

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Contents

Project overview	1
Engagement overview	4
What we asked	
What we heard	6
Zone A:	6
Zone B:	
Zone C:	
Next Steps	
Verbatim Comments	

Project overview

As Calgary grows, our pathway and bikeway capacity needs to develop to ensure a safe and enjoyable space for everyone.

The 3 Avenue South Walking and Wheeling Upgrades Project aims to make it easier to walk and wheel along the corridor while providing vital East and West connections to our existing network. The <u>2018 Centre</u> <u>City Bicycle Volume Map</u> shows that 3 Avenue South is one of the busiest cycling routes in the centre city. Creating a high-quality facility, that is accessible for all ages and abilities, will address some pedestrian and traffic safety concerns that have been raised in past engagement with the communities of Chinatown and Eau Claire, and pathway users along the Bow River and River Walk pathways.

A dedicated option for people wheeling provides separation between people travelling at different speeds, which improves safety, predictability and comfort. Using the Always Available for All Ages and Abilities (5A) <u>Network principles</u> approved by council in January 2020, the 3 Avenue South upgrades will work to increases comfort, safety, connectivity and accessibility for all users. We know that Calgarians want walkable communities, with convenient and attractive connections to neighbours, shopping, services, cultural experiences, natural spaces, workplaces and educational opportunities. Pathways and bikeways provide them with the ability to connect with these destinations.

The project will improve active transportation connections to businesses, residences, transit, and existing pathways and bikeways. There is an increased demand for sidewalk space along 3 Avenue and the River Walk pathway, and providing an on-street alternative will help to alleviate the strain on sidewalk capacity in



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

the area. By moving mobility devices such as scooters, in-line skates, and skateboards off of sidewalks into accessible pathways and bikeways enables people of all abilities to travel in the area comfortably.

We are launching this project in coordination with the <u>Eau Claire Area Improvements</u> so that we can find efficiencies and connectivity with other projects in the area while addressing the impact to the community. We know that future development in the Eau Claire Area means there will be a need for alternative routes for walking and wheeling when the existing Bow River Pathway is closed due to construction or in the event of high water levels on the Bow River. Doing the work now supports our intent to create resilience in the area and future-proof our pathway and bikeway network

The Upgrades

The upgrades being made for people who walk and wheel in the area include:

- Improvements at intersections that enhance safety and make it easier to cross the street
- The possible installation of signals (where appropriate) to enhance pedestrian safety and accessibility
- Wheelchair ramp reconstruction and accessibility improvements
- Traffic calming measures
- Changes to on-street parking, including curb extensions or concrete islands that will improve the visibility of people at intersections
- Creating angle parking stalls where appropriate on side streets to increase parking capacity
- Creating dedicated facilities for cycling and other mobility devices such as scooters, in-line skates, and skateboards
- ٠

Why 3 Avenue South?

- 3 Avenue South is the only east-west road that connects to the Bow River Pathway Network on the west side in the Eau Claire community (at 8 Street S.W.) and the east side in the Chinatown community (via 1 Street S.E.).
- 3 Avenue South supports connectivity and accessibility for people walking, wheeling, and taking transit in the centre city.
- The 3 Avenue South upgrades will support the Eau Claire Area Improvements Project during construction. The upgrades we're making along 3 Avenue will ensure that Calgarians are provided with an alternate route to the Bow River Pathway Network during construction and will also improve access to businesses and residential areas in the vicinity.
- 3 Avenue South has a range of businesses which can be supported through increased access for customers and employees travelling by foot, bicycle, and other active modes.
- Past plans and policies have identified 3 Avenue South as an active transportation corridor and it is an existing on-street bikeway.
- 3 Avenue South is one of the busiest roads for cycling in Calgary (at the west end) and connects to both the 7 Street S.W. and 5 Street S.W. cycle tracks as well as Eau Claire and Sien Lok Park (via 1 Street S.W.).



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Relevant Policies and Plans

3 Avenue South was identified as a cycling connection in several plans and policies:

- Tomorrow's Chinatown: https://www.calgary.ca/pda/pd/current-studies-and-...
- Pathway and Bikeway Plan: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/transportation/tp/cycling/cycling-route-improvements/pathway-and-bikeway-plan.html</u>
- Centre City Mobility Plan: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/transportation/tp/planning/centre-city/centre-city-mobility-plan.html</u>
- Cycling Strategy: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/transportation/tp/cycling/cycling-strategy/cycling-strategy.html</u>
- Calgary Transportation Plan : <u>https://www.calgary.ca/transportation/tp/planning/...</u>
- Centre City Plan: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/pda/pd/centre-city/centre-c...</u>
- Complete Streets Policy: <u>https://www.calgary.ca/transportation/tp/planning/...</u>



Study Area Map:

Calgary 虊

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



Engagement overview

The City hosted online engagement to provide citizens with an overview of the project and collect input on the 3 Avenue South Walking and Wheeling Upgrades project. The online engagement was available from August 12 – September 2, 2020. The online page received approximately 3836 views with 864 contributions of feedback. Due to COVID-19 restrictions The City of Calgary was unable to host in-person engagement opportunities, however the online engagement was extended to collect feedback.

What we asked

Stakeholders were also presented a detailed information package on each zone. These detailed information packages can be found at <u>https://engage.calgary.ca/3Avenue</u>. Stakeholders were then asked to provide feedback on the following questions:

Zone A:

- When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?
- When referring to Option 1 shown above for Zone A, what is the level of impact to the community?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?
- When referring to Option 2 shown above for Zone A, what is the level of impact to the community?

Zone B:

- When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think should be improved?
- When referring to the option for Zone B shown above, what is the level of impact to the community?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Zone C:

- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When referring to Option 1 shown above for Zone C, what is the level of impact to the community?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?
- When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?
- When referring to Option 2 shown above for Zone C, what is the level of impact to the community?

Additional Questions:

• In general, how often do you travel using the following?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- When travelling to and along 3 Avenue South, which transportation modes do you use?
- Why do you travel in this area?
- What are the mobility needs of people who live, work, and access this area?
- How has the experience of travelling to and along 3 Avenue South changed since the COVID-19 pandemic began?
- Do you have any additional comments about the project?
- How did you hear about the project?

What we heard

The project received approximately 3,840 page views and 864 pieces of input from the online engagement. Below is a summary of the themes that emerged through the citizen engagement for this project. The themes are listed from most frequent to least frequent.

Zone A:

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected. The majority of feedback for Zone A saw the preservation of parking as a benefit for this option.

Traffic Flow

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow and specifically saw this option of maintaining two-way traffic as a benefit.

Safety

Participants expressed and identified various safety concerns as they relate to this option. Specific safety concerns included conflicts between cycling and driving and conflicts between people walking and using scooters on the sidewalk.

Pedestrian Realm & Walkability & Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that viewed the improvements to the streetscape (sidewalks, ramps, and crossings) as an overall benefit to the pedestrian realm, accessibility, and walkability of the area.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?

Safety

Participants expressed and identified various safety concerns as they relate to this option. Specific safety concerns included conflicts between cycling & driving and conflicts between people walking & using scooters on the sidewalk. Comments indicated a strong desire for protected lanes for a safe separation of modes.

Traffic Flow

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow and a concern that this option would cause a problem for the traffic flow of the area. Conversely there were also comments relating to a desire for more traffic calming measures and a decrease in the speed limit.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected. While the majority of feedback for Zone A saw the preservation of parking as a benefit for this option, there was still numerous comments expressing the desire to retain as much parking as possible.

• When referring to Option 1 shown above for Zone A, what is the level of impact to the community?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



Cycling and micro-mobility safety and facility design





Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020





• When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people walking and people driving).

Traffic Flow & Connectivity

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow, which included both benefits and concerns. These included comments on the 1-way conversion, traffic calming measures, and congestion. There were also numerous comments that expressed appreciation for the connectivity to the cycle network this option provides.

General lack of support



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. Subthemes within this feedback indicated a perception of a negative impact on businesses, a desire to not make any changes to the area, and comments indicating tax dollars should be spent elsewhere.

Pedestrian Realm & Walkability & Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that viewed the improvements to the streetscape (sidewalks, ramps, and crossings) as an overall benefit to the pedestrian realm, accessibility, and walkability of the area.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected. There is concern over the parking loss presented within this option.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. Subthemes within this feedback indicated a perception of a negative impact on businesses, safety concerns, a desire to not make any changes to the area, and comments indicating tax dollars should be spent elsewhere.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected. There is concern over the parking loss presented within this option.

Safety

Participants expressed comments that related to safety which included: importance of clear sight lines, concern of mix of transportation modes at intersections, potential conflict from parking and cycle tracks, and conflicts between drivers turning and cyclists.

Traffic Flow

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow, which included both benefits and concerns. There were numerous comments that expressed a desire to maintain two-way traffic.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

• When referring to Option 2 shown above for Zone A, what is the level of impact to the community?







Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



Zone B:

• When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think works well?

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people walking and people driving).

Traffic Flow



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Feedback received had many comments that related to this design option being beneficial to traffic flow. Participants expressed an appreciation for no changes to roadway operations and felt the increased crossing safety elements would also serve as traffic calming measures.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this option feedback indicated the benefit of retaining all of the existing parking.

Pedestrian Realm & Walkability & Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that viewed the improvements to the streetscape (sidewalks, ramps, and crossings) as an overall benefit to the pedestrian realm, accessibility, and walkability of the area. There was also feedback that indicated the removal of the pedestrian scramble was a benefit to this option.

General feedback for both support and opposition of the project

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general support and general lack of support for the project. Subthemes within this feedback that were in support indicated an overall favor of this project and the design option, while feedback in opposition related to perception of a negative impact on businesses, safety concerns, a desire to not make any changes to the area, and comments indicating tax dollars should be spent elsewhere.

• When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think should be improved?

Safety

Participants expressed comments that related to safety which included: importance of clear sight lines, concern of mix of transportation modes at intersections, potential conflict from parking and cycle tracks, and conflicts between drivers turning and cyclists.

Traffic Flow & Connectivity

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow. Participants expressed a desire for a reduction in the speed limit. There were also numerous comments that expressed the need for the connectivity to the cycle network.

General feedback In support of this design option

There was a significant amount of feedback that reflected overall support for this design option and that the design option was good as presented.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Pedestrian Realm & Walkability & Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that expressed a desire to have more trees and vegetation added to the design option. There was also feedback that indicated a desire for the streetscape to have aesthetic improvements. Input received also indicated the removal of the pedestrian scramble is seen as a negative impact.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. Subthemes within this feedback indicated a perception of a negative impact on businesses, safety concerns, a desire to not make any changes to the area, and comments indicating tax dollars should be spent elsewhere.

• When referring to the option for Zone B shown above, what is the level of impact to the community?





Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020







Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



Zone C:

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in Option 1, feedback indicated the benefit of retaining most of the existing parking.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for Option 1.

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of Option 1 as they relate to the physical separation of modes (i.e. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people driving).

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is general safety concerns and desire for no changes to the area.

Traffic Flow



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow and the benefit of retaining two-way traffic.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option as it is presented.

Pedestrian Realm, Walkability and Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that this option does not enhance the walkability of the area as a result of sharing the space with wheeling devices.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this Option 1, feedback indicated a lack of support for the removal of any parking.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is general safety concerns and desire for no changes to the area.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think works well?

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option with specific mentions to the conflict of modes of transportation.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Safety

Participants expressed the safety concerns of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (i.e. having people cycling and driving share the road, and people walking and riding scooters sharing the sidewalk).

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this option feedback indicated the benefit of retaining all of the existing parking.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option as it was presented.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think should be improved?

Safety

Participants expressed the safety concerns of this option 1 as they relate to the conflict of modes (ie. having people cycling and driving share the road, and people walking and riding scooters sharing the sidewalk) and a desire for a physical separation between drivers and cyclists. Pedestrian safety concerns were prominent in the feedback.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option as it was presented.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option with specific mentions to the lack of desire for cycling amenities in general and a desire for no changes to the area.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option and the project. Comments also indicated a desire for no changes to the area.

Traffic Flow

The project received numerous pieces of feedback that indicated the preservation of the two-way traffic as a benefit.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this option, feedback indicated the benefit of retaining all of the existing parking.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option as it was presented.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option and the project.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this option, feedback indicated the benefit of retaining all of the existing parking and a desire for additional parking to be added.

Pedestrian Realm, Walkability and Accessibility



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Participants provided feedback that this option does not enhance the walkability and that the pedestrian realm could be improved.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option. Subthemes included the support in people cycling and riding scooters having dedicated spaces that are separated from people walking and people driving.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option and the project.

Parking

The theme of parking was prominent within the feedback collected, and in this option feedback indicated the benefit of retaining all of the existing parking.

Pedestrian Realm, Walkability and Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that sees this option as being beneficial to the pedestrian realm and walkability of the area and commonly mentions the improvements to the crossing safety of the option.

• When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?

Safety

Participants expressed the safety concerns of this option having safety concerns with the width of the cycle track and that it is too narrow.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for this option and the project.

General support



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option as it was presented.

Pedestrian Realm, Walkability and Accessibility

Participants provided feedback that gave specific recommendations to crossings and intersection improvements.



• When referring to Option 1 shown above for Zone C, what is the level of impact to the community?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020







Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option with the main comment being around the support for the complete cycle tracks.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative impact on businesses and parking loss concerns.

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people driving and people walking).

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the removal of parking within this option.

Traffic Flow



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow and the benefit of retaining two-way traffic.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the removal of parking within this option.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative impact on businesses and parking loss concerns.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option with the main comment being around the support for the complete cycle tracks.

Traffic Flow

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated the need for additional traffic calming measures within this option.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think works well?

General support for option and separated one-way cycle tracks

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the separated one-way cycle tracks.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative safety concerns and negative impact to businesses.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people driving and people walking).

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated the retaining of some parking is a benefit to the option.

Traffic Flow

Feedback received had many comments that related to traffic flow and the benefit of retaining two-way traffic.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think should be improved?

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative impact on businesses, parking loss concerns, and an overall lack of support for wheeling amenities and the cycle track.

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the removal of some parking within this option.

General support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the option.

Safety



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Participants expressed the safety concerns of this option as they relate to potential conflicts of all modes at parking lots and spaces, and intersections.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative safety concerns and negative impact to businesses and a lack of support for the cycle track.

General support for option and cycle tracks

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for this option and the cycle tracks.

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people driving and people walking).

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated the retaining of parking is a benefit to the option.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative safety concerns and negative impact to businesses and a lack of support for the cycle track.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Safety

Participants expressed the safety concerns of this option as they relate to potential conflicts of all modes at parking lots and spaces, and intersections. There was also concern with the widening of the cycle track on the North side.

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the removal of some parking within this option.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?

General support for option and cycle track

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for the separated two-way cycle track. Comments also indicated the appreciation for wide cycle tracks.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a perceived negative safety concerns, negative impact to businesses, parking loss, and a lack of support for the cycle track.

Safety

Participants expressed the safety benefits of this option as they relate to the physical separation of modes (E.G. having people cycling and riding scooters having a dedicated space to travel that is separated from people driving and people walking) as well as the increased safety crossing for people walking and wheeling.

• When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Parking

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the removal of some parking within this option.

General lack of support

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated a general lack of support for the project. A subtheme within this feedback is concern over a parking loss and a desire for no changes to be made to the area.

General support for option and cycle track

The project received numerous pieces of feedback in response to this question that indicated general support for this option and the separated two-way cycle track.



When referring to Option 2 shown above for Zone C, what is the level of impact to the community?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020







Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



Additional Questions:



• In general, how often do you travel using the following?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Transportation modes Walking or wheelchair 173 Bicycle 125 Micro-mobility 16 (scooter, in-line... Electrified mobility 39 device (E-Scooter, E-... Transit 33 Automobile 167 Taxi and/or Ride-hailing 42 Service Other 10 0 20 40 80 100 120 160 180 200 60 140
- When travelling to and along 3 Avenue South, which transportation modes do you use?

• Why do you travel in this area?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



• What are the mobility needs of people who live, work, and access this area?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020





Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

• How has the experience of travelling to and along 3 Avenue South changed since the COVID-19 pandemic began?



• Do you have any additional comments about the project?



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020



• How did you hear about the project?

Next Steps

Once we have reviewed all the feedback, The City will weigh the feedback alongside the recommendations received from our technical experts and report back to the public at the October public engagement session.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

Verbatim Comments

The following is a record of the feedback received through in person and online engagement.

Please note: Personal, identifying information, as well as any portions of comments not in compliance with the City's Respectful Workplace policy are removed from participant submissions. However, the intent of the submissions remains. No other edits to the feedback have been made, and the verbatim comments are as received.

Zone A:

When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?

- No removal of trees
- I guess keeping all the parking...
- This option creates slower, two-way traffic. However, it also relies on human meat shields to slow cars.
- Preserves parking
- I don't think anything works well, as this is pretty close to exactly how it is currently.
- No changes to 2 travel lanes and 2 parking lanes.
- Some sidewalk improvements
- Nothing
- maintains 2 way street
- no, it won't
- Nothing
- The small section of eastbound separated bike lane. Admittedly, the bike box at the 7th st. intersection is effective, but why not at the other intersections if cyclists are sharing the road with cars?
- Connection to 7th ave and pathway networks
- it connects to the pathway
- The only real benefit is maintaining two-way vehicle traffic, which is good for business.
- Makes more sense to add money to developing 2nd ave rather then 3rd as that's the road that needs more attention.
- If you are serious about following the 5A principles than cycletracks are the only right answer. Sharrows do nothing to keep people safe.
- sidewalk improvements
- Nice wide sidewalks, two way traffic
- •


- It allows more comprehensive access for drivers, though this limits opportunities for other travel modes.
- I live in this district and parking is already an issue. Parking retention is important to me, so keeping those extra stalls.
- It doesn't impact current parking spaces which the area is low in
- Don't change it
- Retains two-way vehicular traffic.
- An actual designated bike lane indicating to riders that they can use the road for their bike.
- Improvements for pedestrians
- More parking
- Improved walking spaces will improve vibrancy and sense of community. May help local businesses.
- Getting Rid of Mayor Nenshi
- Marginally more pedestrian friendly than the status quo.
- minimal impact to road capacity
- I like the sidewalk improvements and connectivity to the bike facilities on 7 St.
- Separation of cyclists and scooter riders is the only good feature of this proposal
- Not much right now I've seen seniors nearly killed by scooters who never stop at stop signs. This is
 a community with an older average age and a seniors home scooters are ridden by a younger
 crowd who have no sense of respect for their elders
- Everything
- I like the cycling lane. I like the idea of getting the scooters OFF the sidewalks since they are menace to pedestrians
- I like the parking
- It allows for more parking space. The sidewalk improvement are always useful. More needs to be done for those hearing impaired.
- Maintains character and beauty of the community, maintains access and vibrancy of businesses, maintains walkability of the community. Biking on these streets is already safe with low speed and low volume of traffic.
- Share lines do nothing. The design is essentially status quo from a biking and walking experience.. still need to be on guard for cars
- Improved sidewalks, wheelchair access. Keep two-way street
- Two way road.
- It will help maintain the residential feel and allow residents to access the same amount of parking
- - I live along 3 Ave (Liberte) and believe that this road should remain a two-way street. I haven't seen the cycle/scooter volume to justify separate lanes.
- Good access for residents to drive in & out of area. Roads keep getting more & more restrictive. There are enough dedicated cycle track already in the area.



- No change to roadway or parking. Scooters (and bikes) MUST NOT EVER be on the sidewalk. There's retirement homes for frail seniors in this block!
- Nothing
- Retaining parking is important. People need to be able to come downtown and find somewhere to park (visiting Eau Clair, etc). Side walks are also equally important. Cycle tracks are not used or accessible by all
- Parking rmains
- The seven Street bike lane. Very well in fact since the opening of the Peace Bridge.
- Pedestrian curb cut improvements
- Separated eastbound bike lane section, and ramps
- This option will not work at all. Bicycle infrastructure needs to be completely separated. If the 2018 Centre City Bicycle Volume Map shows that 3 Avenue South is one of the busiest cycling routes in the centre city it deserves dedicated bike lanes.
- This option will be great for drivers hitting/injuring cyclists and will remove those pesky families/women/seniors from using this street for cycling s/.
- Cheap and keeps lots of parking.
- Very minimal change. Road still two-way and same amount of parking.
- Two way traffic for vehicles
- Dedicated cycling infrastructure provides certainty for all road users while still maintaining parking. One way traffic flow is appropriate for this area of Downtown.
- Balanced
- Nothing, you are mixing people and cars, it is unsafe. I'd never take my kids biking on this option
- Nothing. This will be a disaster.
- There is less social engineering. Keep my money in my pocket and not use it on special interest groups. I have yet to see more than 1 person riding their bike during a snow storm
- test
- Sharrows aren't helpful and don't provide protection.
- Is faster for experienced cyclists.
- Crosswalk and sidewalk improvements.
- Two-way vehicle travel and parking retention.
- Option 2 is incredibly forward thinking and I fully support this kind of configuration
- Keeping 2 directional traffic is a benefit.
- Retains 100% of parking, which is often a barrier for some
- nothing works well. better to close pathway than make residents suffer
- Sidewalk improvements. I believe many seniors and physically impaired people live on this block, so this will benefit them



- This option will not work. Research has illustrated that "sharrows" do not increase cyclist comfort, and do not increase route usage. This would be taking away parking while providing no benefit to cyclists and pedestrians.
- Nothing. Blkes and big cars don't mix. Scooters and pedestrians don't mix. People get hurt. The money saved by not building protected lanes is wiped out by medical bills by AHS and less bike/walk traffic.
- Parking, I live in Zone A and the parking spots are usually always pretty busy.
- The bike path currently connects from the peace bridge and down 7 street SW, while allowing an alternate roadway on 3 Ave for bikes
- The cycle tracks. I think it will flow better from zone to zone it's frustrating when bike infrastructure is inconsistent. Provides greater safety to cyclists and provides clear pathway to pedestrians.
- This works well for cars and is your cheaper option if you don't take health and safety costs into account.
- Option 1 maintains two-way traffic throughout the two blocks
- No change to roadway and parking. Removed bikes and scooters off sidewalks.
- Sidewalk improvements, parking retention.
- I'm glad the city is considering how extend the cycling area
- Preservation of residential character, bushes and parking near the residences.
- On street parking works for natural traffic calming.
- Keeps vehicle traffic flow when needed. Low volume so experienced cyclists would be comfortable.
- Improved pedestrian experience.
- I think this is an excellent area to connect to the pathway system
- It's good for cars and drivers, lots of parking
- Minimal changes, works with low vehicle traffic.
- it's hard to say it works well at all. There's a bit of a missing context. Lots of on-street/off-street parking west of the 'study area'
- I think the greenway option works. I'm a huge fan of bike lanes, but know there would be significant pushback against any loss of parking. One way eastbound would also force everyone in the area to turn onto 8th which may cause traffic issues.
- Finally you put back in the pedestrian crosswalk that was removed to allow bicycles the right of way. This will be a plus with bikes and cars sharing the road
- This provides an obvious connection between the pathways and the 7th Street cycle track.
- Nothing Sharrows are terrible
- Sidewalk retention, bicycle infrastructure is present
- 2 way traffic-no separation for bikes
- n/a
- Keeps residents and businesses happy by maintaining their perceived need for parking
- The current arrangement.



