are no other convenient options for safe cycling.</i></p> <p><i>City staff who have led the project have openly said that they are recreational cyclists and not commuters. Yet more and more cyclists are cycling to commute to work, schools, and to business and shopping destinations. We must</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>give current and potential cyclists safe options for getting to destinations in Sudbury. We suggest we address the needs of the utilitarian cyclist with a destination priority order of schools, work, business/shopping, entertainment and recreational.</i></p> <p><i>The Bicycle Advisory Panel recommended certain routes and provided a rationale for those routes based on important destination on those routes. This should be done in order to understand the route choices that were proposed, especially if they do not match the recommendations of the Bicycle Advisory Panel, or the Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel.</i></p>
<p><b>Trails and the Network</b></p> <p>Page 7 of the June 2013 Open House charts the various options for Bicycle Facilities according to Book 18. Of particular interest, the criteria for establishing an off-road trail states:</p> <p>Ideal for families and recreational users. Suggested when on-road improvements are not feasible along roadways, and when ample ROW is available.</p> <p>The In Constrained Corridors section states:</p> <p>Typically incorporated into parkland and valley land. Cyclists may choose to remain in the roadway.</p>	<p><i>The proposed AT network includes the Rainbow Route trails in the City, some of which cannot be used by cyclists, some of which can only be used by mountain bikes, and some of which are too difficult to use for the average cyclist. Almost all cannot be navigated safely in the dark by a woman pulling her child in a trailer. Including these trails without indicating their suitability for commuting cyclists makes it appear that all routes are suitable, and they are not.</i></p> <p><i>If the AT trails are to be included as a substitution for regular on- and off-road cycling infrastructure that is suitable for users other than recreational cyclists, then the City needs to ensure that they meet the same standards that accommodate all various user groups. For example, to be the only option for connectivity between neighbourhoods, the trail must be paved, lighted, and designed so it can be used by 8-80 age groups.</i></p>
<p><b>Facility type selection</b></p> <p>On page 158 of Book 18, the document talks to Phase 2 of implementing a bikeway network:</p> <p>6.1.2 Phase 2: Bicycle Facility Type Selection</p> <p>Part one of the assessment consists of confirming the feasibility of the route based on a review of the submitted plans, supporting route selection, planning and design criteria, as well as other relevant information. The Bicycle Facility Type Selection Tool presented in Section 3 should serve as the basis for this feasibility assessment, and should include:</p>	<p><i>We are assuming that this was done as part of the development of the proposed routes, yet no rationale has been presented for the bicycle facility type selections chosen by the City. Is it possible to see the data so we can understand why certain routes were chosen over others, why certain roads were not identified, and why certain facility types were proposed for some roads? There are some proposed facilities that we question, like the recommendation of only a marked route on Lorne Street – the volume of traffic alone would indicate that this is an inappropriate selection for this proposal. The</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A collection or confirmation of current roadway characteristics including AADT volumes, collision data and commercial vehicle percentages; and</li> <li>• A field check for both on and off-road route segments to measure sight distances (if applicable), and to identify any other site characteristics that may be considered for facility type selection.</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>Bicycle Advisory Panel provided the rationale for their choices for all citizens to review; we feel that the City should do the same.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Facility type selection</b></p> <p>On page 7 of the June 2013 Open House materials, the various facility options are provided, along with the principles for applying each option to road types.</p>	<p><b><i>Standards need to drive the appropriate facility selection for most roads, with very few exceptions allowed; these should be clearly articulated and done in consultation with the cycling community.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The facility types that were chosen to be implemented in the city were: signed route, route/paved shoulder, bike lane, edgeline, cycle track, and trail.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Do these major categories include the subcategories sharrows and separated bike lanes, paved shoulders with buffers? If so, that was not identified on the maps, so it is difficult to agree or disagree with the proposals without those clarifications.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>We also have several concerns about suggested facilities on specific roads/streets.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The City proposes to convert boulevards to cycle tracks. We acknowledge that this may be a cost saving, but there are inherent dangers with implementing cycle tracks along roads that have many private and business entrances. How will the City ensure that cyclists are protected at driveway and business entrance intersections? Will the City commit to taking out poles and other obstructions before implementing the track? Will the City commit to retrofitting all curbs that impeded a cyclist's progress? Will the City commit to ensuring that proper line of sight is implemented at all vulnerable intersections?</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The City is suggesting we use "edgelines" as a cycling facility type. This is in essence a bike lane that has parking permitted on it, and no bike lane road markings. Where are the guidelines for their application? What is the justification for using something that is not recognized as a standard</i></b></p>

	<p><i>cycling infrastructure type? What is the justification for using it on the suggested routes i.e. Kelly Lake Road. If there is room for an edgeline and parking is not an issue, why not put in a bike lane?</i></p> <p><i>The City is proposing to use bike route signage only on some roads. Even with education campaigns associated with their implementation, automobile drivers will in all probability not change their driving behaviours due to these signs. A better choice would be to implement markings on the road and larger Share the Road signage (sharrows).</i></p>
<p><b>Stakeholder involvement</b></p> <p>On page 157 of Book 18, the document describes the 5-Stage Implementation Schedule proposed for implementing a bikeway network. Namely,  Phase 1: Preliminary Review  Phase 2: Bicycle Facility Type Selection and Feasibility Assessment  Phase 3: Facility and Network Design  Phase 4: Monitoring  Phase 5: Update Municipal or Regional Official Plan</p>	<p><i>The document mentions workshops with stakeholders to review and discuss alternative design solutions. At both open houses, the material that was presented was incomplete and very hard to decipher. Concerned citizens spent innumerable hours trying to make sense of both sets of maps. At the second Open House, we requested that the names of roads be included on the maps for all proposed routes, in order to identify what was being proposed. Some effort was made to clean up the maps before they were posted online, but that was too late for us to pose questions to staff. And not all routes were clearly identified - we've had to consult Google Maps again in order to try to identify some of the streets and roads that are being proposed.</i></p> <p><i>The maps at the second Open House did not cover the whole of the City of Greater Sudbury, so while some infrastructure was proposed at the first Open House, we do not know if it is included – the second Open House maps do not show all regions (for example Onaping and Levack).</i></p> <p><i>Will there be other opportunities to meet with staff about the specific details now that we have had an opportunity to better examine the documents? The Open Houses, in our opinion, are not the proper venue to discuss specific recommendations; they are a one-way presentation to the public, and not an opportunity for meaningful dialogue.</i></p> <p><i>There is mention of a feasibility study. How will</i></p>



