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Stakeholder Session
Downtown All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Cycling Network – Stakeholder Session

Background

The City of Saskatoon’s Complete Streets Design and Policy Guide is designed to achieve a more balanced approach to street design, one that accommodates the safe movement of people all ages and abilities by multiple modes (i.e. walking, cycling, transit, vehicle). The City’s Active Transportation Plan identifies the importance of providing an interconnected system of bicycle facilities that is comfortable and attractive for users of all ages and abilities.

When the Downtown Protected Bike Lane Demonstration (4th Avenue and 23rd Street) wrapped up in November 2017, City Council directed the City administration to report back on what a complete, connected downtown AAA cycling network would look like in Saskatoon.

The City mailed letters to approximately 1,170 downtown property owners, businesses and other stakeholders (e.g. the cycling community) on January 8th, 2018. The letter described aspects of the AAA initiative, including that it will:

- Take into consideration how cycling facilities connect to Saskatoon’s wider cycling network.
- Determine how to integrate with other key downtown projects, such as the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) plan along 3rd Avenue and opening of the Traffic Bridge in fall 2018.
- Consider the impacts on all downtown users to ensure that the most appropriate streets host AAA facilities.

A follow-up email was sent on January 15, 2018. Recipients of the letter and email were asked to add their names to a contact list for future project updates. Stakeholders who opted in for updates, as well as several targeted stakeholders such as organizations representing cyclists, pedestrians, older adults, and many more, were invited to attend the open house sessions on January 20, 2018. The sessions were an opportunity for stakeholders to share their knowledge and insights regarding the development of the Downtown All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Cycling Network.

Session Format

There were two stakeholder events, each approximately 90 minutes in length. Each session began with a brief PowerPoint presentation that included an explanation of the Active Transportation Plan and how it integrates with the Complete Streets Design and Policy Guide, the Growth Plan and the City’s...
Strategic Plan, as well as noting other influencing factors and projects (e.g. BRT, Imagine Idylwyld, Traffic Bridge, 3rd Avenue and 19th Street intersection upgrades).

The presentation referenced the timeline for the Downtown Protected Bike Lane Demonstration Project (2015 – 2017), the provision that protected bike lanes (PBLs) be included in the Downtown AAA Cycling Network, and that the current PBLs on 4th Avenue and 23rd Street be retained until the Downtown network is presented to City Council.

The presentation defined the downtown study area and highlighted the three guiding principles of the AAA cycling network:

- **Safety** – Cyclists are vulnerable and travel more slowly than motor vehicles.
- **Comfort** – This is an important part of attracting more people to bicycling as a mode of travel.
- **Connectivity** – Cyclists need a network of continuous low-stress routes that provide connections to local and city-wide destinations.

The presentation was followed by discussion and engagement activities between stakeholders and the Active Transportation Program Manager, with four City Transportation Engineers stationed at informational display boards (see Appendix).

Stakeholders were asked to provide input regarding criteria that could be used to assess which downtown streets are best suited for a AAA cycling facility, as well as challenges and opportunities for each street.

**Who Attended**

The sessions were attended by between 40 and 50 people in total (not everyone signed in). Stakeholders in attendance included individuals who signed on behalf of the Saskatchewan Health Authority, as well as civic facilities such as TCU Place, Saskatoon Fire Department and Saskatoon Public Library. Stakeholders from the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Business Improvement District, Meewasin Valley Authority, Open Door Society and Partners in Employment also attended. Downtown business people attended, although they appeared to be limited in number. There were also stakeholders from Saskatoon Cycles as well as university students. The City Councillor representing the downtown Saskatoon ward was also in attendance.

**Evaluation Criteria**

What’s more important to stakeholders in terms of where AAA cycling facilities should go? Stakeholders were asked to prioritize the criteria being used by the City in their evaluation of streets on which to locate AAA cycling facilities. Stakeholders did this by allocating dots to the criteria (posted on display boards) they felt should receive priority. Each stakeholder was given six dots, which they could allocate in any manner they chose for the six criteria. This “dotmocracy” is a cumulative voting method used to identify preferences regarding specific criteria.

**SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER INPUT**

The following is a summary of stakeholder input regarding the evaluation criteria. Of the six criteria presented, stakeholders allocated the majority (59%) of dots to two criteria—bicycle network (34% of dots) and cyclist safety (25% of dots).
### EVALUATION CRITERIA (DOTMOCRACY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Network (34%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to surrounding areas</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages with other bicycle facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current and potential bicycle traffic</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyclist Safety (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit of segregation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with vehicles</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Walking (14%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business (14%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street environment</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Driving (8%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile travel time</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit (5%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit operations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit stop conflicts</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LINKAGES (BICYCLE NETWORK)

Stakeholders gave priority to bicycle network linkages (30%), including corridors providing linkages to surrounding areas and with bicycle facilities in other parts of Saskatoon. Few stakeholders (4%) prioritize corridors in which large numbers of existing or potential bicycle trips originate and terminate.

### CYCLIST SAFETY

This is followed by cyclist safety (25%), with most prioritizing segregation of cyclists from higher overall traffic volumes and the idea that separation on such corridors will provide the greatest benefit to cyclists. Fewer stakeholders (7%) prioritize corridors with fewer turning movements at intersections and driveways.

### PEDESTRIANS (PEOPLE WALKING)

Stakeholders allocate priority to evaluation criteria around pedestrian safety or impact on pedestrians with mobility needs (10%). These considerations also come up in discussions.

### STREET ENVIRONMENT (BUSINESS)

Some priority (11%) is placed on with additional buffering to improve the pedestrian environment and street level commerce.

### PARKING

Stakeholders are less likely to allocate priority to evaluation criteria that involves impact on parking (3%). As a general rule, it appears that most stakeholders agree that AAA facilities cannot exist on streets with angle parking.

### IMPACT ON MOTORISTS

Some priority (8%) is placed on criteria that consider corridors with the least impact on travel time of people driving.

### TRANSIT

Little priority is allocated by stakeholders for evaluation criteria to consider corridors in terms of their potential to conflict with transit (2%) or the idea that corridors with the least impact on transit travel time should be preferred (3%).
Opportunities and Challenges
Participant Suggestions on Maps

The presentation featured two stations with large maps showing both existing and potential AAA routes. During discussion of opportunities and challenges, participants were asked to write their comments on sticky notes and attach to the maps. Those comments are summarized below. They have been organized into several categories, including bridge access, parking, traffic lights, preferred routes and excluded routes.

Broadway Bridge, Traffic Bridge and Access to AAA Network

- Connectivity via AAA network to Riversdale area on 19th Street. Close outside lanes, make bike path Avenues A to H.
- New Traffic Bridge is going to be nicest bridge for cyclist crossings; connecting it with north/south AAA routes in an appealing way is key.
- Connectivity via the University Bridge between Saskatoon City Hospital and Royal University Hospital and the University of Saskatchewan is important and needed by a large number of year-round cyclists.
- Need improved connections for cyclists and pedestrians coming off bridges.
- The bike lane should be on 3rd Avenue off the Traffic Bridge.
- When Traffic Bridge opens, need excellent way findings to access Farmers’ Market via River Landing.
- Route across Broadway Bridge to get to Farmers’ Market is challenging if you cross on the south side of the bridge and proceed west; cyclists have to stay on sidewalks.
- The bottom of the Broadway Bridge needs work. Cyclists travelling south on 4th Avenue should be able to get to the SW side of the bridge. Cyclists travelling down the north (right) side of the bridge should be able to access 19th Street.
- Better signage on all bridges depicting expectations for pedestrians, cyclists and cars would be helpful.
- Dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists where Broadway Bridge accesses 4th Avenue; this multi-use trail has poor visibility (curved) where it becomes 4th Avenue and is too narrow for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists.

Parking

- There are issues for the PBL on 4th Avenue with the parkade between 21st and 22nd Street. Parkade users need to be informed of the bike lane and potential hazards to cyclists from cars exiting the parkade, particularly during rush hour.
- The parkade on 4th Avenue between 21st and 22nd Streets will be a bottleneck whether there is a PBL there or not. Don’t let bad design of parkade bring down an ideal bike lane street.
- Better demarcation of parking stalls would assist with motorists and where they can park.
- City vehicles, taxis, delivery trucks and dumpsters are often parked on the PBL on 4th Avenue, right after 21st Street.

