

## yesterday's ATAC meeting

---

From: Jackie Chow (jchow23708@yahoo.ca)

To: pirani@mapleridge.ca

Cc: heather\_rush@hotmail.com; kroy@sfu.ca; ichowfx@gmail.com; nobell@telus.net; navdeep@bikehub.ca

Date: Thursday, September 27, 2018 at 11:21 a.m. PDT

---

Hi Purvez,

I'm excited to hear that you intend to do an update of the Transportation Plan in 2019/2020, and that there will be lots of forums, open houses etc.. Looking forward to an open and transparent process, and real opportunities to give input into this important document! 😊

### 117 Ave.

I was very surprised to hear that the City is now considering a bi-directional multi-use path on 117th Ave. 117th Ave. between Laity and 207th is actually, in my opinion, one of the best sections of east-west bike route we have in our town. It's "good", but not "great". The only issue we have is the stop signs along the route and the occasional speeding car. We were happy with the traffic circle at Steeves. The buttons that were used unfortunately didn't really prevent all vehicles from keeping up their speed and going right over them, even more so when not all of the buttons lasted and it's clear that this needs to be fixed to avoid potentially dangerous situations. We were hoping to see more (and better) traffic circles. Maybe even a bike-permeable diverter (at Steeves) to divert car traffic and keep 117th low traffic.

I understand the need for a sidewalk on 117th Ave. But it would be unfortunate if the need for a sidewalk rather than the wish to improve 117th Ave. as a safe and convenient bikeway would be the reason for the choice of a bi-directional multi-use path.

Maybe my impression was wrong, but you appeared to have misgivings about the qualifications of the UBC cycling safety researcher that I was talking about with regard to safety of bi-directional cycling facilities. [Kay Teschke](#) (now retired) was one of the lead researchers at the [Cycling in Cities](#) research program at UBC, and after her recent retirement she continues to be involved in research as well as cycling advocacy.

I had an e-mail exchange with her back in 2015, when Maple Ridge was planning the multi-use path along 240th between Hill Ave. and 104 Ave. I've attached the relevant text of one of her e-mails which might be useful for you. As cycling advocates we don't just listen to our gut feelings, but we look also for scientific evidence and data to improve our understanding and to support our positions. I've also attached the Harris paper she talks about, as well as a graphic from one of Scheper's studies (with my own translation).

As I mentioned yesterday at the meeting, in the Netherlands, where ample experience and evidence has led to world class cycling infrastructure with some of the lowest cycling accident stats in the world (even though it has the highest cycling rates among the elderly and the young), bi-directional multi-use paths are used very selectively. They use them along quiet rural roads with few or no driveways. They also use them along busier streets/in more urban environments, but only where potential car and bike conflict points at intersections are controlled by traffic signals or otherwise safety for cyclists is improved through e.g. raised crossings.

We have alerted the municipality multiple times about the potential dangers of bi-directional paths, however it appears the City has determined that bi-directional multi-use paths are the best way forward in our city.

Note that experienced cyclists often tend to avoid the use of bi-directional infrastructure, as they're much more aware of the dangers. This type of infrastructure tends to be specifically chosen to improve safety for less experienced cyclists. Less experienced cyclists, however, are less aware of the dangers. You commented yesterday that "cyclists will just have to learn to deal with it", but I would point out that we can't really expect less experienced cyclists (kids, families, seniors...), when having the right of way, to be extra alert to dangers from inattentive drivers who are more likely to make mistakes because they have to deal with complex traffic situations. With all due respect, I would not call this a "safe systems approach".

One other concern I have, is that along busy highways like Lougheed Highway, once the existing bi-directional multi-use path is extended and crosses major intersections, contrary to cars, cyclists may end up having to stop at every such intersection to press a button, and will be spending much time waiting at traffic lights, in order to maintain car traffic LOS, which tends to be the main priority in these situations. Improving our cycling infrastructure is about more than just improving safety. In countries where cycling is popular, **convenience and effective speed** are for most people the deciding factors to use their bikes, so we can't ignore those two important aspects of cyclist travel.

I hope you will keep the above in mind when planning cycling infrastructure on 117th Ave., on 207th Street and any other future projects.


### Polygon development

Last night I did forget to ask one last important question about the above development, namely with respect to the cyclist/pedestrian crossing at the roundabout on the connecting road. We raised the concern about this aspect of the design in our [letter](#) dated August 21, and prior to that I also asked the project manager, Michael Canning, in an e-mail on Sept. 4, which he hasn't had a chance to reply to yet.

The drawings show a median, so I suspect that people on bikes crossing the residential street to the north at the roundabout will be required to ride into the residential street and to dismount to cross at the crosswalk north of the median. Is that correct? This wouldn't exactly be a convenient crossing for cyclists, which would be surprising, considering that the addition of this collector road happened as a result of a suggestion by Dave Rush (ATAC member with a cycling interest) to add this as a convenient connection for people on bikes. HUB suggested to construct a raised crossing for cyclist convenience and safety instead, so hopefully the City has recognized this as a feasible solution to ensure both cyclist convenience and safety?

Kind regards,

Jackie Chow  
HUB Cycling  
Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Chapter

 2015 06 05 Comments Kay Teschke re bi-directional and multi-use.docx  
15.7kB

 Harris Inj Prev-2013.pdf  
615.8kB