	<p><i>the public be involved? In particular, cyclists who ride on the City roads should be involved.</i></p> <p><i>It is to be noted that staff who prepared and directed the project are not cyclists and do not see our roads from a cyclist's point of view. In response to questions as to whether the consultants had ridden (on a bicycle) all of the proposed routes, the answer was no. How can cyclists respect the proposals in this case?</i></p> <p><i>Some suggestions that were made at the first Open House were rejected, but no rationale was provided for the decisions. Will feedback be given this time to people who submit recommendations?</i></p>
<p><b>Stakeholder involvement</b></p> <p>On page 4 of the January 2012 Open House, mention is made of SMAP's involvement in the project:</p> <p>SMAP</p> <p>The Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel is mandated to assist staff and Council in implementing a vision for a holistic approach to a multi-modal transportation system where citizens can walk, cycle and/or use public transit efficiently and safely to get to their destinations. SMAP will be working closely with the project team throughout the project to ensure this vision is carried forward through the Master Plan.</p>	<p><i>SMAP has NOT been consulted in a meaningful way. As the developers of the Sustainable Mobility Plan, they should have been involved much more closely with the route and facility type selections. Will there be an opportunity for SMAP and other cycling organizations to be part of the process as it moves forward? Including the final selection of routes and infrastructure? And the development of policies and implementation strategies? As it is now, SMAP and cyclists who are the major stakeholders in the development of cycling infrastructure are not being included in the process.</i></p>
<p><b>Process Stages</b></p> <p>In the Process Overview at the January 2012 Open House, the various phases were presented on page 3 of the materials. Phase 3 was presented as:</p> <p>Phase 3: Define Implementation Strategy and Short-Term Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify and Recommend Transportation Improvements</li> <li>- Develop Supportive Cycling and Pedestrian Network Policies &amp; Implementation Strategy</li> </ul> <p>On page 16 of the materials, step 9 details:</p> <p>9. Prepare Implementation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare an Opinion of Cost to construct the</li> </ul>	<p><i>Page 3 of the materials for the June 2013 Open House indicate that we are at the end of Phase 3, yet the Open House did not provide an opportunity to review any of materials that will be developed in step 9. Will we be given an opportunity to do this? Staff indicated at the Open House that the next step is a final report that will be presented to Council.</i></p> <p><i>The materials indicate that the original timeframes for Phase 3 were spring 2012, with the next review be scheduled for September 2012. This review was delayed for almost 10 months. As a result any opportunity to integrate cycling infrastructure into 2013 summer road construction projects was lost. How will the City</i></p>

<p>network (based on unit costing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify priorities</li> <li>• Identify maintenance strategies</li> <li>• Develop phasing strategy and strategy to prioritize sidewalk improvements</li> <li>• Identify potential funding strategies and partnership opportunities</li> <li>• Public Review</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>mandate the required retrofits for projects that did not include infrastructure due to the delay in developing the implementation plan? For example, the Lasalle/Notre Dame intersection?</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Will the City confirm that all 2014 projects that are currently being planned will incorporate Complete Streets (and therefore cycling) principles?</i></b></p>
<p><b>Policies – Complete Streets</b></p> <p>Phase 3 identified above mandates the development of Network Policies and Implementation Strategy</p>	<p><b><i>Is the City committed to formally adopting Complete Streets within the Official Plan? The June 2013 Open House documents refer to Complete Streets as a policy, but there is no recommendation that the full Complete Streets approach as described by Complete Streets Canada should be integrated into the Official Plan.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Is the City also committed to develop Complete Streets Guidelines as other Canadian municipalities are doing?</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Is the City committed to creating a formal Cycling Strategy and accompanying implementation plans, as was currently developed by the province of Ontario and other municipalities?</i></b></p>
<p><b>Policies – Road Classifications</b></p> <p>Page 5 of the June 2013 Open House materials proposes a Road Classification policy.</p>	<p><b><i>We applaud the policy, but also are concerned that the classifications might not necessarily be applied to all roads because staff have deemed the implementation too costly.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>We would like see an analysis of all arterial and collector roads, complete with justification as to why some of them were left out of the proposed network and why some of them don't have the recommended cycling infrastructure as per the proposed bicycle facility type selection.</i></b></p>
<p><b>Traffic calming</b></p> <p>On page 118 of Book 18, the document discusses traffic calming.</p> <p>Traffic Calming measures such as roundabouts, speed tables, road diets and reduced speed limits aim to reduce the speed and volume of motor vehicle traffic on a particular roadway. However, consideration must be given to ensure traffic calming designs do not adversely affect cyclists</p>	<p><b><i>We are very concerned with the recent implementation of curb extensions in the City. Extensions on Churchill Avenue, Kathleen Street, and this year on Attlee Avenue were implemented with the intent of slowing cars down but are detrimental to encouraging cyclists on these roads.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The implementation in its current form is dangerous as it forces cyclists into the ongoing path of vehicles at many points along the road,</i></b></p>