Traffic Lights

- Dedicated lane plus lights would work better for cyclists.
- Would like to see traffic light changes; bike specific lights with different timing for bikes using AAA routes and green lights for right turns for motorists.
- Work needs to be done on traffic lights on existing PBL – need advanced start for cyclists to enable them to enter intersections before motorists and no right turn on red light
for motorists. If right turn is needed for traffic flow, include a green arrow in light sequence.

Preferred Routes

- The natural and best east-west corridor for a bike path is Meewasin Trail along Spadina Crescent. It connects to 4 bridges downtown. Could put separate lane for bikes adjacent to pedestrian path on Meewasin Trail.
- 3rd Avenue is the most logical way to travel north-south across downtown by transit and bicycle. Good connectivity, including to north residential areas. Prioritize bus and bikes before cars on this route.
- BRT could go north on 4th Avenue and south on 3rd Avenue; would provide room for a two-way cycle path on 3rd Avenue.
- 4th Avenue PBL is a great place to bike.
- I’d like to see a second north-south PBL on 1st Avenue from 19th Street to Queen Street.
- 21st Street presents a great opportunity to improve bike safety; a route here would encourage cycling downtown and provide an opportunity for businesses, cyclists and pedestrians to work together. Great route if used properly.
- 23rd Street is a good street for cycling; work on modifying the Bus Mall to better accommodate cyclists.
- For east-west network segments, 25th, 23rd and 19th Street would work well for providing east-west coverage, both for destination stops and commuting through.
- 2nd Avenue does not work due to angle parking, so 3rd and 4th Avenues are best options; 1st Avenue is also very wide.
- Remove 2nd Avenue from consideration for AAA; angled parking and street design create too many restrictions. 21st Street has same challenges, should also be removed from consideration.
- 2nd Avenue would be good option if angle parking eliminated.
- Transit Mall in the way of PBL on 23rd Street is disruptive.
- PBL should be on 25th Street; provides access from University Bridge, University of Saskatchewan and College Drive. Street is so busy that cyclists use sidewalk.
- Consider moving to one-way streets downtown to open up more options for dedicated bike corridors.
- Split up network in logical east-west, north-south sections equal distances apart: Meewasin Trail, Idylwyld Drive, 23rd Street and Queen Street.

- Response from fireman: No; current street width in front of #1 Fire Station is required to allow truck to back in.

Routes Excluded from Consideration

Several comments were collected at the station identifying downtown streets excluded from consideration (see appendix).

- Four of five notes agree with exclusion of all streets listed, including 5th Avenue between 22nd and 25th Street, 6th Avenue between 24th and 25th Street, 21st Street E., and Ontario Avenue, Wall Street and Pacific Avenue.
- There is particular agreement on the exclusion of 21st Street, as this is a great opportunity for a pedestrian priority street.
- One comment disagrees with excluding 5th Ave between 22nd and 25th Street, because it would provide a good connection between Kinsmen Park and north residential area and possibly to 4th Avenue and the PBL.
Other
- If 19th Street is being considered for cycling facility west of downtown, changes have to be made to 19th in downtown as it’s not bike friendly; most cyclists currently use the sidewalk.
- Appreciate the tweaking the City has done, but more needs to be done. At intersections, vehicles need to be stopped further back so they can see the cyclist waiting at the intersection to go forward.
- Separate cyclists and pedestrians at lights.
- If I’m waiting at a red light when cycling, if I’m not on a street that has a PBL, I’m not sure where I should be – in the traffic lane or in the furthest right lane. If I’m in the furthest right lane, I impede motorists trying to turn right.
- Improved snow clearing on bike lanes is important.
- Improved communication to the public about real cost (time and money) of PBLs.
- Would like to see PBLs, but only in summer and by using removable posts and temporary lane markings.
- The sharrow bike lane at the corner of Spadina Crescent and 24th Street narrows too much; needs to be widened for safety of cyclists.
- Crossing Wall Street at 24th Street is a challenge for pedestrians – lots of near misses for our staff. A challenge also for cyclists, but less so than for pedestrians.
- Future connection to the rail corridor and North Downtown should be considered.
- The alley north of 5th Avenue (adjacent to the YWCA) should be bought by the City and used as a bike lane.
- Businesses along 4th Avenue are clearing snow into PBLs.
- Buses along 23rd Street currently stop in PBL. Consider raising cycle lane and having bus stop in driving lane.

