### Shared Attributes
- Connection to Bannatyne Ave. cycling lane via protected cycling lane on Furby St. or Kate St.
- Connections to future cycling facilities on Arlington St., Sherbrook St. and Maryland St.
- No cycling improvements on McDermot Ave. west of Arlington St.
- Traffic calming measures will aid in reducing vehicle speed
- Recommended half-signal at Arlington St. will impact traffic

### Option 1: Two-Way Protected Bike Lane with One-Way Traffic
- McDermot Ave. becomes one-way eastbound for vehicles and transit with westbound traffic re-routed to William Ave. or Notre Dame Ave.
- Protected facility separates cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles
- Separating on-street parking and cycling eliminates dooring issues
- No anticipated change in on-street parking
- Two-way cycling requires bike signals at signalized intersections and increased driver/cyclist education
- Minimum recommended width for a two-way cycling facility
- Bike lanes to be used by emergency vehicles during emergency situations

### Option 2: Neighbourhood Greenway
- Cyclists must share street with vehicles
- Maintains both eastbound and westbound travel lanes for vehicles
- Minor conversion of parking on McDermot Ave. between Arlington St. and Sherbrook St. is required to accommodate traffic calming
### CYCLING FACILITY TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWO-WAY PROTECTED</th>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD GREENWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling lane can be at grade or raised</td>
<td>Includes traffic calming measures to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

- **Bumpouts** extend the pedestrian area to reduce street crossing distance for pedestrians and slow down vehicles.
- **Raised crosswalks** delineate the crossing for motorists and require them to slow down.
Between September and November 2015, the public provided input on the West Alexander Pedestrian and Cycling Corridor through multiple public engagement activities.

The key themes that emerged from the input include the following:

**WHAT WE HEARD**

- Enhance pedestrian safety
- Promote cyclist safety
- Address cycling connections to the study area
- Ensure sidewalks and bike lanes are well maintained
- Consider traffic demands
- Improve aesthetics
- Support for cycling infrastructure

**OPTION EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The options will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Safety** (20%)                              | - Safety for all users  
- Separation between cyclists and vehicles  
- Pedestrian crossing risks  
- Emergency vehicles |
| **Cycling Operations & Facilities** (15%)     | - Comfort for cyclists  
- Door opening  
- Cycling within the area  
- Connections to existing facilities  
- Access to desired destinations  
- Bicycle parking |
| **Pedestrian & Cycling Environment** (15%)    | - Access to destinations  
- Pedestrian comfort  
- Accessibility |
| **Streetscaping & Amenities** (15%)           | - Streetscaping and amenities |
| **Traffic Operations** (10%)                  | - Traffic congestion and delays |
| **Transit** (10%)                             | - Transit operations  
- Access to loading  
- Access for transit users and vehicles |
| **Parking & Loading** (15%)                   | - On-street parking and loading  
- Access to/from parking and loading |
| **Costs** (5%)                                | - Capital costs  
- Maintenance costs |
| **Ease of Construction & Maintenance** (5%)   | - Construction and staging  
- Utility impacts  
- Maintenance (snow clearing, street cleaning etc.) |