- Sidewalk improvments. No changes to two-way road operation or parking. Makes sense as these are slower-speed residential streets.
- ummm A whole bunch of cars get to drive? Just like they do on 4th,5th,6th, and 9th.
- Nothing works well.
- May be simplest to implement since there are minimal improvements proposed in this option.
- Option 1 is not much different than what is there now. It is a nice quiet place now to walk and bike, but biking would be safer if there was less vehicle traffic.
- I don't see how this is much different than current (which does not work well), aside from sidewalk improvements.
- Nothing, painted lanes don't really help provide safer options. It's possible the paint may alert motorists that this is a high traffic cycling corridor into downtown, and may provide motorists with signals to be more aware
- Nothing, not necessary, usage would be non existent waste of tax payer money
- It enforces traffic calming by sharing the road with bicycles and vehicles. Allows 2 way traffic.
- It has been working well
- This is the current setup. It doesn't work well.
- None
- some improvements for pedestrians
- Only Option 1 is acceptable to this community.
- The only good thing I can say is it is not option 2. I prefer option 3 where you are not wasting tax payer dollars on something as non essential as this when the city is running a massive deficit
- The limited number of parking spaces are not impacted. Traffic flows East to west during rush hour. After the weekday afternoon rush hour there is no concerns with car bike access to road ways. Parking with so many families is a prime concern.
- Option 1 works best, keeps 3 Ave. accessible to vehicles both directions, this is a must for traffic/delivery/upload/download of goods. Parking is essential for area residents/festival traffic in the park/business access for consumers/senior home visitors
- No real change to current layout is very familiar
- Rush hour is only time when there are a few cyclists. Want to keep two way traffic. We shouldn't have to lose parking. Scooters are seasonal. Residents have already lost parking from 7th Street bike lane, and two way operation of street.
- No changes to parking and much-needed sidewalk improvements. Road remains two-way street.
- Parking is important for the neighborhood businesses
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- x
- It is ok.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- nothing. Need a cycle track.
- Minimal impact on parking availability for residents and sidewalk improvements that don't effect the old growth trees and foliage.
- 3 ave is already narrow and does not need more space taken out to green scrape.
- Traffic is maintained.
- Given the proximity of the bike paths I do not think it is necessary to separate the cyclists from the motorists. Keeping parking is a positive and keeping it two way for convenience of residents and Fire Department is positive.
- I don't support option1 as it can be dangerous
- parking traffic flow
- Don't make any changes to 3rd Ave SW
- Clear signage for cyclists and motorists to know there's mixed users
- Status quo leave the same the cycle path on 7th St SW has negatively impacted the businesses enough.
- Keeps traffic flowing both directions,keeps parking spaces
- Road should be two way and no need to make separate line for Cycling. It will disturb the residence as it is small road. No change is required
- All parking retained.
- We need all the parking we can get, unfortunately. Cycling doesn't seem to be much of an issue for me here.
- The avenue is not that busy so I am okay with bike and car traffic sharing
- Nothing. Makes the road design worse for cyclists and motorists.
- i think this is similar to current operations but with more heightened awareness for cyclist that would be great. Going on how busy it can be at weekends. loosing carparking spots might not be a good plans
- Traffic in this Zone has a flow pattern dominated by rush hour. Easterly in the morning and westerly in the evening. The actual volume is low and easily supports the current flow of vehicles and bicycles
- It's a nice continuation of the bike path.
- happy to see improvements in wheelchair ramps, but that's about it.

When looking at Option 1 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?

- I don't think this should be considered as it just creates a broken and disconnected cycle track
- Why is it a shared road with cars? Not good for all age cycling



- I do not like mixing bikes/scooters with cars. However, mixing those with pedestrians is also not a comfortable solution.
- Sharrows are no substitute for a real cycle track
- I think there should be increased separation from traffic. Oddly, I find this the most dangerous part of 3 Ave in spite of how narrow it is, because cars get impatient and close pass bicycles.
- Nothing
- Sharrows are not bike infrastructure. Protected lanes are required for the influx of all ages and abilities riders from the pathway. Sharrows can actually decrease safety with a false sense of security.
- Bike paths
- separation between pedestrians scooters and cyclist.
- Sharrows are bad and kill people, sidewalks need less congestion.
- Cyclists, skateboarders, scooter riders and rollerbladers should not have to share the lane with vehicles. There needs more physical separation between vehicles and people. This option is also prioritizing parking way too much.
- Not enough infrastructure for bicycles & other non-vehicle mobility options
- Sharrows are no good, make the stretch 30km/hr and add traffic calming. Or perhpaps a one way between 7th and 6th ST SW
- needs seperation from vehicles/parking, better protection at intersections
- Any option without dedicated protected cycling infrastructure is not acceptable
- There isn't much of an upgrade for any mode.
- Should look at creating more affordable parking so everyone can enjoy.
- Install cycletracks.
- There is very little improvement for cyclists. This is unfortunate given this missing link from multi-use pathway system to existing cycle track. building beside houses so scooters on the sidewalk seems like a disaster waiting to happen.
- Separation is needed between cyclists and vehicles
- The street serves commuter traffic, which can be in a hurry. It can also get quite busy at 8th Ave/8th St westbound. This makes it less comfortable at shared space, which will exclude less-confident Calgarians from using, or result in safety issues..
- Parking places for scooters that isn't grass/sidewalk.
- Honestly i dont think the city needs to spend money in this area. Its fine how it is
- Don't change it
- Too much public money being used to store private property (cars).
- The bike lane should be separated, as this decreases the chances of cars and cyclists conflicting with one another
- This option needs a speed limit of 30 km/h or less, and accompanying traffic calming
- Pedestrian safety



- Given the high level of bike and scooter traffic, and the potential for increases, option 1 fails to provide a safe environment (and even a sense of safety) for people walking and riding bikes -- will suppress potential growth in activity here.
- Also getting rid of the entire City Council
- Cyclists still face an unfriendly environment this street is narrow enough that drivers have a hard enough time doing the right thing right now.
- not many improvements to walkways
- I don't like sharing the road with cars when I am on my bike it doesn't feel safe.
- Cycling infrastructure is over-engineered creating a cluttered feel. The short stretch of bike lane is pointless. With so few cars here, even in rush hour, 3 Ave is better left as it is
- We need parking here, it's inhabited by older people who don't cycle or use scooters those are only used by people passing through not residents and it causes a lot of problems and danger to lives of the older people
- Nothing
- For people living in the area of 2nd Ave and 7th Street, the access to this area will require even more o. I f a detour as 7th St is one way . Also it will add more congestion around 6th St SW since there will be fewer options out of the area
- I don't like that cycling tracks aren't seperated.
- Based on experience sharing of bike and car on a single file doesn't work well. Drivers do not read the sign and get impatient staying behind bikes, driving very close to bikes. Overall this option is safer for bikes and better for the landscape
- Nothing
- Reduce speeds to 20kph and speed bumps so that users don't have to fear the one car speeding
- no need for separated bike lane section on road
- Sidewalk improvements
- It is really important to me that the intersection at 3 st S and 8 st SW is smooth and there is safe and smooth bike access from the pathway system to 3 ave S. Similarly it would be important to have a good transition from cycle track on the East side
- Parking. Consider angled parking on the south side of 3 Ave in front of the Eau Claire Retirement Residence. This will increase the # of stalls. Another alt. eliminate street parking and encourage use of the surface lots on the west side..
- Remove street parking on one side of the road.
- Keep it as is. Do not allow scooters or motorized skateboards on sidewalks EVER! Do not change infrastructure just to accommodate a few scooters that are useable for less than 6 months of the year! Keep sidewalks clear of scooters!
- Bikes shouldn't have to share with cars
- Mitigation of risk to cyclist with parking in front of care residence.



- The park area at 3rd Ave and 8 street, should have the access to 3rd Ave removed. The park should be renovated to include a soccer pitch or ice rink / blade park.
- Lack of protected wheeling facilities does little to improve and manage the existing users, and the increase that will be expected due to pathway detours. There are more condos in this area than before, so there is more traffic interacting with 3rd Ave.
- Single file shared lines, very dangerous
- Add dedicated, separated bicycle lane.
- Separated cycling infrastructure is crucial for accessibility of all demographics. Why are we even still considering painted bike lanes especially in downtown, when they are proven to be less safe? I will not take kids on street with cars here.
- if you move forward with this, you're essentially spending money, and doing nothing
- Make it one way for cars and add a biking facility for the other.
- Nothing
- Sharrows are not a solution for cyclists this is an option that does not effectively meet the needs of any user well.
- Listen to local residents
- A cycle track
- Separated scooter/pedestrian and bike/cars.
- Yes, leave it alone. It works fine now, there are no incursions in this report any viable reason to make changes (ie pedestrian/cyclist injuries)
- test
- Add cycle tracks
- Separate bike and car lanes. Sharrows are ignored by drivers and confusing for cyclists.
- For all options, pls do not remove driving lanes or on street parking. Just have cyclists/scooters follow the rules and respect pedestrians. There are plenty of existing cycle lanes in the rest of downtown that are under utilized.
- Sharrows are pretty much useless, but I don't want to see vehicle traffic reduced to one-ways.
- separated lanes for sure!
- Leave the traffic flow alone, put the bikes on the sidewalks. Also eliminate cyclists having right of way over turning cars in their inside lane. This is very dangerous.
- Need to improve protection for vulnerable road users
- stop the project.
- Sharing the road between cyclists and motorized vehicles can be challenginng, I have found this usually means either drivers are courteous, or cyclists have to hug the parking lane to allow passing
- Fully separated lanes are safe for cyclists and cars. Cars do not have to worry about hitting cyclists if they are in a separated track, and cyclists don't need to worry about cars hitting them with separated tracks.



- On block 2 the road is not wide enough for cyclists and pedestrians to share road, would make sense to to remove the parking zone on the south side of block 2 where the road narrows.
- The area of concern around pedestrian safety is outside of the elderly Care Resident, the sidewalk can have a ramp for scooters to go down and join the bike path before the facility
- Designation of shared space. Cars do not share roads well in Calgary.
- There needs to be separated cycle tracks. When cars and bikes are mixed, cars never share the road. I've been honked at and driven off the road on "single file" bike/car sharing roads.
- Pedestrian and cyclist access and safety should be improved with separated cycle tracks.
- I'm concerned about the lack of consistency of facilities from Zone A to B, especially for winter time. I rely on the cycle tracks to be snow-cleared in the winter to get around and I would be concerned that the sharrows would not get that same treatment.
- Maybe stop people from using that part of the road to exit downtown and bypass traffic on 4th ave. That is where a lot of the peak traffic comes from. If you take that away it would mostly be local traffic and safer for cyclists, scooters etc.
- The lack of cycle tracks and having scooters share the sidewalk doesn't increase safety of commuters. There's no incentive for drivers to go slower. And sidewalks aren't big enough to share. Additionally transition from zone a to b is awkward.
- Too many cars, and too much priority placed on their perceived needs.
- Sharing bike and car lanes is still very dangerous.
- NA
- Support for active transportation—remains unsafe for cyclists, scooters mixed with pedestrians.
- Protected lanes are essential to encouraging ridership
- Separate of cars and pedestrians, bikers, scooters. It's dangerous biking next to parking (getting doored)
- No indications of how the 8th St. crossing will improve for walkers or wheelers. Traffic on 8th St should yield to 3rd Ave.
- The intersection with 7 St seems like an unnecessarily confusing mix of cars and bikes. Is anyone other than residents or very local office workers parking on this stretch?
- Put in a speed limit of 30 to encourage slower driving speeds
- Putting a three way stop sign on 8th street and 3rd ave SW.
- Separation of people on bikes and scooters from cars is the safest improvement. Having a place for scooters to be off the sidewalk is also the safest improvement.
- Separated bike are cars and a 30km/hr speed limit is neeeded
- It could be improved by turning it into Option 2. Sharrows are a lose-losee for everyone; cyclists aren't safer and drivers are stuck behind slower-moving cyclists, creating antagonism.
- sidewalks and greenery need upgrades
- This isn't a neighbourhood greenway too many cars and traffic. Would need more traffic calming to be effective



- Sharrows do nothing to protect cyclists and encourage new cyclists to use that route. Even on a slower street cars squeeze you out and you are watching for car doors. Plus you are not removing scooters from sidewalk which is the major hazard IMO.
- Nothing. Option 1 is very reasonable.
- huh. This should be absolute primo non car street. Vibrant Chinatown. Close to River. Eau Claire will be rebuilt... someday. I'd go as far as to say there are too many cars.
- Unbelievable gall on the part of city employees and councillors
- Not enough meaningful immediate nor future-oriented improvements. Leaves active modes competing with each other and motor vehicles still. Does not align with design best practices given stated highest purpose is safety. Doesn't incentivize active modes.
- One-way traffic for cars, with a dedicated two-way bike lane?
- Please don't remove all the parking!
- Needs safer cycling infrastructure. Shared roads are not safe. This is a busy street during rush hour. It becomes hairy for cyclists in the current shared road (sharrow) configuration, and major risks for dooring of cyclists and scooter operators.
- Everything, Option 2 is far superior and safer for everyone involved, protected cyclists due to the bike lane, pedestrians are separated from the road by the bike lane, and the narrowing of the corridor by the bike lane forces traffic to slow down, safer
- Don't do it, don't necessary, waste of money.
- Bicycle use is less safe sharing the road. Vehicle drivers may become impatient and pass unsafely. Little separated cycle track section too short and inconsistent within the zone, seems confusing.
- Nothing should be improved
- It is too cramped for cars alone with parking on both sides, let alone cars and bikes. There are a lot of close calls with cyclists passing cars very closely.
- The sharing is impractical.
- add bike lanes
- The city never required developers to put in enough parking for all residents who live in the area let alone visitors or parking for any small businesses that are providing jobs and tax dollars to the municipality. This street does NOT require changeesses
- Scrap the whole idea. Also put the scooters on the roads where they belong they are a menace to pedestrians
- I would improve the park at 8 at and 3 Ave SW. Remove bike access to 3rd Ave as the new Peace bridge is the major connector now. This land could be a soccer pitch to a baseball diamond to outdoor Skate park. Install 4 way stops in area slows traffic.
- Traffic lights that slow down bicycles on Ave; the speed of cyclists on the Ave is hazordous to seniors/children.
- Separation between cycles and vehicles would be beneficial
- No bike lane at all



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Plan does not address the overall problem with motorized scooters. Scooter riders should not be allowed to share the sidewalk! Especially in this block where there is a seniors residence! City Council needs to create new bylaws.
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- Make sure the parking lots that is enough!
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- Cycle track.
- Make sure there is ample signage on the road for vehicles to understand they share the road (although that's currently in place, the green coloring helps).
- Nothing. There are lots of bike lanes and Eau Claire is not far way and there is a bike path there for those who feel more comfortable on a path
- If proper separation is provide then it can be improved
- Nothing needs to be improved
- More space for cyclists and pedestrians
- For safety, need some form to separate cyclists from vehicle traffic.
- More parking would be great if possible.
- It's all good
- Makes the road less safe for cyclists. Eastbound cars turning right from 3 Ave to 7 St now have to turn across a bike lane. This will be extremely confusing, and will result in vehicle bicycle collisions.
- I think a similar cyclist awarness markings on the road at the 8st end might be useful
- I think it works well
- I don't like that vehicle traffic short-cuts down 3rd Ave to 8th St to exit downtown. As a cyclist, I don't like the budging sidewalks at intersections. We cyclists get squeezed get squeezed by vehicles against the curb at these sites.
- honestly, constantly pandering to cyclists is really getting on my nerves. The driveability of Calgary's downtown has been decreasing for many years now, with permanent fixtures for most cyclists who only ride a few months per year.

When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think works well?

- amazing work
- Fully connected cycle tracks, safer for pedestrians and for bikers
- Protected bike lanes!



- I really like the separation of uses. This feels most safe and allows for the best causal flow of people walking and wheeling.
- Provides a legitimate cycle track and maintains connection to river pathway system on both ends
- I think this would solve a lot of the risk in this area with cars and bikes interacting.
- The cycle track will make it easier and safer by separating bikers and cars. By creating this redesign It will draw more bikers off the bow river, so you will see additional usage compared to the study. Cycle track will benefit this.
- Nothing works well
- Protected bike lanes. Conversion to one-way traffic will decrease commuter cut-through traffic.
- Cycling path
- separations of pedestrians and cyclist/scooters. increase safety and enhance cycling infrastructure
- One way cycle tracks
- Very strong separation between people and vehicles. Very safe for the actual users of the area (pedestrians, cyclists and micromobility).
- Better bike infrastructure, safer street overall because of slowed traffic
- Separate cycletracks are great
- Protected cycling infrastructure
- Massive improvement in safety for people wheeling. The wheeling lanes will also provide a buffer and safety for people walking.
- Makes more sense to add money to developing 2nd ave rather then 3rd as that's the road that needs more attention.
- Physical separation looks good. If there is a way to preserve some parking that would be good too.
- Improved link of cyclists infrastructure. Less interaction between wheeled individuals and older adults. Less interaction between cars and those on bikes. One way reduces potential collisions for left turning cyclist
- Separation between cyclists and vehicles. Option 2 is the best option for a safe street suitable for all users and abilities.
- Cycle tracks
- Cycle tracks provide access to any level of ability or age rider, while still allowing motor vehicle access. This creates a viable continuous east-west corridor for all users. Commuter use may be lessened and more community-focus achieved.
- Added safety for pedestrians.
- It prevents the 8th and 4th intersection from getting bottled up
- Don't change it and save tax payer money
- Better separation of fragile human lives against dangerous 3,000 pound metal boxes.
- Having a designated bike lane works very well. I would use 3rd Avenue to get around the downtown area.



- Separation of modes- wonderful! As a walker I don't have to worry about people on wheels, and vice versa
- Separating cycles and scooters to increase safety of all
- Improved access and safety (both perceived and actual) for ALL active transportation options will increase local-oriented activity and customer count in local businesses. Serves the whole population not just people with cars. Also a quieter, nicer st.
- Separate cycle tracks ensure that the large number of cyclists going through here at peak times will have a safer environment.
- nothing
- I like the dedicated lanes for cyclist and scooters. I also like to connectivity to 1st and the river pathway and this options shows how people should use the space safely
- Nothing. It's a dog's breakfast
- Nothing, if this comes to fruition I shal sell up and move out of Calgary and close down my buisness and make all my employees redundant. I can't operate. We're not in California and we're fooling ourselves to think Calgary needs more cycle tracks here
- Nothing. Cyclists in the area (ie 7th street) don't use the designated bike lanes so giving them a separated lane is just infuriating for drivers.
- I like the cycling lane. I like the idea of getting the scooters OFF the sidewalks since they are menace to pedestrians
- I like the separated cycling tracks a lot.
- Separated bike lane (safer for bikes and scooter). Better connects with other tracks in Calgary. Creates a more humane feel to the neighbourhood. Will attract more pedestrian as it is a less noisy road and with more in and out from bikes/scooter
- Nothing.
- Separate modes of travel key if car speeds aren't reduced
- Do not like Option 2 no need for separate cycle track, since close to Eau Claire bike path
- Love this option. It enhances opportunities for active transportation WHICH IS GREAT! Let's encourage more walking, biking, scooters, etc. and less cars. I love that there isnt going to be a lot of parking, which makes it feel nicer in the neighbourhood.
- objectives are not clear
- I think it would probably connect well to the cycle track in Zone B and be more comfortable for cylcists who don't like sharing traffic with cars
- I don't like this option. Making this a one-way street is a bad idea...
- It doesn't work for residents in the area.
- Nothing. This is an extravagant vanity project.
- Separate bike lane
- Continuity of cycle lanes to 7th st cycle track



- The bike lane up and down 7 th street SW, the present side walks along 3rd Ave are very wide and welcoming.
- Protected/separated wheeling infrastructure that connects to existing on-street and pathway protected. It accounts for the increase in traffic due to more residential. It's a natural connection and will relieve congestion on the pathway, good investment.
- Separated one-way cycle tracks with bike path
- Dedicated bicycle lane.
- Separated cycling infrastructure should be standard, it shouldn't be an option to debate! We wouldn't build an unsafe street for cars, why are people on bikes deemed to be lesser users?
- works very well in alienating drivers and car owners, creating gridlock, and reducing visitors in area
- Safer for everyone. Separates scooters from pedestrians
- Nothing
- a more comforatble option for bikes an escooters
- Provides clarity for all users. A safe and dedicated route for cyclists is important in this area.
- The downtown core has been emptied out and is becoming more dangerous. I would not feel comfortable walking or biking after dark in my neighbourhood. Take care of crime first.
- A real cycle track, much safer, would take my kids here.
- A huge increase in safety for all users, and bringing traffic past local businesses.
- Nothing, absolutely nothing. You are making work out of nothingness, just stop.
- test
- Protected infrastructure for people riding bikes, scooters, etc.
- Wider it better with cycle track
- Separate lanes are safer and more attractive to casual cyclists and families. This is critical if this route is to be a temporary detour from the river path.
- Crosswalk and sidewalk improvements.
- In general, I'd like to see protected bike lanes in all three zones. Especially given the COVID context, leveraging the city's greatest publicly owned asset (sidewalks) to provide safe ped / bike access is paramount even for economic recovery.
- Angle parking if it helps reduced the size of vehicle driving lanes to slow traffic.
- Separated lanes
- Protection for vulnerable road users is good
- nothing works well. better to close pathway than make residents suffer
- Separate cycling and scooting lane. One way traffic will cause calming
- I think this is the better option, as the track is more comfortable for cyclists of all ages, and is protected from traffic, meaning less concern about being hit.
- It allows cars to keep being cars. Cyclists who are not comfy sharing the road are now more likely to visit the businesses in the area.
- Separation of bikes/scooters from Cars & less street parking.