- Broken posts separating PBL from road lead cars to park in the bike lane.
- Several PBL posts are down along 23rd Street, sometimes lying across the bike lane. What is maintenance schedule? Will maintenance be improved when AAA is built?
- Short-height jersey barriers would help protect cyclists (sticky note re: Spadina Crescent in front of Bessborough Hotel).
Overview of Discussion at Stations

In addition to capturing comments stakeholders attached to the maps, notes were made of stakeholder discussions at the two stations. The following is a summary of those discussions.

Safety

Safety is one of the most overheard words in discussions at the sessions, and the most important consideration as it provides context for many of the comments at the stations. Stakeholders primarily talk about safety in terms of cyclists, but often for pedestrians and even motorists as well. Some primary safety concerns include difficulty parking, getting in and out of parking facilities or turning right without endangering cyclists using corridors with PBLs.

There are suggestions that motorists experience limited sightlines and that cyclists run the risk of proceeding with an unwarranted sense of security because they are in a PBL, so they proceed with less caution and awareness of pedestrians and motorists that can intrude into their corridor.

Participants also suggest that safety improvements should not only benefit cyclists but also pedestrians and motorists.

Education

Discussions around safety frequently include comments regarding the importance of education—teaching people how the PBLs work. As one participant notes, “We’re learning now how to have dedicated bike lanes, so that in the future when it becomes really important for our city to have them, we’ll all know how they work and how to use them, as cyclists, pedestrians and motorists.” The concern is that all people visiting downtown learn how to use AAA facilities responsibly and safely, regardless of whether they are cyclists using AAA facilities or motorists or pedestrians co-existing with them.

Consistency is part of some discussions about the importance of education; some stakeholders suggest that people find the various types of bike lanes (PBLs, sharrows, etc.) confusing.

PBLs and BRT

Some stakeholders wonder why BRT, currently recommended for 3rd Avenue in the downtown area, and PBLs cannot co-exist on the same street. Some stakeholders do not want to lose the parking along 3rd Avenue that this might entail.

Demonstration Project

Some stakeholders wonder whether or not the criteria for measuring the 4th Avenue and 23rd Street Demonstration Project has been met. If it has (as is the understanding of some participants), the success of the project is not being celebrated. Some have the impression that various elements of the demonstration are being cast in a negative light and used to show that it has not been successful.

One suggestion is that communication about AAA facilities should highlight the fact that everyone benefits, not just cyclists. There is a sense that this is not communicated clearly enough. The PBL demonstration project seemed to place too much focus on comments about the infrastructure benefitting a select group
of people and so was not worth of support. Incorporating messaging that AAA facilities such as PBLs are designed to encourage more people to use cycling as an alternative mode of transportation could counterbalance that argument.

**Corridor Opportunities**

Stakeholders find it easier to point out the challenges as opposed to the opportunities with existing and potential AAA streets. Spadina Crescent is a ‘natural’ corridor, or ‘intuitively’ where some stakeholders want to go. 23rd Street is often mentioned as a good corridor, despite challenges with the bus mall interrupting the PBL.

There are mentions of whether Idylwyld, after it is redesigned as part of the Imagine Idylwyld plan, has been considered for PBLs. 1st Avenue or 2nd Avenue are mentioned as possible corridors. Some stakeholders suggest that 21st Street between the Bessborough Hotel on Spadina Crescent and Midtown Plaza on 1st Avenue would be a good corridor; however, most suggest this is more appropriate for pedestrian traffic. Overall, there did not appear to be consensus among stakeholders regarding preference for any specific corridors.

**Corridor Challenges**

Some of the challenges discussed by stakeholders with the 4th Avenue corridor revolve around too much traffic, restricted sightlines for motorists turning right (and fear of collisions with cyclists they cannot see when doing so), problems with entering and exiting parking facilities because of having to cross the PBL and risks of crossing into motorist lanes for cyclists that want to turn left at intersections along the corridor.

**Connectivity is a Challenge**

Connecting a potential downtown AAA corridor to other parts of Saskatoon via any of the bridges—Broadway, Traffic, Idylwyld or University—is seen as a major challenge for the network.