<p>(refer to Section 5.1.1 for design guidance).</p> <p>Further, the information on page 120 and 121 discusses chicanes and their impact on cyclists. This discussion can also be applied to curb extensions, which are currently being implemented in Sudbury.</p>	<p><b><i>and especially at intersections. There are other designs of curb extensions that are friendlier to cyclists and that allow them to stay in a straight line.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>There has been no driver education to accompany the implementation of the measures.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>On these roads, cyclists who take the whole lane as a safety precaution suffer road rage outbursts from drivers.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The Transportation Study should include standards for the traffic calming initiatives that will be implemented in the City. Will the City commit to implementing traffic calming policies and also commit to retrofitting the curb extensions that have already been implemented and that are a danger to cyclists?</i></b></p>
<p><b>Other</b></p>	<p><b><i>Building an appropriate transportation network is not just about building roads or talking about accommodating motor vehicles.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>There are a number of other transportation issues that directly affect the successful implementation of sustainable transportation for all road users.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Policies and standards should be developed and approved, and used to drive all decisions in project implementation plans. Lighting, bicycle parking, road/trail surfaces, intersection design including roundabouts, and signage standards are some of the issues that need to be included as more finite plans are developed.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>We would like the opportunity to see and discuss existing policies that directly affect the design and maintenance of roads since they affect cyclists who use the roads. For example, we understand that under the current roads design policy, all roads are designed to a standard of a 60 km/hr speed limit. This is a concern for us.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>There are also gaps that may not be addressed in existing policies. For example, we understand that the roundabout in Minnow Lake will soon go to tender. Can we see the policy or the guideline that provided the basis for its design?</i></b></p>

	<p><b><i>A transportation study also needs to accommodate a wide variety of “vehicles”, including vespas, ebikes, scooters, etc, especially if the intent is to accommodate all modes of transportation.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Review of speed limits on existing roads, including standards and enforcement should also be examined as they directly impact the safety of vulnerable road users. We understand there is a motion to Council to reduce all non-posted (i.e. residential) area speed limits to 40 km/hour. We agree with this proposal.</i></b></p>
--	---



## Transportation Study Specific Route Comments

There is a wealth of information in the proposed routes for the Active Transportation Network. Our specific route comments relate to our primary concern, namely busy roads that are located within the City core or that connect neighbourhoods within the larger regional areas. These roads would be considered, for the most part, dangerous by a novice or nervous cyclist.

Our approach is that quieter residential roads can easily be cycled once appropriate route signage and educational campaigns for both cyclists and motorists are put into place. That is not the case for arteries and collector roads.

For the analysis of primary roads, we attempted to match the list of arteries identified on the City's website with the recommendations that were provided on the map. There may be some mistakes in our analysis because of the difference in some of the names and descriptions of roads. This analysis was the result of meetings held with members and is a compilation of many comments. The analysis is detailed in the sections *City Core Main Roads*, *Connecting and Neighbourhood Primary and Secondary Arteries*, and *Neighbourhood Secondary Arteries*.

We have also provided comments about some neighbourhood streets, but we've not addressed each and every single cycling route proposed on the maps. This feedback was received from many individual cyclists who consistently cycle in their neighbourhoods and who submitted their comments to us electronically. The analysis is detailed in the section *Neighbourhood Streets*.

We look forward to an inclusive final feasibility study which we understand will result in the final Active Transportation Network configuration.

### City Core Main Roads

Road	City Recommendations	Comments	SCU Recommendations
Falconbridge Hwy – primary artery	Route/Paved Shoulder from Longyear Drive (Falconbridge) to Maley Dr. Nothing south of Maley Dr.	This is a neighbourhood link (i.e. Don Lita and Lebel St. areas), and a connection from Garson to the rest of the city. We see many cyclists and pedestrians using the small paved shoulders on the west section between Lasalle and the Kingsway, including students from St. Charles College. Cyclists are also using the sidewalks on the east side.	Add infrastructure on the section from Maley Drive to the Kingsway. Adding wider paved shoulders and a separated path on the east side should not be cost prohibitive.

Kingsway – primary artery	Cycle Track from Barrydowne to Bancroft Dr.	<p>There are no options for reaching many of the businesses located on the section of the Kingsway south of Bancroft Dr. While many of the businesses on the Kingsway are automobile-related, there are nevertheless restaurants and shops that cyclists may want to reach. Workers at these businesses may also want to choose to cycle to work.</p>	<p>We applaud the cycle track from Barrydowne to Bancroft; we are very interested in seeing how the City will handle left-hand turns for cyclists from the Kingsway to Bancroft. This is an extremely dangerous intersection for cyclists.</p> <p>We need to examine creative options to offer cycling options to all of the Kingsway and Lloyd St. between Falconbridge Rd and Notre Dame/Paris. Perhaps a shared cycle/pedestrian track could be investigated south of Bancroft as pedestrian traffic is minimal on this section of the Kingsway.</p> <p>Large paved shoulders between Barrydowne and Falconbridge should be investigated to provide a contiguous route towards Coniston.</p> <p>Large paved shoulders east of Falconbridge Rd. should be extended, especially as this route may be a part of provincial cycling routes (Trans-Canada Trail, Georgian Cycling Route).</p>
Notre Dame – primary artery	Bike lanes from Elm St. to Lasalle.	<p>This is a very busy road where there is frequent speeding. We will be very interested in seeing how the City will handle the intersection at Lasalle and Notre Dame given that no infrastructure was incorporated into our current \$8-9 M dollar reconfiguration of this intersection.</p>	<p>The choice of bike lanes on the section between Elm and Lasalle is excellent.</p>
Barrydowne Rd. – secondary artery	Bike lanes from the Kingsway to Lillian Blvd. Edgeline from Kingsway to Marcus. Route/paved shoulder from Maley to Lillian.	<p>This is a very busy road with many cars turning in and out of businesses and streets.</p> <p>Will the City allow large truck traffic (i.e.</p>	<p>We applaud the lanes and Barrydowne should serve as a example that could be implemented on other busy arteries.</p> <p>We question the use of an edgeline from</p>