- I think having dedicated bike lanes is a good idea, specially since so many cyclists use that corridor to get to work in the mornings and to access other parts of the bike lane network.
- Nothing, turning this avenue into a one way street will decrease traffic for businesses and increase traffic on 4th ave in PM rush hour.
- One of way street will make the road less congested during evening traffic jam
- Cycle track
- I like the separated bike lanes. It's also good there's a layer of parked cars protecting bikes on the left side.
- This works well for cyclists and pedestrians, improving safety, promoting alternative and healthier forms of transportation, slowing traffic, with minor inconvenience for cars. This is the obvious choice. Sharrows do not work -- cars pass cyclists.
- Finally a protected on-street east-west option north of 8 Street SW! Thank you! I think this will connect folks from the pathway system to the homes and shops along 3 Ave !
- It is good for cyclists, scooters etc but not good for residents. I don't like this option
- you need to enforce residential parking only in these residential areas. Otherwise, people are forced to pay parking when they live in the area.
- Physical cycle tracks allow more people of all abilities to feel comfortable cycling and increases safety for pedestrians.
- It makes me, and my children, far less likely to be killed by a drivist. I'm much more likely to bring them to the area if they don't have to ride with cars.
- Cycle tracks increase attractiveness to cyclists and calm traffic.
- Better for pedestrian and wheeled access.
- Good support for pedestrians, cyclists, good separation of cars, pedestrians, and active transport modes.
- The protected lanes would make people want to bike more
- It's safer for individuals who travel other than by car with separated cycle tracks
- Clear indication that bikes are a first class citizen and actively encourages less fearless riders to go on road instead of sidewalk.
- It is a beautifully designed welcome into downtown for cyclists who've committed to an active lifestyle and appreciate a feeling of safety as they enter downtown Calgary. People who hate wearing bicycle helmets but are competent cyclists will feel safer.
- Bike lanes are great for cyclists and gets scooters and other faster moving mobility options off of the sidewalk, but still separated from vehicles
- There already is the traffic calming done along here. Signals instead of stop signs . Wide sidewalks in front of the businesses so lines at food trucks don't block the sidewalks. Silent electric scooters LOVE wide commercial sidewalks
- Having the separated mobility lane will help people outside of cars move through the area safely, cars will know where to expect cyclists and scooters, and people in the sidewalk walking won't be worried about scooters.



- Separate cycletracks are great for safety and street character
- There is nothing that is working well
- separated bicycle and car infrastructure is a lot safer, presence of parking is a plus for car-drivers, too, even if it is more limited than Option A. It's not like there's not an overabundance of other places to park, though.
- one way streets suck
- This is excellent a safe space for people of all ages and abilities to walk and bike
- Full separation of bikes and scooters from walkers and cars. This is how to build infrastructure that draws more users.
- Nothing.
- Pedestrians are slightly safer... but they were in no real danger to begin with from scooters on a residential street.
- Well looky here. It's a start.
- Nothing works well as you're killing the neighborhood and the businesses which operate there.
- Not much
- One-way road traffic creates room for separated active modes incentivizes this type of travel, improves users' safety and comfort. Maintains enough current parking. Keeps scooters off the sidewalks. More future-focused use design.
- Option 2 looks good.
- The cycle tracks will work well for cycling and micro-mobility options; also maintains consistent "look and feel" with Zone B. One-way traffic also presents traffic calming opportunities.
- Everything, as state above it's a safer design for everyone involved, protected bike lanes for cyclists, pedestrians are protected from the road by parking and bike lane, and the narrower motor way reduces motorists speeds, making it safer for non motoris
- Nothing, not not necessary, no usage water of tax payers money.
- Separated bike lanes! Cycle track between parking and pedestrians, much safer! Cycle track is straight, no confusing curves or corners.
- It won't work well
- Ensures cyclist safety and keeps them away from vehicle traffic.
- The separation is a must, so this will be better than Option 1.
- better for bikes, pedestrians, scooters
- This does not work for the community
- Nothing works well the idea is utterly ridiculous. Doubly as ridiculous as option 1. There's a perfectly good bike path running E to W 2 blocks away with lovely river views. Neither option works and parking in those areas will become a large issue
- Nothing!! Traffic flows East to west. Makes 3 rd Ave a route for fire trucks!!
- More/additional parking would be a great idea, as long as that does not mean introducing another one way street (6th Ave).



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Cycletracks separated from both vehicles and pedestrians are beneficial for improved traffic circulation
- Nothing works well.
- Absolutely nothing! Once again the city is bending over backwards to support cyclists and scooter riders special interest groups that don't live in this neighbourhood and likely don't pay taxes.
- Traffic will be congested and the impact to businesses will be significant
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- It is not a good idea!
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- Nothing.
- Nothing.
- Leave 3 avenue the way it is now
- More safe for all
- Don't make any changes to 3rd Ave SW
- Cyclists, pedestrians and scooters have their own space. Character will change to feel more urban, more friendly to active transportation
- Nothing I do not support one way traffic on 3rd Ave and removal of parking spots.
- keeps bikes/scooters separate from cars which is much safer
- Separation of growing cyclist usage from vehicle traffic.
- This would remove too much parking from the area, which is mainly residential. We need the parking spaces.
- Less parking; less access to business and daycare
- Nothing. Makes the road design worse for cyclists and motorists.
- it would be safer for cyslists
- Zone A has a significant high rise population and the need for significant on street parking. Two way
 traffic flow is necessary otherwise a service provider or visitor to a resident along 6th avenue would
 need to travel to 8th St. SW, travel north and th
- I like the one-way vehicle traffic and dedicated bike lanes.
- Again, happy to see improvements in wheelchair ramps, but that's about it.

When looking at Option 2 in Zone A, can you share what you think should be improved?

• bigger budget!



- no removal of trees if possible
- Nothing
- I really like this option. Well done!
- Need to ensure cyclists are visible to motorists at intersections with parking in between
- Is there anything we can do to help prevent negative car/bike interactions at 8 St SW? There's constantly a problem with cars running or rolling through the stop signs at that intersection without being aware of bicycle traffic.
- Nothing. I like the design of the cycle tracks. The 1 way street change will also make it better because 2 way traffic has a harder time seeing where the bikes are.
- More Parking, provide two-way vehicular travel
- Narrower travel lane.
- Nothing
- 2 way street, enhance streetscape, not making it a thoroughfare.
- don't do it
- Intersection designs to protect cycle tra k better. Think like the Dutch instead of America
- Looks like very limited space for pedestrians on south side of the road between 8th and 7th street. Are cyclists and pedestrians supposed to share this section?
- N/A, looks great and my preferred choice
- This is perfect! But maybe a 30km/hr zone
- needs seperation from vehicles/parking, better protection at intersections
- Wider cycle tracks
- I'd get rid of more parking if it meant we could maintain two-way vehicle traffic.
- Should look at creating more affordable parking so everyone can enjoy.
- Unsure.
- The parking lane seems to go very close to entrance to building and corner of 3rd and 7th. The issue here is right turning vehicles not being able to see cyclists or pedestrians behind parked cars. Remove one or two more parking spots near turns.
- The one way streets are unfortunate but not a deal-breaker as is the loss of parking. Option 2 is still the far better option.
- Looks good
- Consideration will have to be given to timely snow and ice control, particularly where the facility ramps up to sidewalk level eastbound.
- Loss of parking is a big issue.
- Id still keep 2 parking lanes, even if the road is only 1 way
- Don't change it and save tax payer money
- Retaining two way vehicular traffic increases perceived friction causing drivers to pay more attention to their surroundings.
- There could be less parking.



- Eliminate on-street car paking and widen the sidewalks.
- Finding Additional parking elsewhere after removal
- This design looks good to me, and matches the stated goals and long term interests of our city.
- Get rid of the Corrupt Socialite city council
- N/A
- Not much improvement on walkways and completely destroys road capacity
- I just hope that the parking that remains on 3 Ave has clear sight-lines so people turning across traffic can see people in the bike facilities!
- Cycling infrastructure is an obstacle course with sharp turns and bouncing up and down kerbs and weaving around other infrastructure. Pedestrian road crossing is also more unpleasant with additional lanes to cross due to bike lane.
- Everything it's dangerous for the seniors and that's who lives in this area. The young don't live here they just pass through on their scooters and bikes and are oblivious to the residents but they don't care they just laugh in our faces.
- Everything. Do not give cyclists free reign, they don't obey traffic signals in the area as is.
- For people living in the area of 2nd Ave and 7th Street, the access to this area will require even more o. I f a detour as 7th St is one way . Also it will add more congestion around 6th St SW since there will be fewer options out of the area
- The lack of parking, but it is an understandable trade-off.
- the intersection between street and avenue for bikes don't see very clear.
- Destroys the beauty and desirability of livability and business accessibility. Expect more businesses to close and relocate with this. Does very little to increase safety for cyclists who become more at risk at intersections. Huge negative impact.
- Tracks in one side... Unidirectional tracks are too narrow to ride side by side to chat
- Need more parking spaces, not less. Separate bike lane will reduce already hard to fit in parking
- Love it. Add more trees, cant tell if that is proposed based on the diagrams.
- state what outcomes you expect
- N/A
- I feel like as a Biker I would have to make several sharper turns in the cycle track that would slow me down. may be not a terrible thing? I worry about the intersection at 8 st and car/bike right of way issues. Do residents want a one-way?
- Don't do this Option. See Option 1
- Limit bikes, Scooters, etc to bike paths along river front & along 7th Ave & 5th Ave
- Scrap it and go to Option 1, but do not allow scooters (or bikes) on sidewalks EVER!
- Looks good.
- The loss of parking is not good. There are businesses (daycares etc) that rely on clients being able to find parking in the very near vicinity. A parent can't park blocks away to pick up their child in the middle of winter.



- One way automobile traffic (study on adjacent block traffic)
- Parking access, reduced scooters on side walks city won't allow bikes on side walks but scooters are ok.. increase the plus fifteen out to 8th st Sw. Pedestrians walk along the river either north or south side. Bikes ride up and down 7 th st. SW
- Ensuring that left and right turns are facilitated for those exiting or connecting to other streets or infrastructure north south, and in managing left or right turn conflicts by cars. Ensure parking is limited around crossings to ensure sight lines.
- More sidewalk improvements
- Nothing.
- Clearer left turn option for cyclists going eastbound.
- more parking is needed, 100% of parking retention is required.
- Provide angled parking at the wider part near 7st to increase the amount of parking stalls.
- No need to separate people walking and people wheeling. Cyclists and scooter riders go anywhere they want even when there are bike lanes. There is no reason to sacrifice parking and traffic pattern on a road that is super crazy during rush hour.
- One way streets are bad for communities and businesses.
- Nothing this is the appropriate solution for this area.
- 3rd Avenue should remain as is. For vehicles. The impact to the office buildings and businesses would be absolutely horrible. This is NOT something the city should be spending any money on.
- Listen to the residences. They don't want changes.
- Unsure
- Dedicated scooter parking
- Reinstate parking and two way traffic.
- test
- Not much.
- Just ensure 1 area for loading that's all.
- Less winding and turns in the cycletrack would be preferable, and the wider they can be the safer and faster cycling traffic will flow.
- For all options, pls do not remove driving lanes or on street parking. Just have cyclists/scooters follow the rules and respect pedestrians. There are plenty of existing cycle lanes in the rest of downtown that are under utilized.
- Clear signage, landscape buffer between bikes and travel lane
- Change to existing driving pattern (to one-way traffic) should not be chosen. Vehicles tend to speed more--I witness this every day with the temporary one-ways in the Beltline from 17 Ave SW construction.
- More lanes should be done in this way!
- 1 way traffic is a bad idea. Cyclists having right of way on inside lanes with turning traffic is dangerous.



- not much
- leave 3 avenue alone.
- Will the lilac bushes be replaced with other foliage? Flowers
- Consider removing parking to maintain two-way vehicle flow. This also improves sightlines between cyclists and turning cars. I think the street is wide enough both the cycle track, one-side parking and two-way traffic should be considered.
- Signage. Also, there is enough space (when combining the sidewalk, greenspace all the way to the building fronts for both cycle tracks AND parking. You just need to be creative. Look at some European cities tight on space for examples.
- I lived at 3Ave & 7thSt for 20 yrs. Something needs to be improved to stop cars from making left turns at Buchanans into the cycle lane. Happens daily.
- Instead of having a bike lane on each side, would it save more space to have a two way bike lane on one side? Would save either parking spots or the convenience of the two way street.
- Bike lanes exists 2 blocks north in Eau Claire, this is an expense that is not required and has no pay back.
- Consider only having one bike path (like on 7 street) instead of 2 lanes split between north/south side of the street. Removal of the south side parking makes it very difficult for residents to move in/out of the apartments
- Additional trees by sidewalks for visual cue to slow down.
- -
- I hope this plan includes trees, etc. to make the sidewalks more pleasant and encourage visitors.
- Considerations for the intersections
- Removing the parking is a bad idea as many people parking are residents. I live on this street and many people in my building rely on street parking.
- decent, want the seperation in traffic types
- Ideally this would be the best option except for parking. Prince's crossing allows 3rd party rental for their parking stalls. The businesses also own stalls. That forces a lot of people into the streets that live there and should be entitled to a stall.
- Having a raised cycle track will add to comfort of cyclists of all abilities, particularly because there are a lot of families who bike around the area.
- I'm unconvinced of the need for ANY driving lanes on that street tbh, unless deliveries have no other option.
- Nothing springs to mind.
- NA
- Intersections still look to mix active transport with cars more than is ideal.
- more straight lines for easier riding
- There should be a permanent cement divider between cars and cycle tracks at the intersections otherwise cars will go in bike lanes.



- Improvements to 8th St crossing to make it clear that 3rd Ave traffic (bikes and peds) should have priority.
- better use of the dead space between parking and cyclists approaching 7 St. Planters?
- Significant loss of parking in the residential area will upset area residents. Particularly around the Chartwell living centre street parking likely needed by those visiting, loading seniors.
- No more3 small stop signs for bicyclists. It makes it look unimportant. Put in regular stop signs and they will stop
- Looks good to me. I like the separation between people in cars and people not in cars.
- A stop sign is needed at 8 Street and 3rd ave SW for cars going south
- Save the taxpayers money and forget about it before you destroy people's lives
- I understand why it's necessary, but turning Zone A into a one-way can have negative repercussions
- this options should be put in the bin
- n/a
- Not much
- It works fine now. Quit wasting our time and money.
- Allow for two-way traffic and more parking to benefit the residents and their visitors.
- Full separation.
- Yes cancel this nonsense when people are being sequestered during Covid
- Where are people supposed to park?
- Ensure add adequate bike parking as well as accessible/handicap vehicle parking spots near businesses (in addition to accessible sidewalk and crossing improvements already included).
- Not sure.
- Please keep the parking spaces on the street!
- Unsure
- Change the flexi post cycle lane design with a more solid barrier, like a concrete barrier, to physically separate the bike lane from the motor way
- Don't do it, not needed.
- No improvements.
- Keep chinatown vibrant, it is part of Calgary heritage.
- A waste of road space
- Creating another one way street is a negative for people who live in the surrounding area.
- I can't say at this time.
- nothing
- Move this to 1st Ave as it does connect to the pathway and bridge
- Put the scooters on the roads where they belong and scrap the idea. This is a vanity project and a waste of tax dollars in a time when the city should be cutting costs.



- Everything!! First the issue of scooters and people on sidewalks is a stupid city rule. Second closing of the bike path because of high water means no power in the core and no traffic and citizens relocated. Flood 2012 highlighted this event.
- More parking
- Leave vehicle parking and 2 way traffic as it is or add more parking. The increase in bicyle traffic is detrimental to pedestrians, especially senoirs and children. Slow down dangerous biycle traffic is very important to those walking in the neighborhood.
- Having the EB cycletrack not require a ramp would be a beneficial, even at the expense of on-street parking
- I don't like this option.
- In this option and all options for Zone A, there is no provision to re-establish the pedestrian crossing on the east side of 8th St. SW at 3rd Ave SW. This was removed years ago even though all the residential buildings are on the east side of the street.
- There should not be a separate pathway for cyclist in the downtown area.
- More parking and loading
- N/A
- It will make a bad economic impact on the 3 avenue. You can image that there are only one way to get in and how inconvenient it is.
- -
- X
- We need parking lots!
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- The cycle track will save lives and improve mobility
- As a resident, the removal of parking will be disastrous. Removing parking only to improve access for non-locals to simply cycle or scoot through 3 avenue makes NO sense and is detrimental to those own Own/Live here. Please don't go this route!
- Leaving off the bike lanes and do not turn it into a 1 way. Every other avenue is a one way. It is helpful to have an avenue that is 2 way to help move traffic
- There is not enough bike traffic to warrant this. Scooters are only usable part of the year so should not dictate such significant changes.
- I don not like this option
- good option
- parking
- Nothing needs to be improved
- looks good



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Not interested in Option 2, so this question is redundant
- a
- Not agree with the idea
- Need to assure ease of access to the businesses along the avenue.
- More parking spots, as mentioned above.
- No separate cycle lane required
- Makes the road less safe for cyclists. Eastbound cars turning right from 3 Ave to 7 St or 6 St now have to turn across a bike lane. This will be extremely confusing, and will result in vehicle bicycle collisions. Bike lanes should be 2 ways.
- I unfortunately think loosing the sidewalk on the other side of the road is not a clever idea especially with the residence at the old people home
- Let bikes and cars use the same lanes. Don't try to separate and create obstructions and safety hazards.
- Maintain two way traffic, leave as is. The city just placed new sidewalks along sixth. Given what I have observes on 3td street and 4th avenue it would be of no surprise to see them torn up after a year in service
- I think cyclists have the right of way when going straight from the bike path to 3 rd Ave by virtue of the stop sign on 8th St but it would nice for this to be more clear as it not always followed.
- I don't agree at all with dedicated bike lanes and 1 way traffic. I live at the corner of 8 and 2nd, and I drive this neighbourhood daily. Pandering to cyclists at the expense of drivers is mind-boggling.

Zone B:

When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think works well?

- Cycle track the whole way
- Separated bike tracks
- Protected bike lanes! Removing the scramble crossing that's useless during the weekend
- I really like the safe separation of people who wheel, walk, and drive. It makes a lot of good intuitive sense.
- Provides a safe option for cycling for riders who wish to bypass congestion on the river pathways or access downtown
- It seems pretty close to perfect.
- cycle tracks the whole way will make it safer for bikers and scooters.
- Crossing improvements at intersections for pedestrians.
- Love it. Build it!
- Dedicated cycling path
- If you're talking about option 1 nothing



- Great separation between cycle-track. Narrowing the roadway at intersections is great for slowing vehicles.
- Great separation and use of space
- Cycle tracks!
- Protected cycling infrastructure
- This is excellent use of the massive road width, currently being wasted and creating unsafe fast traffic. Please add protected intersections and signals to 5th St and 7th St intersections.
- Huge improvement in cyclist safety. I also think the removed scramble makes sense here since there (in my experience) has been little need for it.. Maybe a scramble is better near/during stampede or flames games.
- The design works well for all users. Excellent.
- Great to see a protected cycling facility throughout the zone to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities safely on a year-round basis.
- Don't spend tax payer money
- Much better use of the space; including protecting cycle track users from moving vehicles with a buffer of parked cars
- It's good that there is a designated bike lane.
- Separating scooters and bikes from road and pedestrian traffic
- Calgary chinatown business will be impact to a point many will go bankrupt due to ZERO traffic flow. The idea of walking/wheeling absolutely server NO VALUE in pandemic economy. Together with green line killing center street traffic Chinatown will BUST!
- Improved access and safety (both perceived and actual) for ALL active transportation options is vital here. Especially cycle tracks. Will increase local business activity. Serves everyone (not just car owners)!
- The new cycle track will be excellent for transportation through this neighbourhood?
- I like the dedicated bike facility. I like that there is enough room for parked cars and two-way traffic. This option is great!
- This is currently a somewhat intimidating place to cycle and with a really underwhelming streetscape that feels empty and unfriendly, so these improvements and separated cycle tracks are a great idea here.
- I think this entire section work great with minimal impact to existing transit options.
- Separated bike lane, would fit in with option 2 of Zone A. Provides more active transportation in the area. Worker commute can be done through safe biking
- Removal of the scramble crossing its always been a nightmare safety hazard as its not used anywhere else in the city and most people don't know how to use it right.
- Separate lanes for each mode of transportation
- Need to keep wide driving lanes and parking spaces for Eau Claire shops and restaurants. Do not need separate bike lane here



- Separation of wheeling activities from pedestrians. BUT the problem remains for the Bow pedestrian pathway from Centre Street bridge to Peace bridge where in line/e scooters and manual/electric skateboards use pedestrian instead of cycling paths.
- Everything works well. No brainer since lots of room for cycle track, traffic & parking same
- cycletrack
- Separate bike paths
- Retaining parking, adding bike lanes
- bike lanes narrow road, slowing vehicle traffic
- Transitions at intersections for bike turns
- All of it. Love it.
- The separated cycle track is a strength, and narrowed crossings with curb bulbs.
- Dedicated bicycle lane. OK with scramble being removed at 3rd and 3rd.
- this works well in lining the pockets of the city of calgary's favourite contractor. the only difference is
 placement of where the cyclists and parked cars are. i think the road is a good road to have the
 cycletrack on, but just leave it as it is used.
- separated cycle tracks
- Everything
- I probably won't get bothered by E-scooter and/or bicycle when walking.
- It should all work well
- The protected cycle tracks will likely bring safety and comfort to bicycle and scooter users, and in turn pedestrians. Slower driving speeds as a result of narrower lanes will bring increased safety to all (including drivers).
- Not safe, would not take kids
- Better use of road space with cycle tracks
- Option 2 cycle track. Absolutely no reason. I live in Eau Claire. I cycle on 3rd Ave. I live on 2nd Ave. SW near 7th St.SW. Too much road real estate for cars.
- The cycle tracks are the safest and easiest option for cyclists and scooter users. I like how this section is straight and has no bends in the cycletracks. I particularly like the widening of the track at each intersection for better visibility.
- That two-way vehicle flow is provided and bike lanes are protected.
- Separation of traffic works here because there is more room
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Dedicated cycling lane
- The separated cycle tracks will be good for cyclists of differing abilities, and create less worry for cars.
- The protected bike lanes. Green coloured pavement.
- Dedicated bike lanes, getting rid of the pedestrian scramble (either need them everywhere, or nowhere)



- Not much. The bicycle lanes are not required.
- Zone B is good as shown.
- looks great. parking and loading zones are retained on both sides throughout the corridor
- More seperation due to heavier traffic
- Good to see separated cycle tracks
- I like the heavy use of cycle track.
- Great improvement for people wheeling and walking.
- Great separation of transportation modes.
- I love that the cycle tracks are straight and do not jog around like the ones on 7 st SW
- The design is good, preserving the parking and traffic flow is important
- A clear indication where bikes and scooters should go in a proper accessible lane!
- Everything works well. This design is exceptional adaptive re-use of public space for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.
- The street is so wide that people currently speed down it all the time. Narrowing the lanes with bike lanes should help reduce vehicle speed, while protecting cyclists and moving scooters off the sidewalk. This section is win-win-win.
- Bike lane is direct and clear, parking is retained.
- Separation for people out of cars is the best. This will be great. I also appreciate that cars will know where to expect bikes and scooters to be.
- The cycle track at 5th street needs to go north to the river
- Separated bike lanes from car traffic is a must and good design. The presence of parking, even if a little narrow, is a positive as well. The presence of crossing improvements as traffic calming, along with ramps, improves pedestrian safety.
- Everything! Looks great!
- getting rid of the pedestrian scramble that no one understands
- Separated bike/scooter lanes all the way!!!! Excellent.
- Reasonable balance of safety and access for all modes of travel.
- Holy street parking. I like the engineering at crossings.
- I like the cycle tracks. As a bicyclist I feel much safer and less confused about what is expected of me in traffic. You can travel faster without endangering pedestrians.
- Cycling facilities, pedestrian infrastructure all work well. This is a really wide road and can benefit from safe cycle tracks.
- Everything works quite well, pedestrian are more protected from the road by the parking and bike lane, bikes are protected by having their own dedicated bike lane, and the narrowing of the road promotes motorists to slow down.
- Separated bike lanes! Cycle track is between parked cars and sidewalk, separated from driving lane. Cycle track is straight without curves eliminating confusion.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Separation between pedestrians and vehicles. People riding bikes etc should figure out their own ways.
- Separated bicycle traffic in cycletracks is a huge benefit for cyclist safety, especially the separation at intersections
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- It should be left as it is do not need to have more bike lanes
- retention of parking spaces
- Looks great! We need dedicated cycle tracks. People complained at first, but now they LOVE them, and they're always busy, even in the winter!
- Nothing.
- I like it
- this plan is incredibly stupid, mis-appropriating dollars better spent elsewhere,

When looking at the design option in Zone B, can you share what you think should be improved?

