



**CYCLING PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**  
**Minutes – Collaborative Planning Working Group (CPWG)**  
**Norquay Community Centre, 65 Granville**  
**9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. Wednesday February 18, 2009**

**Meeting No. 2**

**Present:**

**Stakeholder Groups**

Jim Chapryk – North Point Douglas Residents’ Assoc.  
Anders Swanson – One Green City/Mayor’s Environmental Advisory Cmte.  
Janice Lukes – Winnipeg Trails Association  
Brion Dolenko – Bike to the Future  
Kathleen Leathers – Prairie Pathfinders  
Jordan Van Sewell – South Point Douglas Residents’ Assoc.  
Brian Timmerman – Exchange District BIZ  
Ingrid Zacharias – Elmwood Community Resource Centre

**City of Winnipeg:**

Bill Ebenspanger – Public Works (Project Manager)  
Stephen Chapman – Public Works (Traffic)  
Lee Caldwell – Planning, Property and Development (Urban Designer)  
Ian Hall - Planning, Property and Development  
Judy Redmond – Planning, Property and Development (Accessibility Coordinator)

**Consultants:**

Susan Freig – Susan Freig & Associates (public consultation)  
Gail Watson - Susan Freig & Associates  
Anne-Marie Thibert – Susan Freig & Associates  
James Betke – Dillon Consulting  
Glen Manning – Hilderman Thomas Frank & Cram

**1. Introduction and Outline of Day’s Activities**

Gail welcomed everyone to the meeting. With a couple new faces around the table self-introductions were made.

Susan outlined the day’s activities and the ultimate purpose of the meeting: To determine the location of the cycling pedestrian crossing, the connections leading to and from the crossing as well as to develop the design criteria. After the meeting everyone will be asked to consult with their constituency groups about the options developed and report back to the Working Group at the next meeting.

In reflecting on the Working Group’s first meeting Susan wanted to reinforce that the cycling pedestrian crossing is part of the overall Disraeli Bridges project that has been in the planning

stages for a number of years. This Working Group was formed with representatives of stakeholder groups and community organizations most directly affected and interested in this aspect of the project, however there has been a Stakeholder Advisory Committee working on the overall project for the past two years. The Working Group's job is to complete one of the final steps of the overall project which addresses cyclist and pedestrian needs.

## **2. Q & A - New Information Materials**

It was asked why the Modified B option in the Design Concept report was not selected. This option included a wider cycling width and two sidewalks. It was explained that this option required an extra girder line and there were ownership/property issues in order to acquire the space needed to build the west sidewalk. The estimated cost was very high.

Based on the Stakeholder Advisory Committee's (SAC) recommendation, their top two preferred options were moved forward. Administration further developed and prioritized the concept that included the separated cycling pedestrian crossing which met with City Council approval. It was added that there is less throw-away cost with this option if there is ever a need in the future to expand to a twin vehicular structure.

Brion asked that it be reflected in the minutes that Bike to the Future's report that led to the separate cycling pedestrian bridge concept that the SAC developed further was inspired by Wardrop Engineering's work on a previous project.

## **3. Project Goals – Expand and Refine**

The goals were reviewed and members were asked to comment and expand on what each goal meant.

### *Technically Sound*

- built to code; to last 75 years
- how well it does the job; meeting the needs of cyclists and pedestrians

### *Needs of the Community*

- usage; design/approach/placement
- connectivity; takes you somewhere
- inclusive of surrounding communities
- creates a place to gather; a destination
- instils a sense of wonder
- aesthetic; reflective of the community; recognition of community's history
- recreation not just transportation
- hire locally

Discussion followed on the desire by the community to remove or minimize the heavy (truck) traffic dividing South Point Douglas. It was stressed that the Terms of Reference for this working group are limited to the Disraeli Bridges project pedestrian/cyclist crossing. Decisions and recommendations made by this group do not preclude future planning on the Louise Bridge Project. To respond to the comment that the Louise Bridge falls within the

geographic boundaries identified for this project (red dotted line on the map), it was noted that many ideas could be generated through the Charette.

*Needs of the City (that we live in)*

- consistent with Plan Winnipeg and secondary plan for the area
- sustainable transportation
- tie in to existing and proposed Active Transportation routes
- sense of self-esteem
- places for kids to connect to the environment

*Cost Effectiveness*

- financially responsible
- cost benefit mechanism: What does it mean economically to get people out of their cars/what value?