		slurry, transports) on the section between Maley to Lillian once the Maley extension is built?	<p>the Kingsway to Marcus; there should be no parking allowed on this section – why were bike lanes not identified?</p> <p>If Maley Dr. is extended, consideration should be taken to provide extra large paved shoulders with possibly a buffer, especially if there are large trucks allowed.</p>
Lasalle Blvd. – secondary artery	Cycle track from Notre Dame to Lansing. Nothing east of Lansing.	The section east of Lansing includes GoodLife Fitness and Jean-Ethier Blais school. Leaving out the section from Lansing to Falconbridge does not provide an adequate connector for the neighbourhoods east of Falconbridge Rd. Typical speeds of automobiles on this section exceed 60 km/hour. The section of Lasalle east of Falconbridge includes a lot of industrial traffic.	The cycle track should be extended from Lansing to Falconbridge Rd. and then a bike lane implemented from Falconbridge to Isabella.
Brady St. – primary artery	No cycling infrastructure	<p>We acknowledge that there are issues with adding cycling infrastructure on Brady St., in particular under the bridge. However, there is currently no easy connector from the West End to the city core, and to the hotel on Brady.</p> <p>See also remarks for Douglas St. as both roads are interconnected to provide access to the downtown.</p>	<p>Discussions should be held with cyclists and the community to see what creative solutions can be found.</p> <p>Possibilities could include at the least a bike lane from the hotel to Douglas, with a controlled crosswalk to Riverside.</p>
Paris St. – primary artery	Cycle track from Elm to York. Signed route from York to Long Lake Rd.	A cycle track is a good compromise. We have concerns about conflict areas with driveways and business entrances. The City will need to ensure clear line of sight, appropriate signage, and community education. We have concerns about the section from York to Long Lake Rd. being a signed route. Traffic is extremely high in this section.	<p>Ensure safety of cyclists on the cycle track (standards will need to be developed for all intersections).</p> <p>Re-evaluate the York to Long Lake Rd. section; extend the cycle track to Long Lake.</p>
Regent St. – primary and	Signed route from Douglas to	Why there is not a contiguous route from	Build a route along all of Regent St. so it

secondary artery	Elm. Signed route from Walford to Paris. Cycling track from Paris to Loach's Rd. Paved shoulder from Loach's Rd. to Countryside.	<p>Elm to Paris? How are cyclists supposed to safely travel north once they reach Walford? Martindale is not a good alternative due to its characteristics. Walford will take cyclists significantly out of their way through the downtown if they are attempting to get to the West End or Gatchell.</p> <p>Caution about paved shoulders without a proper buffer along a very heavily-travelled road where cars tend to exceed the speed limit.</p> <p>A signed route was completed for part of the section between Walford and the Four Corners. This includes sharrows. They have increased the safety of the "strong" cyclist but do not provide a safe route for the majority of potential cyclists.</p>	<p>connects as a minimum to Ontario St.</p> <p>Consider large, separated shoulders from Loach's Rd. to Countryside.</p> <p>Consider a separated bike path on the section from Walford to the Four Corners.</p>
Ste. Anne Rd. – primary artery	Signed route from Notre Dame to Elgin	This is a very wide street with fairly fast-flowing vehicles (although the stop light at the Radisson Hotel has helped). With the proposed cycle track on Notre Dame and the separated bike lanes on Frood, this street is a prime location for separated bike lanes.	Propose separated bike lanes.
Big Nickel Rd. – primary artery	No infrastructure	There seem to be other options to allow easy access from Lorne St. to the West End. However, a primary attraction is located on this road (Dynamic Earth). How will tourists get there safely?	Investigate future route, especially to link the soccer fields at Delki Dozzi and Dynamic Earth.
Douglas St. – primary artery	No infrastructure from Beatty to Brady	This is a major corridor into the south downtown from Copper Cliff, Gatchell and the West End. It has significant challenges – narrow lanes and high speed traffic.	<p>More investigation of the Douglas/Brady challenge is required.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be implemented to connect Beatty and Riverside in order to</p>



		The suggested alternative for travel from the West End is to go up Beatty to Elm (very large hill), or to cross Killer's Crossing (name used deliberately) to get to Riverside. However, with no connecting infrastructure on Brady, there is little sense in putting in infrastructure.	connect the West End to the downtown core.
Elm St. – secondary artery	<p>Signed route from Paris to Ethelbert. Route/paved shoulders from Ethelbert to Azilda.</p> <p>No infrastructure from Paris to Lloyd.</p>	<p>Given the traffic flow, is this sufficient? There are large trucks travelling all of Elm.</p> <p>While all of Elm leading to the Kingsway is a main corridor, there is a large extremely steep hill on the section from Paris to Lloyd.</p>	<p>Considering the average speed of traffic, especially in the city core, a signed route with sharrows signage might be sufficient along Elm St. from Ethelbert to Paris.</p> <p>We tentatively agree with no infrastructure between Paris and Lloyd because of the hill involved but other safe options need to be put into place to provide cyclists with an alternate route.</p>
Maley Dr. – secondary artery	Route with paved shoulders from Barrydowne to Falconbridge and for new proposed section from Barrydowne to Notre Dame.	<p>Cyclists are already using Maley to get from Garson to the City and in particular to Cambrian College.</p> <p>The choice should depend on the posted speed limits and the type of traffic. The intent of the extension is to divert trucks and cars from Lasalle so the assumption is heavy, large, and possibly speeding traffic on this road – slurry and transports already speed on Lasalle.</p>	If paved shoulders are proposed, they should be extra-wide and separated by a buffer. A separated path is preferable.
Second Ave. – secondary artery	Route with paved shoulders from Bancroft to Donna.	Why not take the opportunity to put in bike lanes to connect to the Bancroft lanes? There is not a lot of on-street parking. Several primary schools are located just off of Second Ave. A lot of traffic goes through this connector road. This road is due for reconstruction summer of 2014; it would be a shame to lose an opportunity on this road.	Re-evaluate the possibility of bike lanes on all of Second Ave.