**Destination**

Some people say it’s important to know where cyclists are going in terms of destinations in order to design good bike routes, but others respond that cyclists are just like everyone else in that they are going to all sorts of places. They are not necessarily “just going to the library,” for example. Some are going through downtown; some are going to destinations downtown.

**Downtown Business**

DTN YXE (Downtown Business Improvement District) has five principles it wanted to reinforce at the session in terms of the downtown AAA network, including:

- **Urban Connectivity** – Bike lanes are an opportunity to build links between urban districts.
- **Suburban Connectivity** – It’s important to connect Downtown to the suburbs.
- **Car Convenience** – Motor vehicles remain an important mode of transportation for downtown, and cycling networks should minimize negative affect on parking and congestion.
- **Safety** – Network design must create safe environments for cyclists and non-cyclists.
• Destination-driven – The network should take cyclists past major destination businesses downtown to encourage people to stop and enjoy the area.

Some downtown business people suggest that residents from outside of Saskatoon use vehicles to visit the city and will not be likely candidates for cycling. One businessperson says no one comes to their store on a bicycle.

Others point to significant vehicle traffic from people travelling from rural Saskatchewan to medical areas downtown (i.e. Medical Arts building on Spadina Crescent, medical offices on Wall Street).

Considering the Future

Some stakeholders mention that AAA corridors should be thought out, not in terms of current traffic flow, but in light of significant pedestrian, motor vehicle and cyclist traffic changes coming as a result of development along 19th Street from River Landing residential, hotel and office high-rise buildings underway, as well as significant commercial and residential development in the area immediately adjacent to the Farmers’ Market and Riversdale.

There are also changes on the horizon from the City Centre, North Downtown and Imagine Idylwyld plans, which should be considered in developing the network. More traffic will also be coming from the City fulfilling its density strategy in core areas around Broadway and the riverbank. Connectivity from the bridges will become an even more important consideration with these developments and plans.

Survey Form Comments

The following are verbatim comments recorded on survey forms completed by stakeholders.

WHAT WENT WELL? WHAT DID YOU APPRECIATE?

• I think the set-up works well; allows for general information and then discussion.
• Nice to have the context set at the beginning.
• The interactive respect of the process.
• Very easy to provide comments and engineers are available for discussion.
• Our group was small so it was easy to provide input and ask questions and discuss with City employees.
• I liked the dots to show which was most important.
• Being part of the process; firsthand knowledge helping shape our city.
• Great to talk directly to engineers, see progress being made.
• Good visuals – maps and boards, people to answer questions.
• The opportunity to give feedback.
• Attentive City staff, appeared to genuinely receive and consider comments; provided appropriate feedback/clarification when warranted. Less presentation, more conversation makes sense.

WHAT DIDN’T WORK?

• The maps were vague as to what I should provide on them.
• The evaluation criteria seemed a little repetitive.
• Education should be well understood: cost of maintenance of roads due to cars, low cost of bike lane infrastructure vs. car infrastructure, explain general economic benefits.
• I’m still leery that ‘complainers’ voice is the one that’s focused on; I hope that isn’t the case moving forward with decision.
• The questions or input seemed a bit narrow; meaning, there didn’t seem to be an option to express that bike lanes should not be pursued.
• Early in process, so still very open-ended; when options are narrowed down, would hope that user groups are more directly engaged as it didn’t appear they had been to this point (cyclists in particular) based on responses from City staff.

I UNDERSTOOD WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF ME AS A PARTICIPANT … HOW CAN WE IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
• I would have liked to know ahead of time that we would be looking at maps to find/comment on problematic areas. I would have liked to have time before the day to look at the maps on my own and organize my thoughts ahead of time. I apologize if there was an email ahead of time that mentioned this and I missed it.

I FEEL MY INPUT WAS ADEQUATELY CAPTURED AND RECORDED … HOW CAN WE IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
• Note-taking by staff was evident. Not sure if “sticky note” concept really works, as people are engaged in conversations, which is what should be expected. Notes taken by City staff listening in are probably more valuable.