*Environmentally Responsible*

- life cycle cost
- regulations followed: River and Streams; limit impact on river
- follow Environmental Protection plans
- reduce, reuse, recycle: sustainable design
- get cars off the road
- reduction of carbon foot print

*Personal Safety*

- attain critical mass of users (tipping point) for sense of safety
- lighting scheme – no shadows
- defining boundaries: natural surveillance (open space)
- consider where people are “put out”
- signs/wayfinding
- reduce bicycle and pedestrian conflicts

*Access*

- convenient
- reduce vehicle and cyclist conflicts
- universal design

Generally understood and accepted by most of those affected

- usage
- neighbouring community does not find intrusive; finds useful
- if all other goals attained then this one should be achieved
- need to educate people on choices and options – other groups and general public

**4. Charette Presentation**

Glen facilitated creative exercises with the aim being to have members learn to let creativity flow and alleviate tentativeness about sharing ideas. He explained that in the brainstorming

process it is important to not worry about being judged. He outlined the following “commandments”:

- Focus on shared objectives
- Think, speak, draw freely
- Talk with your pen
- Aim for quantity
- Develop synergy – build on others’ ideas
- Be positive and solution-oriented
- Defer judgment

## **5. Community Issues and Opportunities Exercise**

Members were divided into two groups, based on familiarity with either the Elmwood – north side or the Point Douglas – south side of the river. Groups identified on a large map community issues and opportunities including neighbourhood destinations, linkages, signing, amenities and traffic patterns. (A prompt sheet was provided.) The groups then reported back to the whole group referring to their marked-up map. Some of these are noted below. (Note: These issues and opportunities locations are being graphically illustrated together onto one map for Working Group members.)

### Elmwood side

- Community landmarks such as Old Elmwood Cemetery, Elmwood Post Office, Hamilton House, Elmwood Winter Club, Legion gardens
- Various schools, churches, playgrounds
- Truck routes
- Problem intersections
- known pedestrian patterns
- Northeast Pioneers Greenway
- Narrow sidewalk issue
- Brazier St. lighting
- Opportunities to improve connectivity

### Point Douglas side

- Pedestrian and cycling patterns
- Grade issues on riverbank; “campers”; walkway safety
- extend riverwalk along point and connect to Whittier Park across the river
- Boat launch underused
- Nice views across river into Elmwood
- Some Elmwood destinations
- No curbs or sidewalks in certain areas (e.g. Rover)
- need wayfinding signage on Annabella
- Possibility of acquiring land for additional greenspace?
- Historical buildings and areas that are key destinations (e.g. amphitheatre)
- New day care training centre planned
- Restaurants, sporting facilities, schools
- Maple St. underpass – any chance to re-open?
- Neeganan housing development

- Entegra Credit Union: key destination, including from Elmwood
- need more connections between north and south Point Douglas and to access entertainment district
- Truck issue with Direct Transport; volume increasing and company footprint is growing

## **6. Alternate Concepts for Crossing Locations and Connections**

Members were assigned to three separate groups. Glen instructed that the groups were to develop options for the project. In doing so they were to focus on locations; think linkages; review the commandments and refer to the maps (issues and opportunities). Each group was asked for at least three ideas.

## **7. Review Breakout Groups' Work**

Following lunch each group made a visual presentation on their maps of the crossings, linkages, and broader connections they developed.

### Group 1

Important to have residential input on both sides; helps build community.

- a) Riverbank or Waterfront to Higgins to Annabella across river to Brazier/Talbot
- b) Small Elmwood area park across river to Syndicate to Sutherland
  - critical connections from NE Pioneers Greenway to The Forks
- c) Angus across river to Brazier
- d) Sutherland to the Louise Bridge

Routes/connections through the neighbourhoods would need some upgrading. It would be important to know the traffic flow / future patterns in the broader picture, such as the future of the Louise Bridge and a possible new alignment.

### Group 2

- a) Green option (reduce, reuse, recycle) – Louise Bridge

(It was noted that removing vehicle traffic, in particular trucks, off the bridge would require studying about 1/3 of the city's traffic flow patterns in order to analyze the full, broader impact.)

- b) around McFarlane at the south end crossing the river midway over to Brazier
- c) next to Disraeli Bridge, either right beside or angled down to Annabella
- d) west side of the Disraeli Bridge

Issues identified: would need to know the future plans for the Louise Bridge and the secondary plan for South Point Douglas.

Lots of opportunity for housing development except for truck traffic problem.

Important to keep public access to the riverbank.

### Group 3

- a) south point across to Lagimodière-Gaboury Park (Seine River); river walkway to continue around point with further crossing at Louise Bridge
  - this option would facilitate development of the point

- b) right next to the Disraeli Bridge on the east side but lower
  - can still connect to Annabella (for cyclists) but pedestrian preference would be right on the freeway
- c) Cyclist only bridge, on a diagonal angle starting just west of the Louise Bridge on the north side and end near McFarlane on the south side; include a “Spirit” bus running between the Downtown and Elmwood to accommodate pedestrians

South Point Douglas secondary plan information would need to be considered.