Bancroft Dr. – secondary artery	Retain existing bike lanes from Bellevue to Moonlight. Signed route from Moonlight to Allen. Part of section from Bellevue to Kingsway is a signed route, part of that section has nothing	Not sure why the disconnect on the section between Bellevue and Kingsway.	Please provide rationale as to why there is only part of Bancroft with infrastructure between Bellevue and the Kingsway. We have concerns with the Silver Hills development and its integration with the Network, in particular as it relates to the possible roundabout.
Howey Dr. – secondary artery	Retain existing bike lanes.		We agree. We have concerns with the Silver Hills development and its integration with the Network, especially as it relates to the possible roundabout.
Morris St.	Retain existing bike lanes.		We agree.
Bellevue Ave. – secondary artery	Retain existing bike lanes.		We agree. We have concerns with the Silver Hills development and its integration with the Network, especially as it relates to the possible roundabout.
Martindale Rd.	Bike lanes from Regent to Lorne.	This is a heavily travelled road with industrial traffic. Speeding is prevalent.	We agree.
Kelly Lake Rd.	Edgeline from Lorne to Southview.	This is a heavily travelled road with industrial traffic and high speeds. Speeding is prevalent.	We propose bike lanes. Edgelines are dangerous to cyclists. There is very little parking on Kelly Lake that would warrant no lanes on this road.
Southview Dr.	Edgeline from Bouchard to Kelly Lake; trail from Kelly Lake to Bypass	We are nervous about trails being a safe option for all cyclists. These should only be implemented with the 8-80 rule, and with proper surfaces that allow all types of bikes to travel on the trail, including commuter bikes.  Also, there are little to no intersections on this road and nearby elementary schools.	Ensure any trails that are part of the network can accommodate all bikes and all cyclists.  Edgelines are dangerous to cyclists. With community input, evaluate what is required. We propose bike lanes or a separated path to provide increased comfort and safety to cyclists.
Long Lake Rd. – secondary artery	Signed bike route from Regent St. to end of bypass area. Route with paved shoulders from the end of the bypass area to what looks like Chief Lake Rd.	This is a very busy artery with a large volume of traffic and high speeds.  There is more and more traffic with the build-up of stores along the section just	Additional evaluation and community consultation will be required. A possibility is to extend the Paris separated bike path.

		<p>south of the Four Corners and this is likely to continue.</p> <p>Existing bike shops in this area attract large numbers of cyclists.</p> <p>The section that has paved shoulders also needs to be evaluated as there are homes, playgrounds, and schools along this area.</p>	
Elgin St. – secondary artery	Signed route from Ste. Anne's Rd. to Larch St.	Our comments assume Elgin Greenway from Larch to Van Horne will be built.	Investigate bike lanes from Larch to Ste. Anne's route to complete the inner-city loop.
Lloyd St. – secondary artery	No infrastructure Elm to Kingsway	This is a very busy street, but it is a main connector for cyclists going to the east end of the City. See additional comments for the Kingsway.	If there is cycling infrastructure implemented on the Kingsway, Lloyd or an alternative option needs to be part of a contiguous route.
Lorne St. – secondary artery	No infrastructure Elm to Edna. Signed route from Edna to Big Nickel Rd.	<p>How do cyclists get to businesses in the area just south of Elm (i.e. Dumas' grocery store)? Alternate routes show side streets in Gatchell and the West End, but they are convoluted and hilly. The Riverside/Junction Creek trail option limits access from the east side of Lorne.</p> <p>Lorne is a major traffic artery connecting Gatchell/the West End to downtown. There will be physical challenges with implementing infrastructure, but we need to look at creative solutions to include all of Lorne in our Network.</p> <p>The proposed Larch St extension will have cycling infrastructure that leads to no connecting infrastructure.</p> <p>With the volume of traffic on Lorne St., a signed route is not recommended</p>	Lorne needs to have infrastructure. Discussions on options are warranted.

		according to the Facility Type Selection tool.	
Montrose Ave – secondary artery	Signed route Lasalle to Maley extension	We have concerns over a signed route if Maley is extended and additional traffic is generated.	Discussions on options are warranted.
Ramsey Lake Rd – secondary artery	Trail from Paris to SouthBay Rd.	It is unclear what lies beyond the proposed trail as the map cuts off and does not show linkages in Laurentian University and elsewhere (i.e. South Bay)  What are the implications for the trail if this road is widened?	While it is paved, this trail is fairly narrow. Consideration should be given to increased cyclists/pedestrian traffic. Lighting is also a concern after sunset.
Van Horne St. – secondary artery	No infrastructure on any of Van Horne	There is a school on the section east of Paris, but it also contains a very steep hill.	We tentatively agree.
Westmount Ave – secondary artery	Edgeline from Barrydowne to Attlee	Why not bike lanes? We understand the concern that residents have for parking on Westmount, but this once quiet residential street has become an artery with most traffic not being local. The implementation of edgelines and traffic calming on Attlee which connects to Westmount is dangerous to cyclists.	Replace edgeline with bike lanes.