- Looks great. I'd love for the pedestrian space to have aesthetic improvements to make it feel like a destination stroll.
- I'd like to see two way cycle tracks extended up 5 St from 3 Ave to the Bow River Pathway. I also think the loss of the scramble crosswalk is unfortunate.
- nothing
- Potential pedestrian and cyclist conflicts at intersection crossing locations.
- Protected intersections.
- Nothing
- Regarding option 1 just build cycle tracks
- With respect to streetscape look and feel, it truly remains a landscape of parked cars...
- Make 3rd ave 30km/hr
- Vehicle lanes could be narrower and cycle tracks wider.
- The pedestrian realm could be worked on to remove sidewalk obstacles + add trees and directional ramps.
- The south sidewalk from 6th to 5th st is quite narrow and unappealing. Would be nice to expand this sidewalk up to the parking lot and make the space between usable/easier for those with accessibility devices able to move past other peds.



- Please use this opportunity to extend the 5th St SW cycletracks from 3rd Ave to the Bow River pathway network. This is an important connection that has been missing for too long and will improve safe access to the new 3rd Ave cycling facilities.
- Significant thought will need to be given to the intersection design at 5th St to ensure it functions efficiently and in a way that's clear for all travel modes. Can protected intersections be considered at intersecting bike routes, i.e. 5th St & 3rd St?
- Stop spending tax payer money
- No complaints.
- Too much space devoted parking. Stop designing these areas around parking.
- Keep pedestrian scramble crosswalk to increase traffic flow and area walk-ability
- NOTHING PLEASE KEEP IT AS IT IS WASTEFUL RESOURCES GO NO WHERE
- Very good, balanced design -- improves safety for everyone and beauty too. More bike racks needed along this route. Traffic calming at intersections will be key for safety.
- What impact does the new parking on 4 St have? Can we do without?
- Nothing It looks great!
- N/A
- Connection point with the other Zone/ crossings. The scramble at 3rd ave was a good idea.
- You didn't give a non-bike lane option. Streets like this have become an eyesore in our city and reduce walkability and enjoyment of our city. Its also unsafe for those getting into and out of parked cars to get to sidewalk through the bike lanes.
- Speed is to high...30kph! Also ability to speed is too high... It takes one jerk going 70 to make everyone leave the area
- Do not need separate bike lane on an already narrow street. Need to keep the parking spaces
- Excellent
- Great plan. Scrambles not a loss. Better bike signal progression to compete with pathway travel time
- Nothing, it looks good
- Removal of the scramble is unfortunate. A LOT of people use this and removing it will lead to increased jay walking.
- sidewalk on south side is quite narrow across from Eau claire tower
- Appears all parking is removed on the street in deference if bikes. This should not be the case. Parking is well used.
- N/A
- Needs to be a parking set-back at cycletrack crossing conflicts to ensure a cars length of sight line of right turning cars to see wheeling users crossing the conflict zone. A blub out to slow down turning speed across driveways and intersections needed.
- i don't think anything needs to be done. there's a reason why cyclists use it. there's enough space for cars and cyclists on this stretch of road. just leave it as it is. moving the cyclists behind a row of parked cars makes them harder to be seen.



- Nothing
- But again, E-scooter and/or bicycle go wherever they wise, even when there are dedicated lanes, so not really expecting anything will change other than the road will be narrower.
- no
- While I like having separated cycle tracks (I find it challenging to cross several lanes of traffic when turning off a two-way cycle track), I wonder if it's confusing for intersecting streets to have different types of tracks (separated vs. two-way).
- Actual cycle track
- Add more greenery (grasses, trees, plants, etc.) where space permits.
- Just need to mark clearly where cars getting out of underground parkades in highrise commercial bldg. Place some trees for landscaping & some art.gs.
- Wide entrances at each intersection for more stopped bikes and passing opportunities and better visibility for drivers.
- I think the protected bike lane should be permanent poured concrete and not moveable bollards. It is higher quality and looks less junky.
- Do not give cyclists right of way over turning automobiles when they are in the inside lane. It is dangerous.
- leave 3 avenue alone.
- Nothing
- Extend the no-parking around driveways and intersections. Short curb extensions will re-create 8th Ave, where turning cars cannot see bikes until both are in the intersection. This option is also most useful if the zone A track is implemented.
- The green paint slowly fades. If you use asphalt impregnated with paint (like in Holland) it doesn't wear out. Also, add proper destination signage (even for key ammenities like on a highway -- groccery, bank, restaurants, etc.).
- As I read this it looks like 2 way 3Ave traffic lanes will be very narrow with the addition of 2 bike lanes. Living in the area, every intersection in all 3 Zones are hazardous for pedestrians at crosswalks. Car making right turns on lites are NOT looking
- directional wheelchair ramps at all intersections please!
- More seperation due to heavier traffic
- I'm sad about the loss of the pedestrian scramble, but I think it was always underused.
- NA
- Cycling tracks should be separated from vehicle traffic.
- Intersections still mix cars and cyclists/scooters etc.
- nothing
- Tracks could be wider to accommodate people going side by side since the roadway in this section is so massively overbuilt.
- I can't find anything to suggest.



- Ensure signage/safety features at parking garages. I have been nearly hit and coworkers HAVE been hit by vehicles attempting to enter/exit parking garages here due to obscured vision from traffic/parked cars.
- Bike lane not necessary in this area, which is already very quiet, even at peak times. Vehicle crossing the bike lanes are likely to cause blockages as vehicles wait to cross into traffic lane, reducing cycling safety vs the present
- Looks good to me.
- Make 3rd ave 30km/hr
- The bike lanes could possibly be a little narrower to give parked cars more space for vehicle occupants to exit safely. As it stands from the diagram, cars on one side look very close to traffic, meaning passengers would have to wait for cars to pass.
- n/a
- Removing the criss-cross walk at 3rd / 3rd is too bad but that really only functions at it's best during a small portion of the day. Rest of time it's used incorrectly or under-utilized
- Nothing. This is a very reasonable option.
- I think it looks good.
- Cycle lanes should be protected with a more physical barrier than flexi posts, something like a concrete barrier
- Unsure how cycle track left turns will be accomodated.
- More fines to levy on dangerous bikers and people riding scooters as Chinatown has a massive no. of seniors walking.
- Strong separatation measures between cycle and vehicle traffic are required, including planters. Think 12 Ave quality and not the sub-par 8 Ave implementation
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- No more bike lanes are needed. It is a couple of blocks from the path along the river for those who need a bike path
- there is a very low number of bikes. The bike lanes cause issues due to rider tendencies to not follow traffic rules which can cause more accidents. Also hurts automobile traffic flow as riders are very unpredictable.
- Just making sure the design is from a cyclists' POV so there are smooth transitions.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- This design will grid lock the road. Cycle lane removes the ability to go around a vehicle that is turning right off 3 Avenue. Cycle lane also creates an additional delay for vehicles turning right. Cycle lanes should be on one side of the street.
- Nothing
- yes pedestrian access enhanced, however business impact negates any positives.

Zone C:

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?

- Cycle track for most of the way
- nothing much
- Nothing
- I like the separation from traffic.
- Preserves some parking
- Having separated infrastructure is great for this area.
- two-way traffic is maintained
- Protected bike lanes.
- Bike path
- Nothing
- Nothing, this will be a death trap. You cannot go from cycle tracks to sharrows
- Nothing
- Safety upgrades work.
- The removal of parking. A lot of illegal parking here and I think that removing the option and placing cycling might help that.
- Some protection for cyclists is added.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- As an engineer would say: it's efficient and has lots of throughput.
- The separated bike lane works very well. Helps bring some sense of safety for cyclists.
- Separating cycle and scooter traffic to increase safety for all
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Widened sidewalks, even pavement, clearer crosswalks
- Separated cycle tracks are vital here and will improve safety for all.
- is fine only if the bike lane is on Harry Hay's sidewalk with 100% parking retention on 3rd and 1st Street.
- Cycling space separated from motorists. Some on-street parking retained in key area.
- improvements on walkways, aside from that, nothing
- I like that people cycling and riding scooters are separated from people driving



- Separated cycle tracks are a huge improvement and I prefer scooters separate from bikes because they're slower and tend to be used casually or in groups which interferes with efficient cycle track use for commuting and errands.
- Sidewalk improvements and crossing improvement. Separated one way cycle track from 2st to 1st
- Keeping two way traffic.
- Separate transportation Lanes
- Raised pathway for pedestrians. Need more space for people to walk in this area
- Separate bike paths
- ?
- Nothing
- Retaining two-way roadway.
- Separated one-way cycle tracks and raised pathway No change to roadway operations for people driving
- Will be great at providing opportunities for pedestrian injuries...
- alienating drivers, and creating more conjestion, and removing parking that is used by a lot of people
- Separating everyone from the drivers.
- It appears to be a good compromise that increases safety to those who wheel while keeping parking and driving options (e.g., the left turn lane) for those who drive.
- Keeping the parking on northside of avenue
- Appeasing drivists and maintaining votes
- There is less social engineering. Keep my money in my pocket and not use it on special interest groups. I have yet to see more than 1 person riding their bike during a snow storm
- Crosswalk improvements.
- Not my favourite in most senses.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- na
- Other than retaining some parking in the area, NOTHING. Parking on 3rd avenue in this block is often used by Calgarians looking to access Chinatown, Eau Claire, Prince's Island Park, the Bow River, etc.
- nothing. leave things as is.
- Separate cycle lane
- Parking is somewhat maintained, as is a separated cycle track, making it safer for all-abilities users.
- Better of 2, but remove bike lanes. Waste of tax dollars, dangerous and reduces parking in area where needed
- Not much
- No tangible improvements
- Option 2 is better as cycle tracks are safer than raised pathways that have conflicts at intersections.



- the bus layby/raised bike paths in front of BP Centre to allow for bus access from the curb of the road.
- Improvements of the street crossing and the section of sidewalk at 3rd Av/1st ST is welcomed.
- I like the cycle track. Sharing with pedestrians is fine.
- Retention of parking spots it useful as parking demand is high in that area.
- Improved safety for bikes/scooters etc.
- it make good use of a dead street
- nothing
- Keeping on street parking would help drivers to access the necessary locations.
- Tracks and clearer indications where active transportation should go
- Objection, will not work well at all
- I like retaining parking. This should be a Stephen ave feel area where cars, bikes and pedestrians blend slowly and seamlessly
- Retains parking
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Current traffice and parking works well, allows for parking so vistors can visit river, restaurants and shops.
- The bike separation is a benefit to road users and the retention of parking/loading in front of Livingston Place is a benefit to the businesses there who may need it.
- Parking and loading availability
- Loading and parking available.
- providing parking spaces to drivers are equally important as providing bike lanes to cyclists and scooters
- Parking and loading is available
- Separation of bikes and cars
- You cannot have pedestrians and cyclists sharing the sidewalks this will lead to too many conflicts.
- It's ok, not safe for my kids
- no bike paths and more parking. Free access for cars
- the raised bike lane section is good for the presence of transit buses have massive blindspots, so separating them from bikes is smart.
- All goods
- Parking and loading
- It's ok only
- More parkin
- Retains parking
- Please NO bike lane & do nothing!!
- Nice that it provides some parking space.
- The path way should turn north at 2nd Street SW to River Front Ave.



- Scooter presence is dangerous for senior people, not welcome here
- Reasonable compromise of safety and access for all modes of movement. Keeps at least some onstreet parking.
- Parking spots and loading zones are available.
- no need to change
- A lot works well, the bike lane veers off from the road, being even more separated, there are sidewalk improvements, and it does not sacrifice that much parking
- Do not see much good.
- Terrible idea considering the older population in this area. Should not be done. Waste of tax payers money and hazard to residents and businesses nearby.
- Keep some parking stalls and maintain two-way traffic
- Remains same
- Bike lane is separated.
- It will affect the merchants.
- parking and loading are available
- Parking and loading is available.
- Some parking n loading are available
- parking and loading
- will not work, in chinatown traffic, sharing is dangerous
- Do nothing
- The pedestrian safety and streetscape looks great . Improve the community and businesses along this street,
- must have parking and loading spaces
- Parking and loading zone must be available
- parking is available
- To maintain the status quo
- The existing two-way roadway
- Parking and loading
- nothing is available
- Access to the businesses in this core section of Chinatown is essential. There are already several one way streets flanking this road and to made this street one way would further discourage visitors to the area.
- A moderate improvement for cyclists.
- Parking, Loading and unloading to be available
- Parking and loading is available
- Nothing. The premise Or reason for this project is to remove cars. Put 4 way stops in they slow down traffic on this side Ave. When the lights went in so did an increase in rush hour traffic.



- No change to roadway and maintain 2way flow is good. Most cyclists are couriers during daytime, and it is a concern as they tend to be reckless. Is there speed control for speedy cyclists?
- Nothing
- Parking and loading
- Parking and loading are available
- none
- I think with plenty of parking and enough loading areas will be good for business and shoppers
- I like that you can access the area how it is currently and park nearby where you need to go. My father is handicapped so it is difficult for him to walk long distances
- None
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- None
- nothing
- Leave it as is. Not much pedestrians year round. Block 7 is the boundary of Chinatown, good to allow more street parking.
- None
- none
- None
- N/A
- no comment
- people and bike share sidewalk, parking is available
- x
- bad
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- no comment
- Retain parking and vehicles on a two way street to allow easy access to Chinatown. Parking is very
 expensive and limited in Chinatown. The street parking allows economical parking and easy access
 for Visitors and Businesses on that street. B
- Honestly, if residents of chinatown are that obsessed with their on street parking then let them have it. Divert the 3rd ave cycle track up to the river on 1st sw or something and juat avoid chinatown altogether. Screw them and their obsession with cars.
- None
- None
- parking and loading
- I like that it remains a 2 way and no dedicated bike lanes


Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- negatively strong impact for traffic, business and parking
- Extend the parking stall eastward. Maintain two way traffic for driving.
- parking & loading
- None
- Keep it 2 way
- Nothing
- Not a lot of parking available but better than option 2 where there is no parking at all. Bike lane coexists ok because of lots of office working in the block.
- : Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- it will damage the business altogether. no parking, no parking space for delivery trucks,

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?

- Make it a cycle track for the whole length, get rid of the partly shared pathway.
- too much confusion for all the users to save only a few parking spots
- This option is not good.
- I am nervous about having people moving on and off the road while wheeling. I worry that will create conflict with people who walk.
- Raised cycle path could be confusing and mixing cycling traffic with pedestrians is undesirable
- I think having the shared facilities with pedestrians runs the risk of having pedestrians walk into the bike way. I think there's a general lack of awareness by pedestrians of bikeways, and it may need to be very easily distinguished (different colours)
- Loss of most of the much needed parking on both sides of the 3 Avenue will be problematic. More parking should be retained.
- Cuts down on sidewalk space.
- Nothing
- Bike infrastructure
- No sharrows, this will kill people it needs separation
- Any option without dedicated protected cycling infrastructure is not acceptable. Sidewalk space does
 not count
- But the up and down transitions across curbs, especially in winter, are tough, especially if you're carrying shopping or children.
- Need to separate cyclists from drivers. A lot of e-scooters here that shouldn't be on the sidewalk.
- The idea of a shared space on the sidewalk is not ideal and can lead to conflicts.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Wheelers should never be forced to interface with pedestrians; not a safe combination.
- There should be less space devoted to parking and the speed limits should be brought down to 30km/h. Local traffic should be the only ones accessing the area.



- Find a way to keep the traffic separated instead of shared in some areas as this will get confusing
- Calgary chinatown business will be impact to a point many will go bankrupt due to ZERO traffic flow. The idea of walking/wheeling absolutely server NO VALUE in pandemic economy. Together with green line killing center street traffic Chinatown will BUST!
- Need to look at balancing bike lanes with on-street parking in a commercial area
- Over-values parking -- not so critical here. Undervalues trees & shade to beautify and make comfortable. Very important cycling corridor; shared walking and biking space not sufficient for safety here.
- Variety of facility types may complicate snow and ice control, reducing accessibility, reliability and utility of infrastructure. Potential for bicycle/pedestrian conflicts and associated reduced safety.
- remove the bike lanes and if you remove parking then have more city parkades and charge reasonable rates and not have impark run downtown.
- It doesn't look very predictable i think it will be hard to know when and how to use the bike facility. It doesn't feel intuitive.
- The lack of seperated one way cycle from 1st street onwards towards the east. This creates confusion for the cyclist and will not incentivize them to use the path.
- Too much space devoted to cars... No trees
- No bike lane needed. Should not remove any parking spots in an area where it is already hard to find parking
- The shared section. Parking is unnecessary here.
- Walking and wheeling should not share the sidewalk. Bikes should NOT be on the sidewalk especially in an area frequented by families and daycare groups
- Access for bike route along 2nd st SW up to Steven Ave and to the river.
- returning all on-street parking OR providing replacement off-street parking at on-street rates or lower
- Some parking removal
- conflict points for cyclists and pedestrians is not good think about cyclists trying to get by during lunch hour. Not ideal.
- it needs 100% parking retention, there is enough space as it currently exists to keep all parking, and have a cycling lane. there are also wide sidewalks which are never fully utilized, why remove the one thing that is always used on this block, parking!
- Separating wheelers and walkers.
- I recommend having very clear signage/wayfinding for those points where the cycle track becomes a shared pathway with pedestrians, to minimize surprise/harm and maintain comfort.
- Is it possible to remove the parking on the south side for more cycling/pedestrian room?
- Conflict points between pedestrians and cyclists. Retaining trees.
- Yes, you could just do nothing. It would save time, money and maybe cut some civic jobs to further save more money



- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- Straighter, less windy, and wider cycle track.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- na
- If you want to have a dedicated bike lane on both sides, carve out the space from the sidewalk. Foot traffic along this section isn't high compared to other streets. Retain as much parking spots as possible. Better to re-route cyclists to Riverfront Ave.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Will the trees be replaced
- Implement aggressive measures to prevent people from parking and/or driving in the bike lane. People often illegally park on the sidewalk in this area.
- No bike lanes
- Need to have scooters and pedestrians separated.
- Remove teh cycle tracks
- looks good
- This block is has low amount of bicycle/people foot traffic due to the lack of shops, it would be better to make use the width of the sidewalk for bicycle use. More street parkings should be added for the overflow from Block 7, not removed.
- If the space is to be shared with pedestrians, additional raising of the cycle track will help extend the space particularly since there are more elderly folks in this area and space needs to be created for their safety too
- Mixing bikes etc with pedestrians is unsafe.
- track should not jump onto the sidewalk. I can see this to cause problems and or collisions between bikes and people exiting the bus. not a good idea. see Victoria BC's disastrous implementation of this style of cycle track.
- not really a viable option overly complex bike path for minimal parking retention
- Impose speed limits for cyclist/eScooters for sharing with safety. Also lower the speed limit for vehicles to 30 km per hour same as playground zone.
- Vastly increases the number of bike/scooter/pedestrian conflicts. Not worth it for a loading zone.
- Leave it as is
- More general comment the existing sidewalks seem very underrepresented in the sketches
- confusing infrastructure, with cyclists switching from road to sidewalk. Unnatural and confusing to non-regular users of this route
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep everything as is to allow good flow of traffic and parking



- Sidewalks appear very narrow which may be an issue for pedestrians traveling in opposite directions and those with mobility issues.
- need more parking
- NO way should bikes and pedestrians be forced to share sidewalk space here, this will lead to collisions
- Speed limit reduction and separate areas for bikes cars and pedestrians
- Separation from traffic
- more parking and no bike paths
- No
- Making the bike lane move across the sidewalk and the back onto the street is a bad idea
- Parking
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- Why does the south side bike lane cut through what appears to be a bus stop? Does this not force pedestrians to cross the bike lane to access the bus stop?
- The path way should turn north at 2nd Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Status quo is fine, no need to spend money in this economy, City should money elsewhere for meaningful project.
- Nothing. This option is a good compromise.
- Maintain the current parking spots, not changes needed.
- The cycle lane should be more physically protected than with flexi posts, something like a concrete barrier would be an improvement
- Wheels sharing sidewalk should be clearly marked with yellow
- Don't do it. See above.
- Sharing has to be removed
- Do nothing
- To maintain the status quo
- Nothing should be improved
- Nothing the north side walk supplies plenty of room for bikes and scooters and people. Do the measurements. Save my tax dollars.
- Not having WB cycle traffic mount the curb for a short section would be beneficial (perhaps remove the curb here)
- Need frequent clean up by City
- The lights in the area should be timed so that they go in sequence instead of getting a green that leads to a fresh red light
- None
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- No comment.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- If the upgrade was unavoidable, I would think that the 2 avenue is more suitable to be "upgraded" because the usage of that road is low especially between the 2 st and 1 st. I believe it is worth to be upgarde to activate that district
- no comment
- •
- X
- where are the parking lots?
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- no comment
- Remove bicycles and scooters or have them walk their bikes and scooters thru Chinatown. As a pedestrian I have been forced to stand aside for bikes and scooters who are moving too fast.
- Don't add the greenscape. Leave it alone. It is quaint and does not need improvement
- Add more parking.
- more parking
- 2 cycle lanes should be on one side of the street, with controlled lights. Vehicle right turns across currently proposed bike lanes are unsafe.
- : Two-way street with on-street parallel parking

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think works well?

- Not much, disconnected cycle track
- more parking
- traffic calming
- This seems like very little change from the current situation.
- Preserves parking
- Nothing. I don't like that there are no separated facilities.
- No changes to on-street parking. Pedestrian crossing improvements at intersections.
- No improvements beyond curb extensions.
- Nothing
- Nothing
- Nothing
- This is what is in place now, so not much.
- In this case I don't mind a sharrow because there are so many opportunities for cars to turn right into parking. I think that this keeps cyclists at the forefront and hopefully removes doorings.