All things (options, plans) are interdependent on each other. The re-designation of South Point Douglas from industrial to mixed use/residential will affect routes and origins and destinations. It is uncertain to know when or how this change will happen.

d) Pritchard to Glen Elm neighbourhood (west side of bridge)

Concern was again expressed that any plans developed for the Disraeli crossing would preclude the potential options for the Louise Bridge. It was pointed out that when the Louise Bridge is renewed it will require accommodation for pedestrians and cyclists.

It was commented that there are such a variety of users to consider: regional network pedestrians, commuters (to downtown), local and commuter cyclists, etc. The challenge is how to accommodate all these varying needs.

## 8. Discussion and Evaluation

As a starting point commonalities in the groups’ ideas were identified:

- where the bridge lands
- extra investment needed in connecting infrastructure (sidewalks, lighting, etc.)
- the secondary plan and information on the future of the Louise Bridge; there are gaps in the big picture
- some of the solutions can cause problems elsewhere
- Louise Bridge as a cycling/pedestrian route
- Annabella a common landing
- an option close to the Disraeli Bridge (2 of 3)
- distance needs to be considered: shortest wanted
- potential of area
- build first to assist with changing modes of transportation
- time implementation
- no consideration of cost factor

There was further discussion and concern expressed regarding the Louise Bridge situation. It was emphasized that the study on that project is planned for 2014. The scope of the Disraeli project was always meant to be a rehabilitation project, prompted by the fact that the bridges need work. It was never intended to be part of a large transportation study. The separate pedestrian cyclist crossing was recommended as the best solution for Disraeli Bridge users.

Following is a summary of a number of points made:

Concern was expressed that an understanding of traffic flow patterns in the broader sense and into the future is needed. It is difficult to make a decision when future plans for the area are unknown. Communities are in transition.

It was explained that if the cycle/pedestrian river crossing was delayed, given that it is part of the Design Build Finance Maintain (DBFM), the City would have to find the money elsewhere to undertake it at a later date. It would not be a real “cost savings” to not proceed as it is borrowed money. This budgeted amount cannot be transferred to another project.

It was suggested to focus on what is known, such as the concept for the Disraeli Bridges which Council approved; the riverbanks aren't working; and the area has potential for bike routes.

Again it was reiterated that the group has been brought together because the Disraeli Bridges need to be rehabilitated. Though the decision might be difficult, do members want to give up this opportunity to optimize current needs? No one knows what the future holds. This process should not negatively affect the secondary plan, it could actually enhance it.

A suggestion was made to build a two lane structure next to the existing Disraeli Bridges first, then close the old bridge and transfer traffic over when the other two lanes can be built.

The group was reminded that a contract for the overall Disraeli Bridges Project is expected to be awarded near the end of 2009 and construction of a separate cycle/pedestrian river crossing could likely start in late 2010. A transportation study of the magnitude suggested by the group would require 1 to 2 years and the funds would need to be found first.

In order to move forward with the process the committee was assured that the results of this project do not negate any future plans for the Louise Bridge. The option developed here could become a template for future crossings in the city. Some assumptions will have to be made. All the information will never be available. Focus must be on the opportunity. Secondary plan ideas could “snowball” from what comes of this process.

It was asked if the boundaries of the project could be extended west. It was agreed that if the solution answers the needs and issues this could be considered.

It was questioned if the existing Disraeli Bridge could be “lowered”: a design that would address the issues with the existing structure. It was noted that this has potential and it is not too late for this to impact the evaluation of proponent proposals. The results of both the SAC and CPWG meetings will be considered by City administration

This potential option was fleshed out and it was agreed that the river span could be lower (closer to the water) but not the approaches. Access would be from Rover/Annabella on the south side and Midwinter on the north side. The connections would be improved with ramps and stairs. The sidewalk would have to be a minimum of 5 m to accommodate the underbridge crane. Sharrows would still be installed for commuter cyclists. Textured design, a painted line (or other design options) as well as public education would be needed to address the pedestrian/cyclist conflict.

It was pointed out that removing the 25,000 vehicles/day off the Louise Bridge would necessitate these drivers finding a new crossing. It would be inevitable that other communities would be affected by this traffic shift. This will be “tested” if the Disraeli is closed. It was suggested that another solution would be to have people find other solutions such as buses, bikes, etc. The focus should not only be on moving cars.

Susan commented that it was important for the group to move forward on the cycling pedestrian project due to the day’s limitations of time and energy levels. The South Point Douglas secondary plan is a better venue to move the Louise Bridge study forward. It would require a transportation planning component to the secondary plan development process. It would be important to have the right people around the table that can assist in bringing that dimension to the secondary plan development process.

It was agreed that there are two basic concepts at this point that could be fleshed out: lowering of the existing bridge and a separate crossing. It was estimated that the cost for the additional widening of the existing bridge deck was about equivalent in cost to building a separate cycle/pedestrian bridge structure.