### Connecting and Neighbourhood Primary and Secondary Arteries

While we detail the connecting arteries below, we do not have sufficient information at this time to comment on most of them, other than to state that all connector roads with high-speed traffic should have paved shoulders wide enough to safely accommodate cyclists. This is especially important for roads that may become part of a regional or provincial cycling route. If Norm Miller's bill to implement a 1-metre wide paved shoulder on designated highways is passed, that will set a standard that we should adopt on our municipal highways.

Cote Blvd. – primary artery	Route with paved shoulder Notre Dame to Radar Rd. (Hanmer)		No comment at this time.
Dennie St. – primary artery	No infrastructure Municipal Rd 84 to Hanna Ave. (Capreol)		No comment at this time.
Estaire Rd. – primary artery	No infrastructure Highway 69 S.		No comment at this time.

	to South City limit		
Highway 144 – primary artery	No infrastructure West City limit to Highway 17		No comment at this time.
Highway 17 – primary artery	No infrastructure East City limit to Wahnapiatae	How are cyclists east of Coniston to get to the City? This is an extremely dangerous road with the volume of cars and trucks, and the speeds involved.	Paved shoulders should be put in place.
Highway 537 – primary artery	No infrastructure Highway 69 South to Hill St.		No comment at this time.
Highway 69 S. – primary artery	No infrastructure Ida St. to South City limit		Paved shoulders should be put in place.
Municipal Rd 35 – primary artery	Partial route with paved shoulder (Notre Dame in Azilda deviates from primary artery) Elm St. to Hwy 144	Paved shoulders on our main highways should be evaluated on all sections, not only for cyclists, but for cars and the life of the road. The reality is that some cyclists may not choose to detour into Azilda and their safety needs to be ensured.	While we agree with the proposed infrastructure in Azilda, consideration should be given to provide paved shoulders on the missing section of MR 35.
Municipal Rd 55 – primary artery	Partial trail identified from Kelly Lake to Lively for section Lorne St. to West City limit	If to be used for commuting, needs to be paved, lighted.	Cycling from regional communities west of Copper Cliff needs to be accommodated. This road is also part of the proposed Georgian Bay Cycling Route.
Municipal Rd 80 – primary artery	We think bike lanes from Lasalle to Turner, although it's hard to tell from the map. Route/Paved Shoulder from Turner to Vera. Bike lanes from Vera to Main. Combination signed route and route/shoulder from Main to Jeanne D'Arc.	<p>Consideration needs to be given to the fact that Notre Dame north of Lasalle is very dangerous to cyclists. There have been several incidents on this section where cyclists have been passed too closely and cut off.</p> <p>Depending on the current paved shoulders on sections of this road will not increase the amount of cyclists using this route as they are not wide enough to ensure their safety.</p>	<p>The current paved shoulder between Vera and Lasalle (Nickelodeon Conservation area) is extremely inadequate due to the high volumes of traffic and high speeds (80km/hr or more). If this option is selected, the shoulders should be re-paved and widened in order to safely accommodate cyclists. A buffer should also be considered.</p> <p>Signage and/or use of paved shoulders would be inadequate on the section between Main and Vera due to high traffic volume and speeds; therefore a cycle track would be the most appropriate</p>

			<p>option.</p> <p>While a cycle track is preferred (especially when considering the 8-80 principle), the use of a bike lane is suitable between Valleyview Road and Vera.</p> <p>We understand the rationale for a signed route on certain sections (existing curbs). We would hope that the signed route includes sharrows.</p>
Municipal Rd 80 – primary artery	Nothing north of Jeanne D’Arc	There is a subdivision north of MR80 (Talon, Frontenac) with no safe cycling link to the Network. Residential streets located close to the turn must detour to Jeanne D’Arc to travel to the city core.	Consider infrastructure on the missing section and ensure a contiguous, safe cycling route along the entirety of MR80.
Municipal Rd 80 – primary artery	East of Elmview Dr.	East of Elmview Drive, the westbound lane has paved shoulders, however the raised curb juts out in the middle of this “shoulder” area at Emily Street, Michelle Street and Gatien Street. This requires anyone using this lane to swerve into traffic in order to avoid hitting the curb. The eastbound lane doesn’t have a shoulder, however there is a paved boulevard. This boulevard can be converted to accommodate cyclists.	The existing infrastructure needs to be enhanced to ensure cyclist safety.
Municipal Rd 80 – primary artery	Bike route between Dominion Dr and Main	<p>Most of this area has speed limits of 80 km/hr and the existing paved shoulders are very narrow and unsuitable for use by cyclists under these conditions.</p> <p>An alternative for cyclists and pedestrians exists on the west side of RR80 between Dominion Drive and Richard Road, which would be more suitable if additional signage was added and if it was clearly marked that cyclists could travel in both</p>	Evaluate options.