I UNDERSTAND HOW MY INPUT WILL BE USED … HOW CAN WE IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
• Process from this point forward could have been more clearly explained.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE US TO KNOW?
• I heard one person complain that nobody used bicycles before lanes were implemented, but I personally would not bike without them because I felt unsafe. But with protected lanes would be 100% more likely to bike downtown.
• Poor bike parking facilities at the venue – one hidden bike rack that is too wide for a u-lock.
• I am generally very supportive of what you are doing. Be courageous, you are doing the right thing.
• Keep in mind that if AAA facility is not 100% safe, it is not a failure. It’s not realistic to remove all/any risk – but improve, make it as safe as physically possible. In communication efforts, it’s safer than current options (e.g. painted bike lanes, sparrow, nothing). With current PBL, because there are still safety/sightline issues at driveways, etc., there was dissenting voice that they were unsafe, needed to go. But they are markedly safer than the previous 4th Avenue painted bike lane. You are challenging the status quo and there is bound to be pushback in the community. Courage and political leadership is key to stay the course. Thanks for all your efforts at changing both our physical environment for the better as well as the social normative environment.
• The integration of plans (cycling / transit / pedestrian) is an important aspect of this process.
• It was great to hear from others with their concerns.
• I do not believe bike lanes are necessary in this city due to the time we spend in freezing weather and the imposition it puts on vehicle traffic. Just building bike lanes in my opinion will not mean that more people will cycle to work. I do not feel that streetscaping that involves reducing the number or size of traffic lanes improves the downtown area; it may keep people from travelling downtown.

• This event was well thought out and clearly presented, I appreciated being invited.

• Very important to consider keeping the primary designated street for each "mode" separate; biggest concern of those attending was safety, and this would lead to the least likelihood of conflict.
Appendix
Session Display Boards

Downtown Bicycle Network | Tell Us About Your Street

As a stakeholder, your local knowledge about our downtown streets is important. What challenges and opportunities need to be considered when designing a cycling corridor on downtown streets? Tell us by placing a sticky note on the map!
The Development of a Bicycle Network

The purpose of Saskatoon’s Active Transportation Plan is to increase transportation choices within the city and to improve accessibility for residents. This plan aims to enhance the city’s cycling and walking infrastructure, providing safe and convenient options for residents. The plan is guided by the following principles:

1. **Comfort**: Providing a comfortable experience for all ages and abilities.
2. **Safety**: Ensuring safety for all users, including cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers.
3. **Connectivity**: Creating a network of connections that connects people to their destinations.
4. **Inclusivity**: Making cycling and walking accessible to all.

**Key Elements of the Plan**

- **Complete Streets**: Ensuring that all elements of the street are designed to accommodate all users.
- **Multi-Use Pathways**: Providing paths that cater to both cyclists and pedestrians.
- **On-Street Bicycle Lanes**: Dedicated lanes for cyclists on streets.
- **Shared Use Lanes**: Lanes that can be used by both cyclists and pedestrians.

**City-Wide Bicycle Network Principles**

- **Comfort**: Prioritizing the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.
- **Safety**: Implementing safety measures to protect all users.
- **Connectivity**: Establishing a network of routes that connect various parts of the city.
- **Inclusivity**: Ensuring that the network is accessible to all, including those with disabilities.

**Active Transportation Plan | Proposed Bicycle Network**

This map shows the proposed routes for the AT Plan. While many of the proposed routes still require detailed review, this map shows what a city-wide network of cycling facilities could look like for Saskatoon.

**Existing Bicycle Network**

The existing bicycle network in Saskatoon includes various pathways and lanes designed to cater to different user needs. This network is a crucial part of the city’s transportation infrastructure, providing options for residents to travel safely and efficiently.

**Active Transportation (AT) Plan | Bicycle Network Principles**

- **Provide a network that provides direct ACCESS to major shopping centers, key employment areas, schools, and recreational amenities.**
- **Focus on high-quality connections to and from downtown with all areas of the city and create a downtown network.**
- **Provide a network that provides direct ACCESS to major shopping centers, key employment areas, schools, and recreational amenities.**
- **Improve and connect to existing cycling routes.**
All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Bicycle Network Principles

**SAFETY**
People riding bicycles are vulnerable road users because they have less protection and travel more slowly than motor vehicles.

- An All Ages and Abilities Network should:
  - Minimize and consolidate conflict points between modes (for example, at intersections or driveway crossings).
  - Reduce speed and enhance visibility at interchanges and conflict points.
  - Provide each mode with a clearly defined space for travel.
  - Provide consistent treatments to promote predictable behavior for all users.
  - Ensure facilities are easy to maintain to facilitate safe cycling conditions.