- Nothing really works well with this. There is a lot of parking however this block sits next to a massive surface parking lot so maintaining street parking isn't really needed.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Maximizes parking.
- The separated bike lane works very well. Helps bring some sense of safety for cyclists.
- Traffic calming measures would help safety considering cyclists have to share the road
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Widened sidewalks, even pavement, clearer crosswalks
- Traffic calming will improve safety, but both actual and percived safety still not sufficient for "regular" active transportation users.
- I don't see much of anything that improves the situation for cycling. Pedestrians may benefit somewhat from curb extensions. Appears to preserve status quo with almost all benefits to motorists.
- no change in road capacity
- The interestion improvements this area is VERY dangerous for people walking or crossing the road!
- See comments above
- Maintaining parking and two way traffic and shared bike/traffic lane. This is a slow speed road already in terms of traffic flow. Preserving street scape.
- No change
- People walking and wheeling share sidewalk
- Nothing
- Nothing.
- cross-walk improvement at 1st St intersection; Retaining two-way roadway; Retaining all on-street parking
- Intersection improvements
- this is essentially exactly what it is now, and it works ok, if it ain't broke don't fix it
- It looks.... cheap?
- Cyclists and vehicles sharing the road will reduce driving speeds, which is good for the area given the number of businesses and foot traffic.
- Nothing. It will be very dangerous and frustrating for all.
- Nothing, just stop this. Full Stop unlike cyclists....
- Crosswalk improvements.
- Not a fan.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- na
- Retaining the parking spots along this block.



- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Traffic calming
- Nothing. This option clearly favour cars over active transportation, and will not work as a Bow River pathway alternative. The volume of traffic in Chinatown makes cycling on the road extremely uncomfortable, regardless of roadway width.
- Better of 2 but cycling upgrade not needed
- Not much for business access
- nothing. would not use this with my kid.
- For the traffic pattern at this block, the proposed Option 1 seems to be appropriate.
- I don't think this section works well
- Retention of on Street parking
- Separating cars from bikes etc. is a safety improvement.
- not much
- On street parking is important
- Vehicle Storage
- Leave it as is, will not work well
- on-street parking seems like it would be the most strongly valued by businesses in this area. Plus, cyclists have hopefully had time in cycle tracks to the west, so this transition is less of a shock than if they came directly off the river pathway.
- Closely resembles existing infrastructure, which works well.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is.
- Parking retention, but with parking lots in the area it doesn't seem overly needed. Generally when I've been in the area not all spaces are in use.
- · lots of parking available, important to businesses in the area
- Nothing, this will lead to deaths
- This is terrible it will get people killed you cannot go from AAA safe lanes to sharrows
- no bike paths
- It's too car focused. Sharrows are not a good design and are a lose-lose, as mentioned in my comments regarding Zone A
- No
- Nothing
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- Plenty of parking space, and crossing improvements.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- The same concern on convenience to residents in the area and business sustainability as a result of change



- Crossing improvements for safety and affordable on-street parking. Easy access and parking is very
 important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multigenerational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- Lots of parking stalls are available.
- Nothing, there needs to be more physical protection and separation from each mode of transportation, adding paint isn't safe enough for pedestrians and cyclists, it also angers motorists when they have to share the road with cyclists
- Additional loading zone parking is needed, definitely not bike lanes
- Keep majority of parking and maintain two-way traffic.
- Remains as is
- No noticeable improvements.
- Some parking n loading are available
- nothing
- Keep the status quo
- To maintain the status quo
- The existing two-way roadway
- Nothing
- Intersection narrowing is good for pedestrians and avoids turning conflicts with cycles
- I think this area works well but the sidewalk is starting to crumble
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- Chinatown visitors often short stop at block 8. It should provide space for road side drop off.
- N/A
- no commet
- x
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- no commet
- Keep the parking on the street and increase Handicap parking for those people who need easy access to Chinatown.
- Just leave things alone
- Nothing.
- Formalizes shared road philosophy. Draws attention to needs of other road users.
- Parking is good. Please do not remove parking stalls
- : Two-way street with on-street parallel parking



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street.), can you share what you think should be improved?

- Use option 2 full cycle track
- cycling lanes not protected will discourage cyclists using the whole avenue. this section of the road is one of the busiest with many vehicles. especially during rush hours, many cars wait for left turn eastbound at centre street so shared lane won't work
- The fact cyclists and pedestrians are sharing space not good. And that cyclists are in the road. Also not good
- Adding bikes back onto the road into a shared space is not safe and will only frustrate users.
- Sharrows are unsafe, particularly at the busy intersection with Centre Street
- Having separated bike / mobility facilities.
- Too many driveways to parking lots on the north side of 3 Avenue. Consider consolidating.
- Sharrows are not bike infrastructure. Protected bike lanes are required for the influx of all ages and abilities riders.
- Bike path needed. Needs to run all the way down the St not stop and start.
- Bike infrastructure
- Separation between cars and traffic is needed
- Any option without dedicated protected cycling infrastructure is not acceptable
- No safety upgrades. Riding on a busy street with many vehicles turning on and off, and pulling into and out of parking stalls isn't safe.
- I think the sidewalk should be widened to accomodate e-scooters. If you are forcing them to the sidewalk here, then they need space.
- Protection and separation is needed for cyclists.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Public money spent on private vehicle storage isn't sustainable. Sharrows are frustrating for both cyclists and motorists/full cycle track would be better.
- There should be less space devoted to parking and the speed limits should be brought down to 30km/h. Local traffic should be the only ones accessing the area.
- Increase more safety measures if everything is sharing the pathways and roads
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Need to look at balancing bike lanes with on-street parking in a commercial area
- Bike and scooter traffic is heavy here and has big potential to grow. Lane sharing does not provide adequate comfort, safety, or perception of safety for regular people walking, biking, or on scooters. Plan over-values parking, benefiting wealthy only.
- I question the context (traffic speed, volume and purpose) for a greenway. Sharrows are not cycling infrastructure and preclude AAA access. Greenways include traffic volume and speed management to be effective. This shows neither.



- more walkway improvements, such as rails for protection against cars and assisting elderly while they walk would be nice.
- again, it is not predictable. For people driving, they will need to be mindful of people crossing and navigate cyclists on the roadway, which feels like an accident waiting to happen. it is already SO dangerous here
- There should be continued cycle tracks. Shared lanes make drivers frustrated and impatient and intimidate many cyclists.
- See comments above
- Reduce speed to make it safer (and feel safer)for everyone. Too much space devoted to cars
- Option 1 is best with shared space, no impact to parking
- Needs separate bike paths
- Improve bike lane up and down 2 st SW
- Remove unnecessary crosswalk improvement on west side of Centre Street intersection; westbound bump does nothing. Eastbound bump will create traffic congestion and impair right hand turns.
- People cycling and driving share the road
- Separate cycling infrastructure is needed! Why is this still a discussion in the downtown core? Sharrows are not followed or enforced. Paint does not prevent injuries/deaths, separated cycling infrastructure does!
- so instead of bikes beside parked cars, and moving cars because there is enough space for that, lets put bikes and cars in the exact same spot! that's brilliant. i think you're wasting money on anything on this block. just leave it alone
- Maybe a little more... creativity.
- N/A
- Block 8 and block 9 are busier with car traffic and people searching for parking. More intimidating for cyclists
- Separate modes
- Yes, you could just do nothing. It would save time, money and maybe cut some civic jobs to further save more money
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- Separate bike and vehicle lanes. This is hardly different from the current design, and with two way traffic and parking on both sides is not very safe for cyclists. It will not be used by inexperienced and family users.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- na



- The shared road with bicyclists and vehicles is a TERRIBLE idea. This block has a lot of parking activity for businesses in Chinatown and traffic will be hindered by casual bicyclists. Reroute bicyclists to Riverfront Avenue instead on 2nd or 1st St SW
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Nothing
- A dedicated cycle track with aggressive barriers is a MUST in this area, given the illegal sidewalk parking, and volume of vehicle traffic.
- No bike lanes
- remove cycle tracks
- separate the wheeling facility.
- Street parking are always full the whole day at this block. Adding angle parking or angle loading spaces in front of the building on 3rd Av/Center St would make sense.
- Cycle tracks, this area again is very family friendly and cycle tracks help people of all abilities feel safe
- This is a very dangerous stretch of road for cyclists, with heavy traffic coming off centre Street. Cycling in shared space should be avoided
- Mixing bikes etc with pedestrians is unsafe.
- bikes should be protected from other traffic.
- interrupting the bike paths kind of defeats the purpose of the 3rd ave improvements in zone b and a
- Impose speed limits for cyclist/eScooters for sharing with safety. Also lower the speed limit for vehicles to 30 km per hour same as playground zone.
- Use Option 2 the amount of street furniture will cause increased pedestrian/scooter/bike conflicts.
- Leave it as is
- no specific suggestion other than existing sidewalk condition is hard to understand
- Crossing improvements force cyclists into traffic path, where currently there is enough room to separate from cars at junctions.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is
- Vehicle travel through this area is quicker with the wider commercial nature of the street have had a few near missed while biking this stretch and I don't see anything here that improves that safety.
- Make this 30km/hr and separate bikes from cars
- Separate bikes and car traffic
- parking, parking and more parking for low or no fee
- This isn't an ideal set up. My improvements would be to just go with Option 2 for this block.
- No
- This section in particular has the most vehicle traffic especially during rush hour turning north on center, must have a separated lane
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!



- Not much, looks good to me.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Don't think we need such change when City is tight on budget and escalated property tax rate has already strained people's affordability
- Nothing. This is a safe option that is socially and culturally appropriate.
- I would like to see more parking stalls created.
- Everything, it should be more like option 2, a physical separation for each mode of transportation, providing better safety for everyone, and promoting alternative modes of transportation from cars
- Additional loading zone parking is needed. Not biking lanes.
- Better street maintenance, advanced turn signal for cars
- Needs separation between bicycles and vehicles.
- just remove this option
- Do nothing
- To maintain the status quo
- Nothing should be improved
- Place bikes and scooters on north side walk.
- Nothing
- The lights again need to be timed better so that you don't get every light each time you get 1
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- No cycling and micro-mobility allowed on sidewalk due to safety. People may allow to walk the bike while they are in this block.
- 2 ave is more worth to be upgraded
- no comment
- •
- X
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no無
- no comment
- Keep parking for those who need easy access to Chinatown.
- No cycle lanes you are wasting money when the city does not have enough
- That's what you can do in such limited width of the road.
- Nothing
- Please do not remove parking stalls. Patients drive vehicles for treatment, most do not ride bikes.
- : Two-way street with on-street parallel parking



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?

- Not much, disconnected cycle track
- nothing much improvements
- Adding an expectation of people wheeling in that space may create more awareness for drivers. I do not like this option.
- Preserves parking
- Nothing. Wheeling facilities should be separated.
- On-street parking is retained. two-way traffic is retained. Good for people that are going to Chinatown.
- No improvements.
- Nothing
- Nothing
- Nothing, sharrows kill people
- Nothing
- Nothing really.
- no.
- Maintaining two way traffic flow in the heart of Chinatown is important and this achieves that.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- No.
- The separated bike lane works very well. Helps bring some sense of safety for cyclists.
- N/A
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Widened sidewalks, even pavement, clearer crosswalks
- Low cost for city.
- I don't see much of anything that improves the situation for cycling or pedestrians.
- no change in road capacity
- Nothing it is very dangerous and needs more improvements! Option 1 gives no benefits/changes
- See comments above
- crossing improvments, maintaining two way traffic
- two-way street remains as needed
- Nothing
- Nothing
- Retaining two-way roadway. Retaining on street parking.
- Nothing
- there's nothing difference, but then again i don't know why a cyclist would want to bike through the busiest street in chinatown. it's enough of a hazard as a pedestrian, and i'm asian.



- Save a few bucks by doing nothing.
- Cyclists and vehicles sharing the road will reduce driving speeds, which is good for the area given the number of businesses and foot traffic.
- Nothing. It will be dangerous and frustrating for all.
- Nothing, just stop this. Full Stop unlike cyclists....
- Crosswalk improvements.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- E and W Bound auto traffic is maintained. This is a huge benefit (and a major differentiator from opt 2) that you do not note in your slides. Why?
- Retaining the parking spots along this block.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- I don't travel this block frequently
- Nothing. This option clearly favour cars over active transportation, and will not work as a Bow River pathway alternative. The volume of traffic in Chinatown makes cycling on the road extremely uncomfortable, regardless of roadway width.
- Everything but bike lanes
- Not much for business access
- there isn't really a change to the roadway or sidewalk so I wouldn't say there are any improvements or changes that would lead to things working differently than their current state.
- For the traffic pattern at this block, the proposed Option 1 seems to be appropriate.
- Separating cars from bikes etc. is a safety improvement.
- i think this compromise makes sense for this block parking really needs to be preserved due to local businesses
- two-way roadway is important for business operations (parking & loading)
- Greenway fits with level of traffic.
- Leave it as it, makes us very angry to want to change the way it is!
- I don't know. Option 2 looks so much better in all ways.
- Retains parking and business access for customers and deliveries
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is
- Retaining two way traffic and loading zones I'm sure makes the businesses happy without them actually thinking about it.
- keeping parking and two way traffic
- Nothing, sharrows kill people and this street is used by many dangerous drivers
- Access to the river is important
- Must keep roads for cars and add parking if possible. No bike paths. Bikes can still ride on the road. The bike paths in other area of the city is already barely used.



- Not much. Too car-centric. See my comments above regarding sharrows.
- No
- Not much, less traffic but lots of door danger zones
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- Pretty much no change to existing road condition.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- No comments
- two-way access and affordable on-street parking. Easy access and parking is very important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multi-generational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- Current two-ways traffic is easier to and from Chinatown, loading zones on both sides which is critical for business survival. Cycle tracks are dangerous for seniors crossing streets as wheels are fast and senior slow.
- Nothing, there needs to be more physical protection and separation from each mode of transportation, adding paint isn't safe enough for pedestrians and cyclists, it also angers motorists when they have to share the road with cyclists
- Loading zone and parking stalls must remain same as before. No scooters on sidewalk. This is the business roadway in Chinatown
- Addition loading zone parking is needed not bike lanes.
- Keep all existing parking stalls and maintain two-way traffic. This is important for customers and loading.
- Remains same
- No noticeable improvements.
- Some parking n loading are available
- just remove this option
- The current arrangement is fine. Do not change anything
- To maintain the status quo
- The existing two-way roadway
- Two way traffic, without bike lanes, are vital for business. I read through FAQ and materials provided. This project completely ignored the business sustainability.
- No change to current design
- This area works well as is, it doesn't need to be adjusted, but if they take a lane away it will cripple the area
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- Block 9 is a hot spot in Chinatown. Business on both side of the street. It should provide road side drop off.
- N/A
- Bad!



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- -
- X
- np
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- Keep parking for those who need easy access to Chinatown.
- I like that there are no bike lanes but don't green scape either. It is quaint and does not need improvement. It is part of the charm of China town
- It is working well currently. The most important thing is not to destroy China Town by limiting the shops and restaurants to do business as no trucks can unload the goods. If no parking stall how can I go to the banks for my own business?
- Formalizes shared road philosophy. Draws attention to needs of other road users.
- Our dental office has served Chinatown/downtown patients for more than 20 yrs. We count on supplies trucks and courier services to make our office operational. Restricting loading zone will not work for us.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- it will increase traffic, no good with senior living in areas, no delivery zone for the business and pickupkup

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?

- Use option 2 full cycle track
- cycling lanes not protected will discourage cyclists using the whole avenue. this section of the road is one of the busiest with many vehicles coming in and out of parking spots. lots of accidents waiting to happen.
- The fact cyclists and pedestrians are sharing space not good. And that cyclists are in the road. Also not good
- Doing Option 2 would improve this.
- Sharrows are unsafe, particularly at the busy intersection with Centre Street
- Having separated bike / mobility facilities.
- Nothing
- Sharrows are not bike infrastructure. Protected bike lanes are required for the influx of all ages and abilities riders.
- Bike path needed and to be separate
- Bike infrastructure



- Too much parking here, put the cycle track on the street
- Any option without dedicated protected cycling infrastructure is not acceptable
- Please actually do something this option is essentially what is in place now with more paint.
- This road is chaos. Something to make it less complex is needed desperately. I personally would like to see chinatown in general made of cobblestone streets for roads that are not centre street. Maybe that helps cue drivers that peds exist too.
- This is the one block where I'm comfortable with on-street cycling and am supportive of Option 1. No improvements are needed.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Perhaps transitioning the road to look more like Stephen Ave or the space between EEEL and ICT at UCalgary where the road material says that this is a pedestrian-first environment (think: prominade), but still have enough space for delivery vehicles, etc.
- There should be less space devoted to parking and the speed limits should be brought down to 30km/h. Local traffic should be the only ones accessing the area.
- Increasing safety precautions
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Need to look at balancing bike lanes with on-street parking in a commercial area
- Everything! We should sacrifice parking (there is plenty nearby), and build infrastructure that will encourage a variety of local visitors and support businesses here. Needs to be quieter, safer for active transport, and encourge lingering.
- I question the context (traffic speed, volume and purpose) for a greenway. Sharrows are not cycling infrastructure and preclude AAA access. Greenways include traffic volume and speed management to be effective. This shows neither.
- walkways could be improved
- The sidewalks are BUSY and congested on this block and having scooters on the same surface as people walking is a nightmare. We need dedicated safe for people to walk and enjoy the shops in the block!
- There should be continued cycle tracks. Shared lanes make drivers frustrated and impatient and intimidate many cyclists.
- See comments above
- Reduce speed to make it safer (and feel safer)for everyone. Too much space devoted to cars
- na
- Needs separate bike paths. Bikes should not need to share the road with cars.
- One way traffic is a bad idea. Will make an already confusing and contested area worse.
- Nothing
- Redirect protected bike and escooter pathway from 3rd Ave SW to Riverfront Ave via 2nd or 1st St SW. Return loading zone in front of Silver Dragon...missing? Chinatown cannot afford to lose twoway road, on-street parking, and loading zone.



- Everything
- conflict points for cyclists and pedestrians is not good think about cyclists trying to get by during lunch hour. Not ideal.
- so instead of bikes beside parked cars, and moving cars because there is enough space for that, lets put bikes and cars in the exact same spot! that's brilliant. i think you're wasting money on anything on this block. just leave it alone
- Everything.
- N/A
- Block 8 and block 9 are busier with car traffic and people searching for parking. More intimidating for cyclists
- Separate modes
- Yes, you could just do nothing. It would save time, money and maybe cut some civic jobs to further save more money
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- Separate bike and vehicle lanes. Sharrows are not user friendly, and do not feel safe for the majority of casual cyclists. This is particularly important if this is meant to be a temporary reroute from the river path.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Should improve the objectivity of the analysis. Pedestrian benefits should outweigh benefits to cycle or auto.
- Add more parking along north side of road, remove shared road due to high vehicle traffic on this road; bicyclists will be a hazard, they should be re-routed to Riverfront Avenue.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- I don't travel here often
- A dedicated cycle track with aggressive barriers is a MUST in this area, given the illegal sidewalk parking, and volume of vehicle traffic.
- Remove bike lanes
- remove cycle tracks
- Directional wheelchair ramps please...and again, separate the wheeling facility.
- The sidewalk on this block is very wide, It's overkill for the amount of foot traffic. Street parking/Loading seems to be a constant problem. Convert some of the sidewalk spaces around the buildings to create angle parkings/loading would make more sense.
- Space is too narrow
- This is a heavily trafficked pedestrian area, and I'd consider closing it to motor traffic altogether.
- Mixing bikes etc with pedestrians is unsafe.



- bikes should be protected and not forced to interact woth larger vehicles such as delivery trucks
- nothing
- Impose speed limits for cyclist/eScooters for sharing with safety. Also lower the speed limit for vehicles to 30 km per hour same as playground zone.
- Without on street lane to encourage bike/scooter traffic to move to, a large amount of pathway traffic will be staying on the sidewalk creating additional conflicts. Use Option 2.
- Leave it as is and it is working great already!
- nothing
- This will not be pleasant cycling experience. Centre St intersection needs more consideration. I would suggest that accessing Riverfront Ave via 1 St SW or 2 St SW provides a better cycling experience. Path is busy and narrow for scooters
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is
- There's no actual improvement for anyone other than in a vehicle. If speeds were slowed to 30 it may help cyclists, not to mention slower traffic speed allows people to take a look at the businesses in the area
- Too much parking on that street there are huge parkades everywhere
- More parking for cars and no pay park
- Just go with option 2.
- No
- Separated bike lane
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- More parking space. Going down during Covid, and there's still trouble finding street parking in the afternoon.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- N/A
- Crossing improvements on both ends of the block. Otherwise, this option is socially and culturally appropriate.
- Increase benches for seniors and visitors. Encourage street walking and maintain parking. Option 2 chokes off traffics into Chinatown and will for sure see businesses closed and job loss.
- Everything, it should be more like option 2, a physical separation for each mode of transportation, providing better safety for everyone, and promoting alternative modes of transportation from cars
- More trees and benches.
- Additional loading zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- More parking
- Needs separation between bicycles and vehicles.
- just remove this option
- More traffic control officers on foot petrol to issue tickets to illegal parking and stopping



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- To maintain the status quo
- Nothing should be improved
- Maintain 2 way traffic and current loading and parking stalls. Chinatown business has diminished past decades due to high cost of parking. Changing current roadway flow and reducing parking stalls will kill-off Chinatown's fragile economy.
- Nothing
- This area just needs better timing from the traffic lights
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- No cycling and micro-mobility allowed on sidewalk due to safety. People may allow to walk the bike while they are in this block. (Same as block 8).
- 2 ave is more worth to be upgraded
- I am a worker on the 3 aveune. After I read the details, I have a prediction that it will greatly decrease the traffic flow on the 3 avenue. It probably make a bad economic impact on my working place. I don't want to get unemployment under the pandemic..
- -
- X
- np
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- Remove Bikes and scooters or have them walk thru Chinatown.
- Remove Bikes and scooters or have them walk thru Chinatown.
- Do not change anything. It is part of the charm of China town and does not need to be changed to be like all the other areas in the city
- Can lower the speed because the road is share with cyclists.
- Nothing
- Need parking stalls, handicap and loading stalls. Our patients also complain they are hard to find street parking and expensive.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- city likes to kill the business, do what they like

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?