		<p>directions. Accommodations for cyclists to cross and/or change sides of the road at the intersection of Dominion Drive and RR80, and at the southern part of this section leading toward the next section of cycling infrastructure would be required.</p> <p>This alternate option does not apply to RR80 south of Yorkshire, so either a bike lane or a cycle track would be a better option.</p>	
Municipal Rd 84 – primary artery	Partial route with paved shoulder Cote Blvd to Dennie St. (Capreol)		All of road connecting Hanmer to Capreol should have cycling infrastructure.
Old Wanup Rd – primary artery	No infrastructure Highway 69 S to Highway 537		No comment at this time.
Skead Rd – primary artery	Route with paved shoulder Falconbridge Hwy to Radar Rd.		No comment at this time.
Allan St. – secondary artery	Route with paved shoulder Bancroft Dr. to Government Rd		No comment at this time.
Garson/Coniston Rd. – secondary artery	No infrastructure Maki Rd. to Hwy 17		No comment at this time.
Main St. – Blezard and Rayside Twp – secondary artery	Signed route from Notre Dame to Municipal Rd 15	We assume that this artery is the Bonin/Rouleau/Valleyview connection between Chelmsford and the Valley	No comment at this time.
Main St – Waters Twp – secondary artery	Partial trail from Hwy 17 to Municipal Rd 55	There is no road infrastructure connecting Lively to the rest of the City and no trail beyond Selma in Lively	Additional discussion is required.
Municipal Rd 15 – secondary artery	Signed route from Highway 144 to Main St (Rayside Twp)		No comment at this time.
Municipal Rd 55 – secondary artery	No infrastructure Main St/Black Lake to Highway 17		No comment at this time.
Municipal Rd 8 – secondary artery	No infrastructure from Highway 144 to Sixth Ave. in Levack	There does not seem to be any proposed infrastructure beyond Lively	Connections need to be made to Onaping/Levack.
Radar Rd – secondary artery	Route with paved shoulders from Cote Blvd to Skead Rd		We agree with the proposal.

## Neighbourhood Secondary Arteries

Birch St. – Coniston	No infrastructure East St. to Hwy 17 E.		No comment at this time.
East St. – Coniston	No infrastructure Birch St. to Government Rd.		No comment at this time.
Government Rd. – Coniston	No infrastructure Edward Ave. to East St.		No comment at this time.
Longyear Dr. – Falconbridge	No infrastructure Falconbridge Hwy to Lindsley St.		No comment at this time.
Notre Dame Ave. – Hanmer	Route with paved shoulders from Municipal Rd 80 to Cote Blv.		The paved shoulders need to be wide enough to accommodate safe cycling.

## Neighbourhood Streets

Feedback regarding individual neighbourhood streets was gathered from cyclists who regularly cycle in their neighbourhood. It is not to be assumed that we agree with the proposals for streets if they are not listed here. Additional feedback from local cyclists for all proposed streets needs to be gathered as part of the feasibility study.

Elmview Dr, Valley East	Signed route between Dominion Dr. and MR80	Suitable option for this location, however the addition of sharrows or a bike lane would be more beneficial to increase use by children and inexperienced cyclists.	Review proposal.
Multi-use trail, Valley East	Between Dominion Dr. and MR80	This is not an official City of Greater Sudbury trail, is not being maintained by the City of Greater Sudbury, and is not recognised by Rainbow Routes Association.	Need to be reviewed.
Multi-use trail, Valley East	Proposed between and parallel to MR 80 and Dominion Dr. Located east of Frost St.	Great location for a multi-use trail, will improve connectivity for neighbourhoods.	Agree.
Jeanne D'Arc, Valley East	Signed route between MR80 and Frost	Suitable option for this residential area.	Agree.
Main St., Valley East	Signed route between MR80 and Kalmo Rd.	This is an important location for additional infrastructure due to the	Re-evaluate option.



		location of a popular beach at Kalmo Road, however the road and paved shoulder is currently too narrow for cyclists to travel safely with traffic. This would not be suitable for children.	
Gary Ave, New Sudbury	No infrastructure proposed	Two schools are located on this street, as well as Twin Forks Playground, which is heavily used for activities like soccer in the summertime. Rosemary playground is also located on Gary.	A route should be evaluated.
Madison Ave., New Sudbury	Signed route only on section Gary to Cambrian College grounds	Consideration should be given that all Madison be a signed route, therefore providing a safer option for cyclists coming from Garson wanting to reach Cambrian College and New Sudbury in general.	A route should be evaluated.
Hawthorne Dr., New Sudbury	Signed route Auger to St. Charles College	Hawthorne is a main road that could connect St. Charles College through to the Rotary Trail. It is the closest parallel street to Lasalle and cyclists use it to access to several primary schools in the general area.	A route should be evaluated.
Attlee Ave., New Sudbury	Edgeline on all of Attlee south of Lasalle	The current configuration of Attlee with the edgelines and curb extensions are dangerous to cyclists and will discourage cycling on this street.	The infrastructure, including traffic calming measures, needs to be re-evaluated.
Churchill Ave., New Sudbury	No infrastructure	Traffic calming measures (curb extensions) have been implemented, which cause pinch points for cyclists having to merge into traffic.	The traffic calming measures should be altered to allow cyclists a through-way along the street.
Westmount Ave., New Sudbury	Edgeline from Attlee to Barrydowne. Signed route from Barrydowne to Gemmel.	Edgelines offer a false sense of security for cyclists, and safe driving practices (i.e. not to use the edgeline areas) cannot be enforced.	Edgelines should be reconsidered.
Frood Rd., Donovan	Signed route from north of Victory playground to Perkovich lane; bike lanes from Perkovich	Traffic coming from Lasalle towards Kathleen has a tendency to speed significantly even when reaching the 50	We applaud the choice of bike lanes to connect the Donovan to the city core.

