

## Active Transportation Assessment

<b>Option 1: Bike Lanes (Conventional or Buffered)</b>
<p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate based on OTM Book 18.</li> <li>• Has minimal separation from heavy vehicles which may be unattractive to less experienced cyclists.</li> <li>• Would require a transition at/near Princess to connect with the planned multi-use path. Would add time to a trip.</li> <li>• Least expensive option.</li> <li>• Feasible primarily within the existing ROW.</li> <li>• Viable but not recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Option 2: Multi-Use Path - Recommended</b>
<p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate based on OTM Book 18.</li> <li>• Is separated from traffic.</li> <li>• Separated facilities can form part of an all ages and abilities cycling network.</li> <li>• Can provide a seamless, continuous connection to the path planned south of Barton Street.</li> <li>• Would detour around some obstacles (e.g. hydro towers) but the user would not need to transition on or off the pathway.</li> <li>• Meets goal of providing pedestrian facilities on the west side.</li> <li>• More costly than bike lanes; comparable to cycle track.</li> <li>• Would require an easement to run within the hydro corridor and for the centre pier of Bridge 332 to shift slightly.</li> <li>• Potential property impacts north of Brant.</li> <li>• This is the recommended option.</li> </ul>
<b>Option 3: Cycle Track</b>
<p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate based on OTM Book 18.</li> <li>• Is separated from traffic.</li> <li>• Separated facilities can form part of an all ages and abilities cycling network.</li> <li>• Would require a vertical transition at/near Princess Street to connect to the planned multi-use path. Would add time to a trip.</li> <li>• Necessary to detour around the hydro tower south of Bridge 331.</li> <li>• More costly than bike lanes; comparable to cycle track.</li> <li>• Would require an easement at some locations (e.g. hydro towers) to fit.</li> <li>• Potential property impacts north of Birch.</li> <li>• Viable but not recommended.</li> </ul>