- Separated cycle track
- reducing number of vehicle traveling lanes will make this street more safe. keeping parking spots.
- Not much



- I like the separated cycle track space. It seems like a good connection.
- Does provide a protected cycle track
- Having separated facilities for bikes and scooters.
- Sidewalk improvements
- Protected bike lanes are good. Either size is fine.
- Bike path
- Nothing
- Separation of bikes and cars to the riverwalk is great! These curb extensions are also awesome.
- Nothing
- Balances the range of uses for that block well.
- Allowing the parking here might be ok. There are a few spots taken in the other designs but this seems a bit more needless. Cyclists are separated from cars/ppl they can be patient together for this block I think... can always widen later if needed.
- Happy to see separated cycletracks. Keeping the angled parking is also a benefit.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Both options are similar; not clear why parking needs to be removed in Option 2. Narrow the lanes!
- The separated bike lane works very well. Helps bring some sense of safety for cyclists. As well, the curb bulbs will work very well to get drivers to slow down.
- Separated pathways
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Widened sidewalks, even pavement, clearer crosswalks
- Improved walking and rolling safety at intersection -- very important here. Improved access to local restaurants by all transportation forms.
- The cycle track.
- walkway improvements
- I like that cycling and sidewalk improvements are suggested. This will help with the connections to other parts of the city and the river.
- Adding a cycle track will be a huge improvement.
- See comments above
- sidewalk improvements and narrow bike lane.
- improved crosswalks with dedicated space for people biking to not run into people walking
- The separate bike lanes.
- Nothing
- Works as presented. What about Bike facility on 1st St SE south of 3rd Avenue?
- Everything
- nothing
- It's fine, just depends on how the intersection works out.



- Seems like a win for everyone -- new dedicated space for bicycle and scooter users, no change to parking.
- Cycling/pedestrian sharing will work fine in this area. Parking is more important for access to federal building
- Separating modes of traffic
- Nothing, just stop this. Full Stop unlike cyclists....
- Crosswalk improvements and sidewalk improvements.
- Separate bike and car lanes are more safe.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Retention of angled parking, sidewalk improvements due to access to river.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Increased crossing safety
- The cycle tracks appear well-buffered, and the majority of parking is preserved, though an effort could be made, given the low volume of through-traffic on this road, to increase angled-parking availability.
- Everything but bike lanes
- Not much for business access
- I like the idea of a separated facility for people wheeling and the new curb extensions and space for people walking.
- People cycling and scooters have dedicated spaces separated from foot and car traffic.
- Retention of in Street parking is valuable in this area.
- Full separation of transportation modes is excellent.
- preserves the existing parking
- No comment
- Clear indications about where pathway traffic should go.
- Leave it as is, it is already working great!
- It adds a tiny amount extra of on-street parking. I doubt it's highly used in the existing context. plus the greenline is arriving soon. give parking areas to pedestrians.
- retains parking. two-way bike traffic.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is
- Retained parking, bicycle separation
- parking on both sides is good
- Car and bike separation is great
- Adequate parking for cards and the presence of a separated bike lane. With my personal preference for Option 2 from Centre St to 1 St SE, more parking would be necessary here
- No



- Looks good
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- Sidewalk improvements will be great, as well as improved crossing safety. A lot of pedestrians cross at that intersection to access the river side walkway.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- n/a
- Sidewalk & crossing improvements. Affordable on-street parking. Easy access & parking is very important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multi-generational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- Other than providing more parking for cars, having a dedicated cycle lane is ggreat for safety, however option 2 is more inviting as it is wider
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- No comment as long as keeping the majority parking stalls.
- Remains same
- Separated bike lanes.
- Some parking n loading are available
- just remove this option
- The current set up is fine.
- To maintain the status quo
- The existing two-way roadway
- I suggest routing bike lane through 2nd ave, and no bike lanes on 3rd. Existing bike lane on 2nd can be co-exist.
- Addition of cycletrack is positive
- The traffic flows well here when the lights are working, it has ample parking and you can get where you need
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- Block 10 has business on one side of street. leave it as is.
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- bad
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- Remove bikes and scooters or have them walk thru Chinatown.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Remove bikes and scooters or have them walk thru Chinatown.
- Keeps cars and motorists separate.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- same as now, no change

When looking at Option 1 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?

- Make it as safe as possible for everyone
- is the ramp really necessary? can't you cut the sidewalk down?
- Everything
- This seems fine. I really can't visualize how narrow this is for people who will use the track.
- Wider cycle track would be preferred
- The lanes should be wider. Narrow lanes are difficult for cargo bikes, winter access (can't navigate around ice), and navigating around any obstacles.
- Angled parking on the east side is maintained but there are currently 17 parking stalls vs. 15 proposed. Potential conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.
- Needs a protected intersection at 1 St SE and 3 Av SE.
- Widen bike path
- Bike infrastructure
- The
- Cycle tracks far too narrow just to allow a few people free car storage
- I actually think it's important to keep sidewalk, parking and traffic lanes and if we can fit that with a narrower cycle track, it's fine.
- Iol at this intersection. I imagine you will get light here that is activated by cyclists otherwise I have no idea how to get to that track safely.
- Whether the cycletracks are on the east or west side of 1st St SE, please try to extend them as far as 8th Ave so that the Bow River pathway is safely linked to Olympic Plaza and another important piece of the cycletrack network on Stephen Ave.
- Stop spending tax payer money
- Best Option 1 yet!
- There should be less space devoted to parking and the speed limits should be brought down to 30km/h. Local traffic should be the only ones accessing the area.
- Added greenery
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Parking rates
- Narrow cycle track will create some hazards and discouragement to people on bikes and walking, particularly near the intersection at 3 Ave.
- Ensure clear operation of intersection.



- the bike lanes are rather inconsistent throughout the street, it could be dangerous. Might want to remove it unless proven it's beneficial.
- A narrow cycle track is a bad idea for the number of people coming off of the river pathway.
- Wider cycle trakes are preferable e.g. for cargo bikes, facilitating passing so that people don't get impatient and do unsafe things.
- See comments above
- Reduce speed to make it safer (and feel safer)for everyone. Too much space devoted to cars
- maintain angle parking and all parking spaces
- Wider sidewalk
- This survey for zone c is flawed. The "block" numbers listed in the questions are not on the map. VERY confusing!!!!!
- Nothing
- Nothing
- Nothing
- cycle track to narrow. this is a key access to the river, should be wider.
- nothing, there's no point because cyclists for this stretch are just going to ride where they feel it is most convenient
- Remove one driving lane and provide angled parking to increase the amount of parking stalls.
- N/A
- It does not have the design capacity required for the amount of ped and cycle traffic
- Yes, you could just do nothing. It would save time, money and maybe cut some civic jobs to further save more money
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- Wider cycletrack for high volume use.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Consider angle parking on west side of 1st Street, reduce bike lane on east side of 1st Street.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- The angle parking is dangerous when people back our
- Continue with one-way traffic and the cycle track, but reduce the road to one lane, one-way, and add angled parking on both the east and west sides. This may alleviate the lost illegal parking in the Chinatown area.
- Remove bike lanes
- remove cycle tracks
- I prefer option 2, wider facilities.



- To use the proposed Cycle Track on the west side of the road, people cycling and scooters must cross 1ST SE, which increases chances of accidents. Put the Cycle Track on the east side of 1ST SE makes more sense.
- Younger cyclists or people on cargo bikes may have difficulty navigating the narrow lanes.
- crossing safety is most important, but cars do very commonly turn left onto riverfront for access to the centre street bridge via 2nd av and this should be preserved / kept in mind
- Lower speed for all travellers
- Clear intersection design at 3rd Ave and 1st St to make pathway traffic have priority.
- Leave it as is, already working great!
- consider reverse angle parking. Very slow moving pilot area to try it out.
- bike path would be better located on other side of street, to avoid unnecessary crossing.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Keep as is.
- How narrow is narrow? Narrow two way cycle tracks can be tough to navigate, especially for younger, cautious or less experienced cyclists. The interchange to connect 1st street and 3rd ave needs to be carefully considered to be effective.
- get rid of angle parking difficult to get out as it's hard to see traffic coming from Riverfront onto 1 St SE
- Make this a pedestrian mall like stephen ave to stop cut through traffic
- The intersection design needs to have a 3 way stop of traffic controls
- N/A
- No
- Please NO bike lane & dangerous to everyone!
- No downsides really.
- The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Nothing. This is a safe option that is socially and culturally appropriate.
- Option 2 is the better option, wider cycle tracks attracts more alternative modes of transportation from a car, is safer, and provides more safety by slowing down motorists due to a narrower road
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- More parking
- 2 way cycle track is confusing and hazardous. Cycle track on east side of street requires crossing traffic to turn on/from 3rd ave and is more hazardous.
- just remove this option
- Do not make any changes
- To maintain the status quo
- Nothing should be improved
- Incorporate current bike lane on 2nd, and save budget by not developing bike lanes on 3rd.
- Removing SB on-street parking would improve safety issues with parked cars



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- This area just needs to have better timing from the light's aswell
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- No comment.
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- where are the parking lots?
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- Nothing
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- no change

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think works well?

- Full cycle track
- simpler easier to understand for all users
- Love the cycle track separation. I'm convinced that this is the better option (compared to more shared space).
- Standard cycle track design is clearer and avoids mixing with pedestrian traffic
- This is a perfect design.
- two-way traffic is maintained
- Protected bike lanes.
- Bike path
- Cycle tracks are crucial.
- separation of traffic and bikes/scooters.
- Separate cycle tracks is safest and best
- Cycle tracks
- This is excellent smooth, no curbs, and safe. Will work well with snow removal.
- Less interaction between the different users which is nice. Removal of parking is needed here.
- Separated cycletracks are great. No on-street parking is needed as there already is plenty of parking surrounding this block.
- No mixing of wheelers with pedestrians! Maintains separation, and makes for a more enjoyable ride not hopping on and off curb cuts.



- I like the separated bike lane. I think it is good for the area that there will be less on-street parking. More space devoted to pedestrians.
- Increase in safety for all
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant
 @Chinatown.PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant
 @Chinatown.
- Consistent with nearby street design -- provides good flow of all traffic modes, improved safety, comfort for all. Keeps valued trees. Very important biking corridor needs these cycle tracks. Parking abundant nearby, and wisely sacrificed for safety.
- 3rd Ave east should not be reduced to one lane vehicle traffic and a one way street by having designated bike lanes and parking stalls removed.
- Consistent and uniform cycling facility that should be reliable and easy to maintain year-round. Accessible for all ages and abilities.
- nothing
- The separated cycling facility feels like a safe choice for people walking, riding their bike and riding scooters in the area. It is easy to understand and people are more likely to use it.
- Big improvement to have separated cycle tracks. Huge positive improvement to streetscape and safety.
- No comments
- Seperated cycle track.
- Separate space for each type of mobility is good
- Cycle track dedicated for wheeling
- cycletrack
- Separate bike lanes
- Retain two-way roadway
- Cycle Tracks
- Separated cycling infrastructure! Opportunities for all ages and abilities and incomes to access chinatown
- making it harder to find parking in the area, these parking spots are usually full all day.
- Simple, easy, and there are several off-street parking lots to absorb the few lost parking spaces. Separates wheelers from walkers.
- The cycle tracks will provide increased safety for bicycle and scooter users, and in turn pedestrians.
- Has always been a more comfortable zone to cycle with traffice than blocks 8-10
- Absolutely nothing, quit pandering to special interests and feeding your social engineering egos
- Protected cycle tracks!
- Need cycle track. Not sure many e-scooters will actually go there.
- Straight cycle lanes are faster, more user friendly, and safer for users.



- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Nothing.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Everything
- The dedicated cycle track with no on-street parking creates the best possible sightlines between vehicles and cyclists.
- It doesn't. Bike lanes not needed and reduce parking in a congested area. Parking needed for businesses
- Separated bike/scooter lanes. Scooters should NEVER be on sidewalks with pedestrians. They are a disaster.
- nothing but disruptions to business owners
- Option 2 is better as cycle tracks are safer than raised pathways that have conflicts at intersections.
- separation between people walking, wheeling and driving along with intersection improvements.
- Good transition and connection to the cycle track to the west. No changes for drivers.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Dedicated cycle tracks
- Much safer!
- Dedicated cycling is good.
- Full separation of transportation modes is excellent.
- protected lanes are essential in this area
- everything great option
- Clear separation of modes to decrease conflicts.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- Everything works well. Great design.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Straight forward cycling infrastructure
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Separated bike lanes will improve safety and reduce conflict with road users gets scooters off of the sidewalk and the area is surrounded by alternative parking options. Narrower street should slow traffic, improving safety.
- it doesn't work well at all!
- Cycle tracks are way safer
- Looks great!
- no bike paths
- Separated tracks are a good design and the curb improvements will help.
- Separated lane without the unnecessary twist and turns. Much better



- PLEASE NO BIKE LANES (period) due to dangerous to senior, retiree, disable residents. TURNING into 1-way traffic WILL DEMOLISH CHINATOWN BUSINESS. Together with Green Line (traffic on center street), chinatown will be HISTORY under year 2020 City council.
- Nothing under Option 2 work well. The path way should turn north at 2nd Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Looks fine.
- Seems like a simplier, more straightforward design compared to Option 1.
- Nothing good because parking is gone, and dedicated cycling tracks encourage fast and reckless cyclists.
- Much like option 1 having a dedicated cycle lane is fantastic for safety and promotion of cycling, it's even safer than option 1 as it does not have parking options, getting doored and pedestrian jay walking to their parking spot is a danger
- Terrie idea, does not take the aging residence safety into consideration. Should not have bike lanes in this mainly pedestrian oriented zone.
- Stupid. No on street parking. Why bicycle lane?
- Separated bike lane. Straight cycletrack. Safer without parking.
- Two way traffic, NO more bike lanes, there is a bike path a block north
- the seperation
- It will not work. One way street near Chinatown will create havoc and discourage people from visiting Chinatown. Please do not do Option 2.
- Bike lane is dangerous because pedestrians have to look out for vehicles and bicycles
- Nothing good would work well
- A vastly improved urban environment. Far safer and more inviting for cyclists of all abilities.
- Nothing bikes seldom or never travel here along 3 rd Ave SW.
- Separated cycletracks are very beneficial to cycle, vehicle, and pedestrian traffic. Not requiring cycles to mount a curb is a big plus.
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- nothing
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- bad
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Don't like the bike lanes
- More parking, prefer option 1
- Nothing
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 7 (2nd Street S.W. to 1 Street S.W.), can you share what you think should be improved?

- safer right turn for cyclists to turn from eastbound 3 Ave to southbound 2 St
- Love it. This is great.
- No complaints with it.
- Loss of all of the much needed parking on both sides of the 3 Avenue will be problematic. More parking should be retained.
- Looks good. Makes sense to remove parking because there are no adjacent businesses.
- Nothing
- Intersection design
- Cycle tracks could be wider
- Signalization please, otherwise people wheeling are still subject to right hooks at intersections.
- I like this road. Hoping for sidewalk improvements with regard to widening and allowing more furniture/plants.
- No improvements needed.
- Potential conflict with the existing bus stop; but not a very heavily trafficed bus stop.
- Lower the speed limits in the area to 30km/h. Local traffic only. This will help deter drivers from using the area as a through-way.
- Find a parking solution for the area
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Traffic calming especially important at intersections here. Left turn procedures to and from 1 Street for people on bikes needs to be made clear and not too intimidating.
- Ensure adequate width of cycle tracks (1.5m "+"). Some intersections are missing turn boxes to provide a formal framework for cyclists to make necessary turns.
- remove bike lanes, restore parking and dedicate space to improve walkways
- could the sidewalk improvements from Option 1 be included in Option 2?
- No comments
- The fact that there is no parking in this area can cause some issues. No sidewalk improvements
- destruction of the streetscape, safety risk to pedestrians crossing with the bike lanes
- Reduce speed. Reduce ability to speed. Use Two way wide cycle tracks is better than narrow. More trees please
- Save/create even more area parking
- Nothing, looks good



- Return all on-street and loading zone parking or provide replacement off-street parking at on-street rates or less within 1 block.
- Parking removal
- bring ALL the parking back, there is enough space for parking and this stupid cycle track on this segment of road
- Make it one-way and place parking along the entire stretch on one side of the street.
- I don't often drive/park in the area, but the reduced parking might be of concern to some.
- it would be nice to retain some parking here
- You could stop the entire project, that would be a huge improvement. "Leave well enough alone" is a old and valid phrase
- Add greenery where space permits
- Some landscaping.
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- Limiting the size of parking and vehicle crossings on the cycle track is safer. Whatever can slow vehicle traffic and increase cyclist visibility in those areas would be safest.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Re-route bicycles to Riverfront Ave. Add parking.
- Don't restrict flow 24 hours per day.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Nothing
- Given the width of the roadway, perhaps it is possible to increase available parking by moving the south cycle track into the sidewalk.
- No bike lanes
- remove cycle track and one way traffic, transition from cycle track to roadway will result in more bike-vehicle altercations and accidents.
- Consider transit movements and although I love the consistency of the facility, there is no option for vehicles to pick up and drop off people, so this means, people driving will likely use the green dashed driveways to park and block the cycle track.
- Would be nice if parking spaces can be retained or even increased.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Raised cycle tracks for all abilities to feel safe biking because of the increase distinction from the road
- Parking
- Intersections may be difficult to navigate for less experienced or confident cyclists.
- Nope. Do Option 2. More bike parking.



- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- no suggestions. great design.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- The cycling infrastructure is really unnecessary, with almost no interaction between cyclists and motorized vehicles at present, even in peak times
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Loading zone requirements by Livingston Place should be considered (i.e. parcel delivery, couriers etc who would not use a loading bay). However, on street parking concerns on this section don't need to be considered.
- need parking for nearby businesses
- 30km/hr speed limit
- n/a
- no bike paths
- I prefer option 1 because of the way it handles the bus stop.
- Nothing
- Bike lane is backward thinking, wasting resources & achieve zero green results. Today's technology is 'transportation as a service and City hall, council man/woman must be forward thinking than keep on wasting tax monies.'
- Nothing under Option 2 work well. The path way should turn north at 2nd Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Bike lane overlapping with bus stop seems silly though.
- There's lots of unused space that could be better utilized.
- We need to slow down the cyclists and scooters.
- A more physical barrier for the cycle track, other than a flexi post, something a concrete barrier would be an improvement
- Waste of money, and resources. Not necessary, low usage of any.
- Bus stop will block cycle track. Parkade access is hazardous with vehicles entering and exiting.
- Better Wheelchair and street crossing access
- parking spaces
- Just do not do Option 2. It will destroy Chinatown.
- Dedicated bike lanes should not be installed.
- There is already a bike path along the river, very close to this block. Don't need to spend tax payer money for redundancy.
- Bike access to the core is not an issue. Quicker to ride the river pathway than travel on streets with so many traffic lights and pedestrians.
- No changes
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- So, if the upgrade was unavoidable, I would think that the 2 avenue is more suitable to be "upgrade" because the usage of that road is low especially between the 2 st and 1 st. I believe it is worth to be upgarde to activate that district
- no comment
- -
- X
- Give me parking
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- Leave the tea lone
- More parking, prefer option 1
- 2 cycle lanes should be on same side of street. One way cycle lanes promote car bicycle interactions when a car in turning right and a bike is going straight. This design provides cyclists with a false sense of security at intersections.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think works well?

- Full cycle track
- separate cycle tracks
- There seems to be good, safe free flow and distinction of between people wheeling and parking spaces.
- Cycle track option is safer and better for cycling
- This is a perfect design.
- Nothing
- Protected bike lanes.
- Bike path continues all the way down st
- Cycle tracks
- No bikes on sidewalks
- This is a great balance of parking and safe space for wheeling.
- Separation is good generally.
- Happy with the separated cycletracks and that some on-street parking is still accommodated.
- FULL SEPARATION !!!
- I like the separated bike lane. I think it is good for the area that there will be less on-street parking. More space devoted to pedestrians.



- Increase in safety for pedestrians and motorists with separating alternative traffic
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Wise sacrifice of parking for dramatic improvement to safety for all in this area. Also improvement to comfort and percieved safety for active transport. Will create more pleasant environment for people working in and visiting this area.
- Consistent and uniform cycling facility that should be reliable and easy to maintain year-round. Accessible for all ages and abilities.
- nothing
- I like that some parking will remain for people visiting the area but that the cycle-track makes crossing centre street more predictable and safe
- Big improvement to have separated cycle tracks. Huge positive improvement to streetscape and safety.
- None, with lots of seniors Living around, having cycling path and scooter path increase the risk of accident.
- Safer for bikers.
- Separate space for each type of mobility is good
- Cycle track dedicated for wheeling. Need cycle track for entire 3 Ave!
- cycletrack
- Separate bike lanes
- Retain two-way roadway.
- Cycle tracks and no change to roadway ops for drivers
- Separated cycling infrastructure! Opportunities for all ages and abilities and incomes to access chinatown
- making sure no one goes to chinatown, by removing parking
- Keeps different modes of transport separated. The few parking spots lost are right next to parking lots, so not a big loss.
- The cycle track and buffered bike lanes will provide increased safety for bicycle and scooter users over a shared roadway.
- Good to have greater separation for cyclists
- Absolutely nothing, quit pandering to special interests and feeding your social engineering egos
- Protected cycle tracks
- Crosswalk and sidewalk improvements.
- Dedicated lanes are the most safe and will encourage the highest level of use.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Retains parking on south side of 3rd Ave.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Everything



- This option is good because of the separated cycle track, improving safety for cyclists, and creating less worry for vehicles.
- Everything but bike lanes
- nothing but disruptions to business owners
- this option looks good. no comments
- No changes for drivers.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Dedicated cycle tracks
- Safety in separation.
- dedicated cycling lane
- Full separation of transportation modes is excellent.
- everything great option
- Clear separation of modes and retains useful parking.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- Everything works well. Great design. Green line is coming, give parking spaces to pedestrians.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Nothing
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Safety of pedestrians, cyclists and micro-mobility users is greatly improved while parking losses are minimal. Maintains loading zone for businesses within Lucky Place. More (and safer) foot traffic likely to benefit these businesses.
- No bikes sharing space near the sidewalks and no cars and bikes on the same space
- Looks great!
- no bike paths
- Separated bike lanes are in everyone's best interests.
- Separated lane is excellent. Removing parking next to a giant surface parking lot makes sense to me
- again, bike lanes are backward thinking!
- Nothing under Option 2 work well. The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- The south side looks fine, but the north side not so much.
- It seems a little bit safer for cyclists who are very likley just passing thorugh Chinatown to commute to work or access the river. This little bit of safety and convienence is at the expense of the actual residents and patrons of Chinatown.
- Dedicated tracks encourage fast and reckless cyclists, endangering other motorists and people in sidewalks.
- Everything, Physical separation of each mode of transportation promotes safety and alternate modes of transportation, it also narrows the road forcing motorists to slow down, even more safety


Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Cycle track is dangerous as it travel too fast and too quiet.
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- stupid again. 50% less parking. Why bicycle lane in Calgary weather? 6 months in a year cannot use it. What a waste of money!
- Separated bike lanes. Cycle track between parking and sidewalk.
- Two way traffic, NO more bike lanes, there is a bike path a block north
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- This will create havoc in traffic. Please don't do it.
- Bike lane is dangerous because bikes will travel fast
- Nothing good would work well
- Nothing city has created a problem that did not exist. Until they allowed motorized Vehicles on side walks
- Intersection narrowing is beneficial to pedestrian crossings, cycle traffic circulation is improved, appropriate parking is maintained
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment
- no 無
- no comment
- It does not need Improvement. Leave it alone
- Prefer option 1
- Nothing
- Removing parking is absolutely bad idea. Our patients usually find street parking.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- maintain unchanged

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 8 (1 Street S.W. to Centre Street), can you share what you think should be improved?