- An All Ages and Abilities Network should include:
  - Separate bicycle lanes from motor vehicles when speeds are over 30 km/h and traffic volumes exceed 1,000 vehicles per hour.
  - Ensure the amount of shielding for people riding bikes is reasonable and balanced with other users.
  - Minimize encounters between people riding bikes and those driving vehicles.
  - Accommodate side-by-side cycling and passing movements, where feasible.
  - Provide smooth vertical transitions and pavement surfaces free from obstacles.

**COMFORT**
Attention to user comfort is an important part of attracting more people to bicycling as a mode of travel.

- An All Ages and Abilities Network should:
  - Provide direct and convenient connections that exist between the local and the regional networks.
  - Connect to local and city-wide destinations.
  - Integrate into the larger multimodal transportation network.
  - Provide seamless transitions between different types of cycling facilities (for example, from a raised cycle track to a multi-use pathway).
  - Ensure key destinations and regional routes are interconnected with the bicycle network.

**CONNECTIVITY**
People who ride bicycles need a network of continuous low-stress routes that provide connections to local and city-wide destinations.

- An All Ages and Abilities Network should:
  - Provide direct and convenient connections that exist between the local and the regional networks.
  - Connect to local and city-wide destinations.
  - Integrate into the larger multimodal transportation network.
  - Provide seamless transitions between different types of cycling facilities (for example, from a raised cycle track to a multi-use pathway).
  - Ensure key destinations and regional routes are interconnected with the bicycle network.

---

Downtown All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Bicycle Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Reason for Exclusion</th>
<th>Merits Consideration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Avenue, Between 24th and 25th Street</td>
<td>• does not connect well to the south-end of the study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Avenue, Between 24th and 25th Street</td>
<td>• highly residential in nature • low number of city-wide destinations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street E</td>
<td>• only extends for one block within the Study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Avenue, Wall Street, Pacific Avenue</td>
<td>• low connectivity on east end and west ends as it terminates at 1st Avenue and Spadina Crescent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>streets do not connect well to the north and south ends of study area</td>
<td>potential in the future to serve as a secondary cycling connection to provide local access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Evaluation Criteria

**Bicycle Network**
- Linkages to surrounding areas
  - Consider providing bicycle links across major barriers such as busy streets and river crossings should be preferred.
- Linkages with other bicycle facilities
  - Consider high-quality bicycle connections within existing and planned city bicycle facilities and interconnections should be preferred.
- Separates bicycle and motor traffic
  - Considers which a larger number of existing and potential bicycle traffic originate and terminates should be preferred.
- **Cyclist Safety**
  - Mixture of hierarchies
    - Considers with higher overall traffic volumes, higher speed traffic should be separated from bicycle traffic should be strongly preferred.
  - Separates on such corridors and provides the greatest benefit to cyclists.
- **Conflict with vehicle**
  - Considers with fewer number of turning movements at intersections, driveways, and lanes should be preferred.
- **People Driving**
  - Considers with the least impact on automobile traffic should be preferred.

**Evaluation Criteria**

**Transit**
- Transit stop conflicts
  - Considers higher transit stops and lower frequency of bus service should be preferred as there are better conflicts between coupled and passenger services or walking routes.
- Travel operations
  - Considers with the least impact on transit travel time should be preferred.

**People Walking**
- Pedestrian safety improvements
  - Considers that have priority to improve pedestrian safety should be preferred.
- Accessibility
  - Considers with highest implementation of the bicycle facility will have the greatest number of access issues as well as mobility needs should be preferred.

**Business**
- Parking
  - Parking in or near implementation of the bicycle facility will have the greatest positive impact on the local parking supply should be preferred.
- Street environment
  - Implementation of the bicycle facility will provideynthia with additional shelter from accidents and improve the pedestrian environment should be preferred.
# Satisfaction with Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>42%</th>
<th>58%</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how was your experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a valuable use of my time and energy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was easy for me to participate in the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was clear and understandable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood what was expected of me as a participant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator kept us engaged and focused.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants were given the opportunity to contribute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my voice mattered in this conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my input will be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will likely accept the outcome of this process, regardless of what decision that is made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>