Two groups were formed each to work on fleshing out one concept. (One group did a quick site visit to the bridge to have a look at height, the riverbank and access.) The groups then presented a visual description of their concept, including connections, and explained how the concept addresses project goals.

### Option 1

Attached to the Disraeli Bridge -- 5 m multi-use sidewalk on east side to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians with entire bridge structure lowered 10 – 15 feet.

- connections to main cycling routes at Annabella and Brazier using off-ramps
- route is closer to the commercial district
- keeps everybody together: more eyes (personal safety)
- vehicle access maintained at South Point Douglas
- sharrows for cyclists wanting to stay on the road
- facilitated crossings on Midwinter (various spots including at Brazier)
- possibility of closing Rover to traffic at the bridge; definitely closed to trucks
- Louise Bridge controversy is resolved as cycling pedestrian crossing is clearly a part of the Disraeli Bridges project
- Secondary plan is not affected
- would create an ‘amazing’ Disraeli Bridge
- fiscally responsible (same cost as separate option)
- environmentally responsible as it connects to the Active Transportation system and does not disturb the river bed
- good access
- no need for new wayfinding as people already know how to cross
- would require a tie-in to Annabella (for cyclists); cannot forget that the overpass is designed differently and does not include a multi-use pathway; would also require upgrades, such as lighting
- possible grade issue on Elmwood side for tie-in to underbridge sidewalk
- would require some division of pedestrians and cyclists (painted line, signage, etc.)

Option 2

Separate 5 m cyclist pedestrian crossing connecting to Annabella on the south side and right near Henderson on the north side

- would tie in to Midwinter; facilitated crossings required for pedestrians
- some sort of stop needed at Rover to allow free crossing
- cyclists continue down Annabella; pedestrians connected back onto bridge or can use Annabella
- Disraeli Bridge would still have 1.8 m sidewalk: possibility of turning this sidewalk into a dedicated bike lane, but would be issues to tie in to overpass
- width exceeds standards (allows two cyclists and two pedestrians to all pass each other in opposing directions at the same time)
- good connections: to Active Transportation and pedestrians between the communities
- would be more expensive than the 3.5 m width however Option 1 would require increased investment in ramps and tie-ins
- straight line view increasing safety
- commuter cyclists would still have to travel over the high grade of the bridge
- Would there be a safety concern because it is so much lower than (and apart from) the vehicular bridge?

It was explained that although this separate bridge would only be built to code for a pedestrian and cyclist crossing it would still be designed to withstand the rigorous spring thaws.

Both options would require the design to address the riverbank grade issues at Annabella.

In response to a question it was explained that design/public art/aesthetics/making it a destination would be addressed in Design Criteria.

It was agreed that both plans could work however the City standard for a multi-use path is 3.5m not 5m. The group agreed that a compromise could be possible if “bumpouts” for seating or vista opportunities could be built into the design. Further discussion and review of cost implications would be required.

## **9. Design Criteria**

Each group was asked to draft a list of design criteria based on the following:

- pedestrian facilities: walks, trails, street crossings, streetscape
- bike facilities: trails, routes, parking
- crossing
- signs
- art, image and views
- heritage

Group 1 (attached concept)

- easy to keep snow/ice off the path – easy to maintain
- special consideration for when pedestrians and cyclists and vehicles “cross”
- create green spaces/meeting spaces within cloverleaves

- design signage that directs pedestrians and cyclists
- signage/maps that express what historical features are available at each pedestrian exit
- plant trees for noise abatement and carbon offset
- rebuilding should include a design feature which will make it distinctive: the bridge *is* the artwork

#### Group 2 (detached concept)

- personal safety
- high quality design: railings, materials
- map/display on landings on either side
- enhanced streetscape reflective of community leading into crossing; lighting
- seamless connection into communities at landings
- design of roadway crossings to reflect higher priority for pedestrians and cyclists: Sutherland, Midwinter, Talbot, Rover

### **10. Summary and Next Steps**

There are two options on the table that Collaborative Planning Working Group members are to now bring back for consultation with constituency groups. The resource team will prepare tools (graphic and written summaries) that will be emailed for ease of circulation. Everyone is asked to present and explain both options to their groups and collect feedback. The decision-making process will be discussed at the next meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for the morning of March 18<sup>th</sup>.

The group was thanked for their time, energy, passion and dedication to the project. They were invited to call Susan if they had any questions or required any further information.

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Notes prepared by: Anne-Marie Thibert

#### Distribution:

All present

Kevin Nixon – Planning, Property & Development (Active Transportation)

James McCutcheon - AECOM

Todd Smith – AECOM

Kurtis Kowalke - Planning, Property and Development

John Wintrup - Planning, Property and Development

Ken Allen - Public Works (Communications)