• safer right turn for cyclists to turn from eastbound 3 Ave to southbound 1 St. provision for adding parking back to the north side when the lot gets developed



- I think really clear signage for people exiting their cars will be important. I don't want there to be an issue between opening doors/people exiting and the people wheeling past.
- No complaints.
- Existing on-street parking should be retained as there is a short-stay parking shortage in this area.
- Close some of the extra driveway accesses on the north side. Block is redeveloping and removing them anyway.
- Nothing
- Intersections
- There is too much car parking
- Cycle tracks could be wider
- Could we find a way to consolidate and remove the driveway cuts? They interfere with the sidewalks and wheeling lanes.
- This is a scary track because I imagine a lot of cars encroaching from parking lots or turning in without shoulder checking. I would not be totally comfortable here.
- No improvements needed.
- The many driveways will cause some conflict between motorists and humans.
- Lower the speed limits in the area to 30km/h. Local traffic only. This will help deter drivers from using the area as a through-way.
- Find a solution for parking
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Good design to serve long-term interests of local businesses and the city.
- Ensure adequate width of cycle tracks (1.5m "+").
- remove bike lanes and use space for walkway improvements
- maybe the signal could be advanced for people driving to avoid having cars try to cross with pedestrians and people on scooters/bikes
- No cyclist path, change back to parking
- N/A
- destruction of the streetscape, safety risk to pedestrians crossing with the bike lanes
- Reduce speed. Reduce ability to speed. Use Two way wide cycle tracks is better than narrow. More trees please
- 1 way tough sell in busy Chinatown (driveways, deliveries..) Need more creative solution to keep cycle track
- Nothing, looks good
- RETURN ALL ON-STREET PARKING AND LOADING ZONE. THERE IS SIGNIFICANT COMMERCIAL BUSINESS ON THIS ROADWAY.
- Nothing. This is it. This is what every zone should be.
- add more parking than what already exists. plus there is enough space for parking, this cycle track and driving cars on this segment



- Seems fine.
- I don't often drive/park in the area, but the reduced parking might be of concern to some.
- Fire all of the civic social engineers that would be a HUGE improvement
- Add greenery (planters, trees, natural tall grasses) where space permits
- Just make sure, angled parking forces drivers to back into the parking space. Otherwise very dangerous for cyclists and pedstrians. It's the angle which parking pavement marks are made!!!
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- The long parking zone on the south side is worrisome for cyclist safety. There should be enough space to avoid car doors opening into the cycle track. Also, cars turning into businesses have to cross a lane of parked cars, reducing visibility of cyclists.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Removal of bike lanes, re-route to Riverfront Ave.
- Don't restrict flow 24 hours per day.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Nothing
- Given the nature of traffic in Chinatown, aggressive measures should be used to prevent cars driving in the bike lane, and parking in the bike lane or the sidewalk. Consider concrete bollards.
- Remove bike lanes.
- remove cycle track and one way traffic, transition from cycle track to roadway will result in more bike-vehicle altercations and accidents.
- directional wheel chair ramps.
- The amount of bicycle traffic thru this block is too small. This option seems to create an unbalanced with more negative impact on parking/loading to gain a small positive impact for cyclist.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Raised cycle tracks for all abilities to feel safe biking because of the increase distinction from the road
- parking
- Intersections may be difficult to navigate for less experienced or confident cyclists.
- See if some of the driveways to the parking lot are not necessary. More bike parking.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- no suggestions. great design.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Unnecessary cycling infrastructure on a road with few cars (I bike this route daily). Parking between cyclists and traffic makes vehicle crossing points more challenging, leading to bike lane blockage. Lose-lose for cyclists and motorists.



- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Loss of parking shouldn't be an issue with the massive surface lot that exists on this stretch.
- need parking for nearby businesses
- n/a
- no bike paths
- Nothing
- Nothing under Option 2 work well. The path way should turn north at 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Again, removing street parking space exacerbates an already growing problem. People don't park in the lots because they charge an arm or a leg for short term parking on weekdays.
- Increase parking. Easy access and parking is very important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multi-generational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- We need to slow down the cyclists.
- A more physical barrier for the cycle track, other than a flexi post, something a concrete barrier would be an improvement
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- Keep parking stalls as much as possible. This is not California. We don't need bicycle lane.
- North side cycle track should not jog over, it should be a straight track.
- Better Wheelchair and street crossing access
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- This will create havoc in traffic. Discourage people from visiting Chinatown. Please don't do it.
- Do not install bike lane
- There is already a bike path along the river, very close to this block. Don't need to spend tax payer money for redundancy.
- Stop trying to fix issues that don't exist! This is all about hindering traffic and slowing travel. Increasing fuel consumption and air pollution.
- No changes
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- I believe that the 2 aveune is more necessary to be upgrade then 3 aveune. The district between 1st SW to 1st SE always makes the center street having a traffic jam.
- no comment
- -
- X
- ok
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- no comment



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- no 無
- no comment
- Prefer option 1
- 2 cycle lanes should be on same side of street. One way cycle lanes promote car bicycle interactions when a car in turning right and a bike is going straight. This design provides cyclists with a false sense of security at intersections.
- Increase parking, not remove parking.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- maintain unchanged

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think works well?

- Full cycle track
- consistent separate bike lanes
- I think this feels really safe while allowing for parking and delivery. Really good distinction between uses that encourages positive interactions. Well done!
- Cycle track option is safer and better for cycling
- This works perfectly.
- Nothing works well here. People riding through Chinatown are given priority over people going to Chinatown. Very bad idea.
- One protected bike lane.
- Bike path continues all the way down st
- Cycle tracks
- Good separation and safe riding
- Improves safety for everyone, and retains most parking.
- Hoping this is a one-way westbound. The left turn from southbound centre street is dangerous anyway. Eliminating this in favour of protecting ped/bike and allowing htem to access chinatown from eau claire makes perfect sense.
- Always happy to see separated cycletracks but for this one block I'd prefer option 1.
- Again, full separation.
- I like the separated bike lane. I think it is good for the area that there will be less on-street parking. More space devoted to pedestrians.
- Separating traffic and increase cosmetic appeal of the area
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Creates quieter, safer, and more pleasant place to linger and enjoy shops and restaurants -- key to long term success of local businesses, and to a beautiful downtown. Provides necessary safety improvements for all >> more walkers and bikers visiting.
- Wesbound cycle track provides access for all ages and abilities. Some parking retained.



- nothing
- again, I appreciate that there is on-street bike facilities and some parking on the street.
- Big improvement to have at least one separated cycle track.
- None, with lots of seniors Living around, having cycling path and scooter path increase the risk of accident.
- Seperated bike track.
- Separate space for each type of mobility is good
- Cycle track dedicated for wheeling. Need cycle track for entire 3 Ave!
- cycletrack
- Separate bike lanes
- ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WORKS WELL IN THIS OPTION. DO THIS AND BUSINESS WILL LEAVE AND CHINATOWN WILL COLLAPSE. TOTALLY ASINE AND LACK OF COMMUNITY, BUSINESS, CULTURE AND SENIOR RESIDENT CONSIDERATION
- Cycle tracks
- Separated cycling infrastructure! Opportunities for all ages and abilities and incomes to access chinatown
- creating mayhem for the older asian drivers when turn onto this street, this is going to be confusing.
 it's also going to keep cyclists on their toes when they have to dodge old asians jaywalking and walking in the track
- Keeps all the parking. People are separated.
- The cycle track and buffered bike lanes will provide increased safety for bicycle and scooter users over a shared roadway.
- Absolutely nothing, quit pandering to special interests and feeding your social engineering egos
- Protected cycle tracks
- Crosswalk and sidewalk improvements.
- Separate bike lanes are the most safe and efficient option.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Nothing.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Everything
- This option is good because of the separated cycle track, improving safety for cyclists, and creating less worry for vehicles.
- All but cycling infrastructure
- one-way facility facilities look good. I appreciate the thought of retaining some parking and loading along this street
- Sorry, not much.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible



- Dedicated tracks
- safety and separation.
- dedicated cycling lane
- Full separation of transportation modes is excellent.
- bike lanes at the very least, do not force bikes and especially unexperienced cyclists to mix with rush hour traffic
- not much
- Clear separation of modes to reduce conflict.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- Everything works well. Great design. Green line is coming, give parking spaces to pedestrians.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Very bad design
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Maintaining parking/loading zones for area businesses and separation of bikes and cars, while also getting scooters off the sidewalks is a significant benefit.
- I don't think it works well at all!
- Separation of cycletracks works well. One way is great to stop cut through dangerous traffic
- Looks great!
- no bike paths
- Existence of parking is good given current climate, though I think closing that whole street to car traffic would be best for business and Calgarians, along with separated bike lanes.
- Separated lane is excellent. Looks like very little parking is compromised in the area with the highest concentration of stores, makes sense to me. Hopefully the anti-bike crowd can see that too
- DO NOTHING PLEASE~! (no bike lane, no 1-way traffic) will kill chinatown business
- Turning 3rd Ave SE into an one-way street will create chaos and will kill all businesses on that block.
- Nothing. Seriously, this option is awful for the local businesses.
- Good parking. It seems a little bit safer for cyclists who are very likley just passing thorugh Chinatown to commute to work or access the river. This little bit of safety and convienence is at the expense of the actual residents and patrons of Chinatown.
- Nothing good from Option 2. Needs loading zones, parking stalls, and safe sidewalks for seniors.
- Everything, Physical separation of each mode of transportation promotes safety and alternate modes of transportation, it also narrows the road forcing motorists to slow down, even more safety
- One way cycle track is dangerous to pedestrian. This section of roadway has senior citizens, and high traffic business unloading daily.
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- Nothing works! Are you kidding me to have just one way traffic! Less parking than existing. Who would want to go to Chinatown anymore. We don't have enough parking currently and expensive parking will scare people away. That's exactly what they are doing.



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Separated bike lanes.
- Two way traffic, NO more bike lanes, there is a bike path a block north
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- It will create traffic disaster. Discourage people from visiting Chinatown. Please don't do it.
- Bike lane is dangerous to highly populated roadway. Senior citizens will be injured by collision in matter of time.
- Nothing good would work well
- Nothing leave it alone
- Maintain 2 way traffic and current loading and parking stalls. Chinatown business has diminished past decades due to high cost of parking. Changing current roadway flow and reducing parking stalls will kill-off Chinatown's fragile economy.
- Separated cycletracks are very beneficial to cycle, vehicle, and pedestrian traffic.
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- X
- bad
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- Terrible works!
- no good不好
- Horrible plan
- Prefer option 1
- Nothing
- One way traffic is difficult for courier trucks to pickup/deliver. We also have Staples and other services deliver supplies every week.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- maintain unchanged

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 9 (Centre Street to 1 Street S.E.), can you share what you think should be improved?

- parking on the south side should be outside of the bike track. there's too much frequent vehicle inand-out of parking spots on this section that will cross the track making it unsafe. consider moving the southside one-way cycle track to the north side
- I think signage will be important to remind all users to watch out for each other.
- No complaints.
- See Option 1 for what will work here.



- Painted bike lane is inferior to a cycle track. Should be a curb adjacent cycle track. Flip the parking. Need to further discourage delivery trucks parking on sidewalk.
- Nothing
- Intersections
- slow the speed limit to 30km/hr
- Cycle tracks could be wider
- I would trade off less street parking for two-way traffic.
- love this road design. Would like it if chinatown had cobblestone roads here but think the one-way westbound makes a lot of sense.
- Maintaining two way traffic in the heart of Chinatown is important. Having on street cycling for this one block is okay.
- One way traffic is a bit uncomfortable and confusing. Instead, turning this street into a prominade like Stephen Ave can allow for courriers picking up orders while also freeing up the pedestrian realm and being a more inviting space to stay for a bit.
- Lower the speed limits in the area to 30km/h. Local traffic only. This will help deter drivers from using the area as a through-way.
- Increase in signage for traffic switch to prevent confusion and accidents
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Deserves careful look at traffic flow for people in cars.
- Would prefer to see eastbound bike lane converted to cycle track if possible. If not, door zone buffer is good, but overall may not provide adequate safety and comfort for all ages and abilities in this context.
- remove bike lanes and restore 2 way traffic
- I don't love that cars will cross the bike lane to park. Given the lane becomes one-way, it might be hard for people to see people coming depending on the direction of the one-way/people moving
- Both directions of the cycle track should be separated. Drivers don't consistently observe painted lanes and they can be unsafe. And parking should always be on the outside of cycle tracks for safety reasons otherwise it feels like a death trap..
- No cyclist path, change back to parking
- Signage for bike crossing between street and avenues.Bike lane on south side should perhaps be by the sidewalk and parking spot after it (risk of accidents)
- destruction of the streetscape, safety risk to pedestrians crossing with the bike lanes
- Reduce speed. Reduce ability to speed. Use Two way wide cycle tracks is better than narrow. More trees please
- 1 way tough sell in busy Chinatown (driveways, deliveries..) Need more creative solution to keep cycle track
- Nothing, looks good



- YES...LEAVE EVERYTHING AS-IS. ENSURE THERE IS REGULAR ENFORCEMENT OF LOADING ZONE VIOLATIONS.
- May cause some confusion with one way road ops
- Clear left turn to northbound Riverfront Ave for cyclists will be crucial for safety.
- this SHOULD NOT be done. for their safetly, cyclists shouldn't be riding down this segment of chinatown period. it's a narrow strip. lots of old asians will be walking through, possible death if a cyclist hits one. street festivals also close this road.
- The painted bike lane on the South side is a bad idea. Parking requires vehicles to cross paths with wheelers.
- I've read research showing a correlation between one-way streets and faster driving speeds and increased accident rates.
- Fire all of the civic social engineers that would be a HUGE improvement
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- The winding path on the north side is not very user friendly. Parking zones and cycle track crossings on the south side could be dangerous if not well designed.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Removal of bike lanes and re-route to Riverfront Ave. Having bike lanes between regular car traffic and parking is a dangerous proposition.
- Don't restrict flow 24 hours per day.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Nothing
- Given the nature of Chinatown traffic, aggressive measures should be used to prevent driving and parking in the bike lane and sidewalk. Use concrete bollards. Also dedicate some parking slots to delivery vehicles so they are not forced to use the sidewalk
- Remove bike lanes
- I am worried about the east bound buffered bike lane. As mentioned above, parking and loading is important to the businesses on the block, but I worry about cars/delivery trucks double parking or loading in the bike lane.
- This block has very little bicycle traffic and high area access traffic. The speed of traffic in this area are typically slow and the limit of one way access will create more traffic problems, while benefit gained would be small.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Raised cycle tracks for all abilities to feel safe biking because of the increase distinction from the road
- parking



- Intersections may be difficult to navigate for less experienced or confident cyclists.
- the parking inside of the south bike line is very risky as is the traffic pattern change. really dont like this option
- Barriers to prevent the tracks from being blocked mid block by parked vehicles. More bike parking.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- no suggestions. great design.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- Bike lane is all over the place on the north side. One way traffic for cars reduces access and typically increases speed, making road less pleasant to pedestrians and cyclists. Vehicles likely to block bike lane at crossing points/for deliveries
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Parking/loading inside of the cycle track causes issues. I think the cycle track should be moved to along the sidewalk with parking/loading on the outside of it. One way traffic may be contentious, but ability to use 4th street to Centre is simple enough
- lots of pedestrians on this street, can be dangerous with a full on bike lane on both sides of the street
- Speed limit to 30km/hr, maybe a mid block crossing
- n/a
- no bike paths
- Would look at closing the street to cars.
- Nothing
- Bike lane is backward thinking, wasting resources & achieve zero green results. Today's technology is 'transportation as a service and City hall, council man/woman must be forward thinking than keep on wasting tax monies.
- Turning 3rd Ave SE into an one-way street will create chaos and will kill all businesses on that block.
- Really? In what world is making this stretch a road a one-way a good solution? The road is already tight there. Local businesses and restaurants have deliveries being made all the time. This will increase congestion and reduce accessibility.
- two-way access. Easy access and parking is very important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multi-generational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- No dedicated cyclists lanes should be allowed here.
- A more physical barrier for the cycle track, other than a flexi post, something a concrete barrier would be an improvement
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- Keep two lane traffic. Keep as many parking stalls as possible. Why need the bike lane? Total nonsense. Just use Option 1.



- This block is tricky with parking and business deliveries. It should almost be converted to a pedestrian/cyclist mall, removing all car traffic. Deliveries could unload in nearby lot and be walked to the shops.
- Better Wheelchair and street crossing access
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- Do not change the status quo.
- it's very damaging to turn 3rd Avenue SE into a one way street
- Do not install bike lanes. Do not install one way traffic on 3rd ave. Businesses will be choked off.
- There is already a bike path along the river, very close to this block. Don't need to spend tax payer money for redundancy.
- Leave it alone!!!
- Maintain 2 way traffic and current loading and parking stalls. Chinatown business has diminished past decades due to high cost of parking. Changing current roadway flow (option 2) and reducing parking stalls will kill-off Chinatown's fragile economy.
- No changes
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- I believe that the 2 aveune is more necessary to be upgrade then 3 aveune. The district between 1st SW to 1st SE always makes the center street having a traffic jam.
- I am a worker on the 3 avenue. After I read the details, I have a prediction that it will greatly decrease the traffic flow on the 3 avenue. It probably make a bad economic impact on my working place. I don't want get employment under the pandemic.
- -
- X
- Give me parking
- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- We need parking and drive way on 3 avenue
- carpark
- Inconvenient to get to the church
- Prefer option 1
- 2 cycle lanes should be on same side of street. One way cycle lanes promote car bicycle interactions when a car in turning right and a bike is going straight. This design provides cyclists with a false sense of security at intersections.
- Make Chinatown more beautiful. Making one way traffic will only speed up traffic and people will likely not stop over.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- maintain unchanged



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think works well?

- Full cycle track
- fewer vehicle lanes means safer street. finally a safe northbound cycle track.
- Seems like a good connection
- Wider cycle track design is preferable
- This looks great.
- Nothing
- Protected bike lanes. Not worried about the size.
- Bike path
- Cycle tracks
- Looks good
- Lots of room for all modes
- This is great because it removes parking on the west side of 1st so right turns should be safer.
- Wide cycletracks are great and consolidating all the parking as angled parking works well.
- More space in the cycle track.
- I like the separated bike lane. I think it is good for the area that there will be less on-street parking. More space devoted to pedestrians.
- Separating out alternative traffic to increase user safety
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Wider cycle tracks encourage active transportation. Improved walking, biking, scootering safety at intersection -- very important here. Improved access to local restaurants by all transportation forms.
- Cycle track.
- improvements to walkways and what appears to be little impact on parking with easier parking options
- love that there will be more space for people accessing or connecting to the pathways. also glad to see some of the parking can be replaced.
- Wider cycle tracks are preferable for different bike types (e.g cargo bikes) and to improve the ability to pass so that people don't get frustrated and cause accidents. Very glad a cycle track is being considered for this area which is currently tricky.
- None, with lots of seniors Living around, having cycling path and scooter path increase the risk of accident.
- Larger space for bikers.
- Separate space for each type of mobility is good
- Major ped improvements, 2 way cycle track, parking mostly maintained 86%?
- cycletrack
- Separate bike lanes



- Bike lane on east side of 1st St. How is 4 additional angle parking different here vs. option 1?
- Added parking, wider cycle tracks, no change to roadway
- wider cycle lanes than option 1
- creating obstacles and confusing for a lane to bend for no reason
- Its nice and convenient
- The cycle track will provide increased safety for bicycle and scooter users, and in turn pedestrians. Having only angled parking on one side of the street reduces the chances of someone "getting doored" when passing by.
- Absolutely nothing, quit pandering to special interests and feeding your social engineering egos
- Protected cycle tracks
- This could be ok but need to look at intersections to Riverfront ave.
- Crosswalk and sidewalk improvements.
- The wider cycle track is more efficient for high volume bike and scooter traffic. This is safer and more enjoyable for users.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Angled parking.
- nothing works well. leave 3 avenue alone.
- Way better!
- The dedicated cycle track looks good, though more parking should be added here, given the roadway width.
- Works as is bike infrastructure not needed. Waste of tax dollars. Bad for businesses
- I love this option. it's wide and provides space for all users and keeps the angle parking for those who need to drive.
- Two way cycle track, but no additional benefit from Option 1.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- Dedicated cycle tracks and wider space also safer for those turning
- Keeps cars away AND allows users of varying abilities to use this section with confidence.
- dedicated cycling lane
- Full separation of transportation modes is excellent.
- protected lanes will encourage people to bike and stay safe.
- the overal design is okay
- Wider space is more inviting for bikes/scooters to use instead of using sidewalk incorrectly.
- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- Everything works well. Great design. Green line is coming, give parking spaces to pedestrians.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- two-way bike traffic
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions



- The wider cycle track compared to Option 1 is an improvement.
- Looks great
- Looks great!
- no bike paths
- personally prefer Option 1 as it has more parking and makes up for the single-lane in Block 9 that I prefer
- Looks good
- Eau Claire path way got bike lane already, why doubling efforts for more bike lanes?
- Shifting parking to the east side looks alright, I'm not sure if that increases or decreases the actual amount of parking space though.
- It seems a little bit safer for cyclists who are very likley just passing thorugh Chinatown to commute to work or access the river. This little bit of safety and convienence is at the expense of the actual residents and patrons of Chinatown.
- Extra parking will be welcome.
- Everything, Physical separation of each mode of transportation promotes safety and alternate modes of transportation, it also narrows the road forcing motorists to slow down, even more safety, having a wider cycle track is even better
- Cycle track is dangerous as it travel too fast and too quiet.
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- Nothing works well when you reduce parking. Come-On Planners! Be realistic. This is Calgary and we need car and parking. Our public transit system sucks. Only young people living in downtown will walk and bike.
- Separated bike lanes. Wider cycle track is better.
- Two way traffic, NO more bike lanes, there is a bike path a block north
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- Do not change the status quo.
- Nothing good would work well
- This intersection is very hazardous. This plan puts bikes, scooters and pedestrians into car traffic nightmare intersection. Do not do this!! Deaths will occur!!!
- I suggest routing bike lane through 2nd ave, and no bike lanes on 3rd. Existing bike lane on 2nd can be co-exist.
- Wider cycletrack is necessary for cycle traffic volumes
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- x
- bad



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- Terrible works!
- no good不好
- Horrible plan
- Prefer option 1
- Keeps cyclists and motorists separate.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking
- maintain unchanged

When looking at Option 2 in Zone C, Block 10 (3 Avenue S.E. to Riverfront Avenue), can you share what you think should be improved?