	to Elm. Nothing north of Victory playground to Lasalle.	km/hr area. This affects anyone riding close to Victory playground.  The loop from College Boreal up Lasalle east to Frood and then to the Donovan should be investigated.	The section north of Perkovich needs to be thoroughly evaluated.
Kathleen St., Donovan	Signed route on all of Kathleen	While traffic tends to be fairly slow given the homes, businesses and hills on this street, it is nevertheless very busy as it is a main connector to Notre Dame. The current traffic calming curb extensions on the section close to Frood are dangerous to cyclists.	Change the curb extensions to allow flow-through cycling traffic. Consider sharrows.
Neighbourhood streets in the Donovan: Cambrian Heights, Bruce, Melvin, Snowdon, Burton, Wilma, Morin, Mabel, Mountain, Mount Adam, Leslie	Signed route	These are all fairly low traffic streets with the exception of the Bruce/Cambrian Heights/Melvin connection. There are hills and sharp curves where a vehicle could infringe on a cyclist.	Consideration for sharrows on some of these streets.
Landsdowne St., Donovan	No infrastructure	A primary school is located on the corner of Frood and Landsdowne.	Consider a signed route for students not using the bike lanes on Frood.
King St., Flour Mill	No infrastructure	King would be a good connector to connect the Notre Dame cycle track with the Junction Creek trail	Propose signed route
Ontario St., Gatchell	Signed route from Martindale to Regent	This is a busy street that is nevertheless wide enough for sharrows, but there is also parking along this street. It is an important connector for Copper Cliff and Gatchell. Options for good downtown connections include Riverside to the Elgin Street underpass.	We agree if signed route includes sharrows that clearly indicate where cyclists should travel, which on a wide street should not necessarily be close to the curb.
Cochrane St., Downtown	No infrastructure	While this street has fairly steep hill, it could be a connector for the Kingsway to Mont Adam and on to Mountain and the Junction Creek trail.	Investigate a signed route.
Riverside St., Downtown	Signed route from Regent to Worthington	See comment for Ontario St.	See comment for Ontario St.
Hyland Dr., Downtown	Signed route from Regent to	There is a steep hill that rises on Hyland	A better option is Wembley Drive.

	Winchester	and then goes down on Winchester on this route. This is very dangerous given the stop signs on the hill.	
Beatty St., Downtown	Signed route from Douglas to Frood	There are two very steep hills on this route. The hill that is south of Elm St. has very high traffic. The hill that is north of Poplar cannot be avoided as this section of Beatty is the only option to get to Frood; traffic travelling north on this section often speeds significantly going down the hill.	This route requires more discussion. Eyre may be a possible replacement for the section south of Elm as it is less busy. The section south of Poplar needs to be evaluated re how to provide safe cycling on this road.
Larch St. proposed extension, Downtown	Signed route between Elgin and Lorne.	This extension would go across or underneath the existing CPR tracks. This would be an excellent way to connect the Elgin Street Greenway and the downtown to Lorne.	Install fully separated bike lanes. For full connectivity, look at implementing infrastructure on or parallel to Lorne.
Cedar St., Downtown	Signed route between Paris and Durham	This is a street with very low speeds and congestion. It has multiple stop signs. Implementing a route may not provide much benefit to cyclists.	It would be good to understand why this is being proposed.
Minto St., Downtown	No infrastructure	A signed bike route is proposed between City Hall north to Larch. The short section between Brady and the City Hall entrance would benefit from infrastructure.	Consider infrastructure.
College St., Downtown	No infrastructure planned between Kathleen and Frood	This street provides access to schools.	Propose signed route.
Mackenzie St., Downtown	Signed route from Kathleen to Ste. Anne's	This is a main connector, especially for students going to Sudbury Secondary school. There are many buses, loading and unloading of students, and parking on this street.	Tentative agreement.
McNeill Blvd., West End	Trail	This trail is muddy in the spring.	If the trail is to be the transportation option it needs to be paved and appropriate lighting installed to ensure the safety of cyclists.
Whittaker St., West End	Signed route from Elm and Haig	No connection exists between the northern end of Whittaker and Elm.	Signed bike route appropriate. Recommend removing existing physical

			barriers and pave infrastructure to provide a connection with Elm.
Victoria St., Hazel St., Douglas St., West End	No infrastructure	These are main streets connecting neighbourhoods in the West End. Hazel St. has a small commercial presence. However, implementing infrastructure on these or other main streets in the West End would not lead to anything if Lorne does not have infrastructure.	Re-evaluate requirements in the West End if Lorne is identified for infrastructure.
Victoria, Gilman, Spruce Streets loop, West End	Signed route on Spruce between Regent and Ethelbert.	A loop would be beneficial, including Victoria, Gilman and Spruce. Victoria west of Albinson to Gilman to Spruce and to the Ethelbert is part of the West End transit route.	Consider a signed route on these streets.
Byng St., West End	No infrastructure	This would be a good connector for Lorne to Brennan as it would be a more direct connection between Lorne to the back entrance of Delki Dozzi.	Consider a signed route.
Arnold Street, South End	Signed route from Barbara to Moonrock	No infrastructure from Barbara to Regent.	We suggest putting in this connector.
Walford Rd., South End	Bike lanes	This is a busy road, but is an important connector to primary and secondary schools.	We applaud this proposal.
Algonquin Rd., South End	Both the North-South and the East-West sections are signed routes.	The North-South section caters to significant residential areas and provides access to the library and schools.	We would like to propose bike lanes on the North-South section and further discussions on the East-West section.
Loach's Rd., South End	Signed route from Regent to the existing trail connecting Laurentian University.	This road has multiple schools in the area and is a main connector for students at Laurentian University.	We recommend bike lanes.
Main St., Val Caron	No infrastructure west of MR80 to Montee Rouleau	Confederation Secondary school is located on Main and there are numerous residential areas that connect to it. It is also a connector for Val Caron to Blezzard Valley.	Investigate infrastructure.
Montee Rouleau, Val Caron	No infrastructure from Main to Valleyview.	Infrastructure would connect Val Caron to Blezzard Valley (see Main St., Val Caron)	Investigate infrastructure.