- maybe the northbound cycle track should be extended south to olympic plaza
- Seems fine to me. The intersection will be critical to ensure safety.
- No complaints.
- Parking on the west side of the street should be maintained to avoid safety problem with people parking on east side of the street and crossing to reach Chinatown.
- Needs a protected intersection at 1 St and 3 Av SE.
- Nothing
- Intersections
- Parking should protect the riders, having cars cross the green paint might be dangerous
- Cycle tracks could be wider
- I think in this case we could keep the parking and go with Option 1 / narrower cycle tracks.
- I will be curious to see how this intersection is designed...
- Whether the cycletracks need to be put on the east or west side of 1st St SE, please try to extend them as far as 8th Ave so that the Bow River pathway is safely linked to Olympic Plaza and another important piece of the cycletrack network on Stephen Ave.
- No real reason to eliminate parking (shocker to ever hear me say that XD). Narrow the vehicular lanes!
- Lower the speed limits in the area to 30km/h. Local traffic only. This will help deter drivers from using the area as a through-way.
- Loss of parking, find alternatives
- PLEASE NO WALKING/WHEELING along this area will bankrupt small merchant @Chinatown.
- Possible inconvenience to people driving cars to pick up at nearby restaurants. This is counterbalanced by increased visits by people using transit, feet, bikes, etc. to get here and stay!
- if you want the bike lanes on that side of the road then stick to that for multiple blocks or else it might be unsafe.



- No comments
- Why does the parallel parking need to be removed. Road width could be reduced?
- parking reductions and risk to pedestrians crossing with the wider bike lane
- Reduce speed. Reduce ability to speed. Use Two way wide cycle tracks is better than narrow. More trees please
- Need more improvements to sell change/improvements (eg more trees)
- Nothing, looks good
- RETURN WEST SIDE ON-STREET and LOADING ZONE PARKING.
- Nothing. It's perfect.
- nothing
- It would be best just to leave the cycle track narrower and eliminate one of the driving lanes. Replace the driving lane with angled parking to provide more parking stalls.
- N/A
- Fire all of the civic social engineers that would be a HUGE improvement
- So you are no longer closing off Centre St. bridge road underpass from cars? That we must re-open the underpass to cars again!? Honest, after covid, there will be more people working from home. Keep underpass closed. Less commuters by car into downtown!
- Improve by not reducing existing driving lanes or street parking, not suggesting that cyclists/scooter to share road way or sidewalk. They can go along another street that is less busy or has its own dedicated cycle lane.
- The ramps bisecting the cycle track must be very flat and not have raised bumps or cracks.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Needs more angled parking.
- Don't add more pressure to the business in the area.
- keep bikes and scooters away from 3 avenue.
- Nothing
- Continue with one-way traffic and the cycle track, but reduce the road to one lane, one-way, and add angled parking on both the east and west sides. This may alleviate the lost illegal parking in the Chinatown area.
- No bike lanes
- I guess it depends on what the intersection ends up looking like.
- The cycle track should be on the west side of the 1ST. Parking at this part of the block is always in high demand. Reducing parking spaces in this area is unwelcomed by the users.
- Option 2. This website form and feedback design is terrible
- parking
- Intersections may be difficult to navigate for less experienced or confident cyclists.
- the removal of the parking is problematic due to how many businesses are in the area



- Leave it as is, it's working great already
- no suggestions. great design.
- it is already working fine and please keep it the way it is
- loss of parking on west side is unnecessary. There's almost no cars on the road, even in rush hour, so no need for 2 lanes. Bike lanes would be better on west side.
- This will destroy the businesses in the area and create congestions
- Sidewalk extension on Riverfront at the bottom of the image seems excessive, given the pathway is right there and looks like it would remove additional parking. This could be removed and likely add a few more stalls to limit the parking reduction
- angle parking difficult to back out as it's hard to see traffic coming from Riverfront Ave onto 1 St SE
- Angle parking can be dangerous
- n/a
- no bike paths
- Can't we keep the west side parking space AND add the east side parking space?
- Increase parking. Easy access and parking is very important as most Chinese Canadians visit Chinatown as larger-than-average, older multi-generational family units, using cars instead of bikes and scooters.
- A more physical barrier for the cycle track, other than a flexi post, something a concrete barrier would be an improvement
- zone parking is needed not bike lanes
- Keep the way it is currently. Just add bike lane on the side of Harry Hays building.
- 2 way cycle track is confusing and hazardous. East side cycle track requires crossing of street to enter/exit 3rd ave.
- Better Wheelchair and street crossing access
- this option is better than 1, but unchanged is likely the best
- Do not change the status quo.
- There is already a bike path along the river, very close to this block. Don't need to spend tax payer money for redundancy.
- Leave it alone increasing bike and scooters traffic is not smart or safe!
- Incorporate current bike lane structure on riverfront ave., save budget by not developing bike lanes on 3rd.
- No changes
- I strongly disagree to any changes that proposed to make to 3rd Avenue
- N/A
- no comment
- -
- x
- Give me parking



Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard October 2020

- Waste time and money!
- no change as well!!
- We need parking and drive way on 3 avenue
- carpark
- Inconvenient to get to the church
- Prefer option 1
- The TBD intersection will be a challenge. Would be much easier to design if 3 Ave bike lanes were both on one side of the road.
- Two-way street with on-street parallel parking

Additional Questions:

Do you have any additional comments about the project?

- Please make it a full cycle track. Disconnected cycle tracks lead to confusion and possible injuries.
- While I originally thought a greenway would be a good solution, I'm convinced that the cycle tracks combined with a great streetscrape for pedestrians is the best solution.
- Please use dedicated cycling facilities along the entire stretch and don't resort to any facilities where bikes and cars share the road.
- No
- Important to increase active mobility (walking, cycling, scooter, etc.) in the city, even at the expense of driving mobility. We need to shift to a more attractive city model. No just the 1970's car-centric suburbia Logic of transportation and development
- 5th street should also connect to the Bow Pathway system
- Build cycle tracks
- This is great there is room for cycletracks so let's go
- This is overdue. Please don't give in to the backlash protected infrastructure needs to connect to protected infrastructure (pathways) on both ends and be continuous, to drive usage. With visible high usage, people will understand. 8-80 safety please
- This missing link needs to be addressed for a very small reduction in parking. Alforno is always filled with cyclists and I think small businesses like this could expand if more people were able to bike there safely.
- This is an exciting project. Please move forward with separated cycletracks on 3rd Ave ASAP and also use this project to build cycletracks to properly link 5th St SW cycletrack and Olympic Plaza/Stephen Ave to the Bow River pathway network.
- Cycle tracks along 3rd Ave will make it easier to travel through downtown as well as improve access to other parts of downtown via connections to other cycletracks for all Calgarians with minimal negative impact to established uses.



- One way traffic flow is great because it allows seperated cycling. People are often afraid to share the road with vehicles even on slow street. Drivers really only require access to there homes and to businesses on 3rd ave, its not a throughway.
- More people walking in park. Overall less available parking
- Stop these silly projects and save TAX payers money. This is not Council money
- Would like to see some urban artwork from Alberta Art and Design College. Would like to see some urban community usability features like seating, proper bus stations and appropriate signage
- Please do not proceed with it similar to \$500,000 (o ring) design serve no values
- Please leave this street alone. Why create a minor shortcut when the river pathway is amazing.
- It would be a shame to invest tax dollars in a project here without advancing the design to meet the needs of ALL our citizens -- not just those with private vehicles -- and to support active transportation and economic development we need downtown.
- The entire staff of the City of Calgary make myselfd and thousand upon thousands of Calgarians SICK and want them aLL GONE especially NAHEED NENSHI!!!!!!
- I think this project is a great idea, I would prefer to see protected lanes to encourage riders that are not comfortable riding in mixed traffic such as myself
- As an e-bike owner who lives directly along this route, I am thrilled to see these improvements being planned.
- Leave it alone. Bike path along River, 2nd St. Option, low traffic. Fiscal mismanagement amid falling revenues from tax base. Balance revenues and taxes, don't just keep spending.
- It should be a Cycle Track along the whole route, and it would be nice to include improved access to the Centre St. Bridge for cyclists as many cyclists use Centre St. Bridge as a gradual incline to travel North up McHugh Bluff.
- I understand the desire to make places more accessible without vehicles but people generally don't want to walk further than a few blocks especially during winter time, reducing much needed road capacity for bike lanes will have more negative impact.
- I really hope that you can find a way to make it safer to travel along 3 Avenue. I find the River pathway to be very overwhelming and congested when I am trying to travel through the area.
- I'm excited that improvements are being considered for this area.
- I cycle 3 Ave daily and it functions well. There are few cars even in rush hour, so segregation of bikes and cars is a non-issue. I choose 3 Ave over the river pathway because bikes are separate from foot and scooter traffic. Please don't do this.
- Leave 3rd avenue alone please
- Stop the insanity please. No need to change 3rd Ave to one way and cycle track. Stop spending our tax dollars where it is not needed (Druh Farrell). I need to be able to access my home on 3rd Ave SW. Need to keep it 2 way.
- You need to live here to see it on a daily basis. I look over the cycle track on 7 St SW and watch and all the businesses close down because there's no parking and I see seniors almost killed daily by scooters who didn't have to pass a road safety test



- I think it's a terrible idea. This City Council is too obsessed with cycle tracks. Use our tax money for something more purposeful.
- The area between 7th and 8 th St SW and 3 Ave SW is often congested due to traffic in both directions and parking on both sides of the street. This is dangerous for cyclists and others
- I prefer separated cycling tracks.
- It takes ONE car tableting too fast to stop community feel as people feel uncomfortable (or fearful) of spending time near a road. Plan need to ensure 0 excess speed ... If people live on a street it needs to be 30kph
- Please do not create separate bike lanes here, there is no need as it is so close to the river bike paths for many bikes to commute
- The 3rd Ave work is excellent. Bow river pathway between Centre St & Peace bridges is not pedestrian friendly. The occasional police presence ignores Escooter violators and in discussions with them state it is not their job. E scooters are dangerous.
- Will be initial resistance to change from 2 way to 1 way (just like 7 St cycle track) -will subside if done well
- Thanks for asking for my feedback! I'd be in favour of widening the sidewalks, leaving the road 2 way and eliminate street parking. Encourage use of west surface lot...
- No scooters (or bikes) on sidewalks EVER! Enforce it!
- More cycling year round.
- Further review and input and suggestions are needed before any changes or solidified.
- My neighbor is the first one to have a bike lane that took away parking, now the city is removing more parking. My friends visiting me can't find spaces today. I would like you to think about this development in your neighborhood.
- Why were the business impacts not considered? Why were the community residents (incl family visitors) not considered? Why spend this now and spend this again after Centre St LRT, Green Line, Tomorrow's Chinatown? Permanent...kill Chinatown.
- Please invest in an effective and protected EAST/WEST Cycle-Track infrastructure. Please ensure crossings are handled for the conflict areas they create. Stephen Ave is an ineffective EAST/WEST connector. Speeding on the pathway near Eau Claire will drop.
- Option 1 really has no material change. Much of the roadways in the area are already one way so Option two would align the roadway with those of it's kind in the area while also providing safe active transport to a roadway that is in high demand for it.
- I've been able to bike in this area more, but still won't take kids without separate infrastructure. The Chinatown Cultural Plan is about all ages enjoying the community, separate infrastructure would support that! Families riding here support business!
- i don't understand this city's obsession with removing parking where it's needed. on a street that there are always cars parked on it, to remove it all. why did Eau Claire Market fail? parking. street parking is the only affordable short term parking.



- I have been living in the Eau Claire neighbourhood for a few years and I walk up and down 3 Ave S. daily and have no problem with it. So, I don't see a need to change anything.
- I do not agree with any changes to 3rd Avenue
- Bicycles not obeying the traffic laws
- Diverting traffic from the pathway will GREATLY increase the number of users passing businesses on 3rd
- Diverting traffic from the pathway to these businesses will help them in this difficult time
- There's already plenty of unused parking
- Keep going. You have more people supporting this freakin' wide piece of road which is quiet ALOT of the time in terms of car traffic. Not many buses travel on it either.
- Yes, please remember that a lot of downtown commuters (driving) use 3rd Avenue as a connector to Centre Street in order to access their downtown buildings.
- The idea to improve the area is good, but please do not force "active" transportation down the throat of everyone. Most people who enjoy Chinatown drive down there. They want convenient driving access and parking, not more difficult and less.
- The Chinatown BIA needs to stop opposing every opportunity to revitalize this area. This project is much needed and they just want to see this area wither and die.
- Prioritizing pedestrians, scooters, bikes and wheelchairs should be #1 in this area. Typically see little vehicle traffic and due to increased active transportation we need more space.
- One ways are very frustrating when you are a local resident. We travel a lot at off peak times and having roads inaccessible when there is little to no traffic is unnecessary.
- Removing parking in and around Chinatown is a TERRIBLE idea. The Chinese community does not predominantly reside within a radius where it is accessible by walking/biking/scooters. The majority of the community DRIVES to Chinatown to access businesses.
- City of Calgary has failed to control bikers and scooters. People need protection from them. This bad idea will cause much harm to the Chinatown area and the people who use the area. Many older and disabled persons will be put in danger.
- Making our city more livable will have long term positive impacts
- Stop wasting tax dollars on bike lanes. Unnecessary on this street, dangerous and bad for residents and businesses
- Stop wasting \$ on bike lanes. Taxes are already too high without city finding new fun ways to both waste money and actively make neibourhoods worse
- Add signs that help cyclists/scooters find their destination at intersections. Add proper yeild/stop signs to manage bike traffic -- especially at busy intersections.
- This is a waste of tax payer money when adequate pathways exist all along the river path2 blocks north.
- Consider having 1 two-way bike lane instead of a bike lane on either side of 3 Ave
- I don't always go there because it's hard to get to this area on my bike, and I don't want to drive. Having easier cycle access will increase my engagement with this area.



- The construction of protected bike lanes will bring our family down to Chinatown more often. We spend our money at businesses we can bike to with our 2.5 year old. We want to spend money locally and this will help.
- I think the project is awesome. I'd like to see option 2 bit you need to address parking (maybe change the zoning or issue more residential passes?) as folks are profiting on parking stalls and many don't even live in the building, and others have many
- I support widespread use of cycle tracks.
- This is another cycle track project disguised as a road improvement project. It's part of the City's war on cars. We need to do what's best for business (parking and auto access). Otherwise downtown will be a ghost town.
- Leave it as is, already working great!
- This is a very promising project. It looks thoughtfully designed. I appreciate the ability to provide these comments online. Perhaps too many sections/options but it speaks to the opportunities and complexities to efficiently using this street. Thank you.
- please keep it the way it is. it is working well
- The east part of this route through China Town is not the natural cycling route, which would be better connected to Riverfront Avenue via 1 St SW or 2 St SW. West of Centre St, 3 ave is a great cycling/pedestrian route without inconveniencing motorists
- Not a well thought out project. Will negatively impact business in the area. Where are all these people going to park there bikes if they want to access business amenities.
- Too short of an engagement. Eau Claire has already had one access to their homes removed when 7th street was turned into a 1 way exiting their homes, now access again being restricted so people can commute through Eau Claire. Permit holders lose space
- 3rd avenue is so wide that this project is needed all the way across downtown
- This will really help businesses
- Apparently it's more important to satisfy the needs of a couple of people who want to write-up bike then those in the community that have invested their lives there. But its seems that this city council will screw over anybody in the name of greater good
- Chinatown businesses are less competitive because of lack of parking and expensive parking rates. While catering to cyclists are important, parking is also vital to the survival of these businesses who pay a lot of the city's tax revenue.
- save the money-this is unneeded social engineering
- Bike paths are unnecessary
- Build more projects like this so Sean Chu can actually be right about something when he says that Calgary hates cars
- There has never been enough parking in this area. Cycletracks will massively impact this and make it even harder for small business to survive.
- PLEASE DO NOT PROCEED



- For Zone C, Option 2 is the worst. There is a better option, which has the bike and e-scooter path way turn north at 2nd or 1st Street SW to River Front Ave.
- Overall, option 1 makes far more sense. Short term street parking is already a hot commodity in Chinatown, so reducing it just make the problem much worse. Option 2 absolutely will hurt local businesses, especially turning Block 9 into a one way.
- Be aware of the social & cultural impact this project will have on Chinese Canadians accessing this shared space. Are we force fitting a cycle track through Chinatown so predominately-white cyclists can safely and conviently bike to work and the river?
- What about parking for the folks visiting in Zone 1 and the partrons of Buchanans restaurant? Very limited parking now and to take existing parking away it is hard not to see another restaurant cosing in Calgary but this would be the fauly of the city
- This is a terrible idea. There is already no parking downtown and you will kill the current businesses that are already so affected. No more bike lanes! Keep parking and stop changing every road to a 1 way
- Chinatown needs traffic flow and people flow. Parking and business loading/unloading are critical. Current scooters are dangerous to pedestrians as I have seen collisions a few times. Dedicate cycling tracks encourage reckless speeding.
- I've that there are more people walking and biking for pleasure than for commuting. That could change as the economy improves. It is a lovely area to live, visit and walk through.
- please ensure adequate parking is available along zone 3
- Why is this necessary? Money could be better spent on actual needs and not wants of a very small population.
- I fully support active modes of transportation and this project aligns with my priorities.
- I visit senior family members and restaurant in Chinatown, convenience in parking, drop off and pick up is very important
- It is certainly unwarranted. Improvements are needed but one way traffic is simply stupid.
- Not enough parking in Chinatown turns people away
- Limited consultations with stakeholders
- once again the city is not engaging honestly and openly with citizens and has already decided that they will negatively impact this that live and work inbthexarea
- This is a complete waste of taxpayer money. It is a vanity project and nothing more. 3 Ave is some of the only public parking in those areas and those spots are vital to the area. Put the scooters on the road where they belong and put in a helmet law.
- The project needs. Seems made up!! When the city added traffic lights along 3rdAve instead of the 4 way stops rush hour traffic increased. The four way stops are effective at slowing traffic.
- You should have left more character space for comments. The concerns of resident/tax payers in the area should be considered first, not just those visiting the area. More speeding bicycle traffic that ignores intersection rules is not welcome at any time.



- As long-time business owner in Chinatown, we have seen a decline in people flow due to economy, demographic shift and the high cost of parking. 3rd Ave is the most important road in Chinatown. Changes must be made with consultation with local businesses.
- Very excited to see alternative mobility improvements down this corridor. These are a long time coming!
- already have the river path for scooter and cycling, why add more? scooters shouldn't be promoted.
- I think cyclists should have to be licensed the same as cars, even if it's only \$12.00 for a year. Perhaps then they'd take stop signs seriously. Scooters are seasonable. They ride all over the road, don't obey stop, travel wrong way down road etc.
- I don't want one more dime spent on bike lanes or traffic changes to accommodate scooters. These are special interest groups! Focus on supporting the residents and businesses in a this Zone not spending public money on nice to haves!
- No
- The sidewalk and ramps at 3 Ave and 7 St intersection have been dug up and replaced at least 3 times in the past 10 years. STOP!
- Do not use 3rd Ave. South for this project.
- Holy smokes, this is maybe the most intense Engage form I've participated in, and that's not a good thing. It was an overly complex and long winded form not creating great access, could be politicize. Combine option questions. Simplify review documents.
- I would strongly believed the 2 avenue is more suitable to be upgraded if the "upgrade" was necessary and economical.
- During the pandemic, I believe the city should consider the economic impact after the project. I know a beautiful world that all we like it, but we cannot neglect the reality on the 3 avenue. Especially during the pandemic period.
- I park my car on 3avenue everyday, this project will make me more difficult to find a parking in the future.
- I cannot believe you want to spend money during the worst deficit crisis we've ever had
- It is no good. No parking no people. My boss business no good. I don't like it. I need job!
- I work at 4 street 3 Avenue. The parking lots are so important to me. The parking fee
- Don't waste time and money to do it!
- I meet my friends at the China town everyday, I feel good. I don't like your plan at all. I don't like any changes. Is the financial of the government good to do upgrade?
- I work in the Dragon City Mall, I strongly disagree with the option 2 of Zone C. It will make a terrible impact on China Town area by taking off the parking!! We need to say something on it!!
- I work Great Chinese restaurant, no car park no people no good. business is difficult to do. If no car park, it will kill us, understand??
- I get to Calgary Chinese Pentecostal Church every weekend, it will be annoying me if there are less parking lots on the 3 avenue.



- This change would have a negative impact on the community. Look what happened to businesses when road work was done on 17th. Ave. Sw for years.
- The amount of people accessing this area is astronomical and is difficult for residents to manage limited parking, crowded streets, illegal parking, increased noise, etc.
- I think the city of Calgary does not have the money to continue to make improvements at the moment. Our tax base is decreasing and businesses and people are trying to survive
- I have traveled through this area for years and have seen very little bike or scooter traffic in the area. Even less during COVID-19.
- City hall has created an us vs them environment and the people have lost their voices. Work with the business community to get this right. They know the community best and can guide you on the changes required.
- love this idea, please implement
- Even though I don't have a vehicle I understand importance of having stopping and parking availability for deliveries and visitors. Having bikelanes would get rid of this, making it difficult for vehicles to stop.
- There has been more active transport here and we need more room for active transportation since the river pathways are SO busy. I wish this area felt more safe: if I had kids, I wouldn't go here as it is now.
- This is a road with relatively low car traffic use (compared to other heavier used roads in downtown) and seems like a good fit to have the city make changes.
- This is not a good time to re-develop or re- direct bicycle lane from along river side to Chinatown. If the City has money, may consider to assist the small businesses there. It's more meaningful.
- It would be very much appreciated appreciated by all residents in this community if parking was NOT removed.
- Would like to have more space to procide comments re impact on 2nd and 1st Avenues if 3rd is one way Eastbound
- The concern is the traffic flows to/from the building parkades in the area will be negatively affected. It already takes a significant amount of time to exit the parkades along 3rd Ave during rush hours due to heavy traffic.
- No thank you
- I use 3rd Avenue to bike from 10 Street bridge to 5 Street SW to access work. Totally safe commute without need for a separate bike lane. Thanks!
- Bike lanes should be 2 lanes on 1 side of road, with controlling lights. One way cycle tracks result in confusion at intersections. Vehicle right turns combined with bicycle straight-through are a common source of incidents and near misses.
- The only improvements i have thought needed is at the 8st intersection. more clear the right of way for pedestrians and about people/cars turning off 3ave to 8st. some people get confused who has right of way. otherwise i don't see any major issuesng of



- Please understand and respect the needs of local businesses. Many have invested years to make Chinatown a better place and a desirable attraction for tourists and Calgarians. The bike lane upgrade will harm local businesses.
- For bicycles, pedestrians and other non-motorized travel, use the land available along the river to develop more lanes or paths. Leave 3rd Avenue as is.
- I would like to know the statistics on injuries due to vehicles and bicycle accidents. I live in the area and can't remember one! Most cyclists who come down third Avenue are experienced commuters and are very comfortable driving in this low speed environ
- No cycling path, highly not recommended