CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	Ορτιοι
Usage				
<ul> <li>Trip purpose</li> <li>Demand (existing, latent &amp; future)</li> <li>Demographics</li> <li>User Group</li> <li>Capacity</li> <li>Flexibility for various non-motorized modes</li> <li>Integration / connectivity to other transport systems</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Accommodates the existing and future high pedestrian/cyclist demands along Burrard Bridge (i.e. approximately 50% of the total demand across False Creek). Accommodates approximately 40% and 60% of the total pedestrian and cycling trips across False Creek respectively.</li> <li>Serves primarily commuter traffic during the weekdays and recreational traffic during the weekend (i.e. approximately 55% of the total weekend recreational demand across False Creek); sidewalk extension allows for significant pedestrian/cyclist capacity increase.</li> <li>Usage of this crossing will also be particularly high during special events in the False Creek area.</li> <li>Primarily serves origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville, Kits Point, Macdonald to Arbutus, and UBC to Macdonald zones on the south and Downtown South, the CBD and West End zones on the north.</li> <li>Allows for flexibility of usage by other non-motorized modes (e.g. skaters and wheelchairs) and good integration with existing bike lanes along Cornwall Avenue/Burrard Street on the south side of the bridge and Sea Side route on the north side.</li> <li>The proposed 3 m (overall 6 m) outward sidewalk extension allows for significant pedestrian / cyclist capacity increase; however, the capacity at the towers will be constrained in the variations that provide limited or no capacity improvements at these "pinch points".</li> <li>Enhanced route would likely integrate / connect with the tentative concepts of bike lanes on Burrard and Hornby as defined in the Downtown Transportation Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Would accommodate the existing and future pedestrian / cyclist demand as in Option B1, however, the proposed 1.5 m (overall 3 m) inward sidewalk extension results in a smaller increase in pedestrian / cyclist capacity.</li> <li>Serves primarily commuter traffic during the weekedays and recreational traffic during the weekend (i.e. approximately 55% of the total weekend recreational demand across False Creek); sidewalk extension allows for significant pedestrian/cyclist capacity increase.</li> <li>Usage of this crossing will also be particularly high during special events in the False Creek area.</li> <li>Primarily serves origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville, Kits Point, Macdonald to Arbutus, and UBC to Macdonald zones on the south and Downtown South, the CBD and West End zones on the north.</li> <li>Allows for flexibility of usage by other non-motorized modes (e.g. skaters and wheelchairs) and good integration with existing bike lanes along Cornwall Avenue/Burrard Street on the south side of the bridge and Sea Side route on the north side.</li> <li>Enhanced route would likely integrate / connect with the tentative concepts of bike lanes on Burrard and Hornby as defined in the Downtown Transportation Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Although there is the potential for some shift in weekday commuter pedestrian/cyclist demand from the Burrard Bridge, the amount is not expected to be substantial given the nature of the new crossing and required connections to the existing commuter network system.</li> <li>The new crossing is expected to primarily accommodate recreational traffic during the weekdays and particularly during the weekdays and particularly during the weekends.</li> <li>Usage of this 6 m to 9 m wide crossing will also be particularly high during special events in the False Creek area.</li> <li>Allows for flexibility of usage by other non-motorized recreational users (e.g. skaters and wheelchairs) by providing a good low level connection between the north and south Sea Side routes.</li> <li>Although the new crossing would significantly increase the capacity for pedestrians and cyclists, depending on its required frequency of opening for the passage of marine vessels, the overall capacity could be considerably hindered.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The new crossing is exally a significant among (recreational users, to the weekdays and weekends from / to G southern downtown performed owntown performed owntown performed owntown performed owned by the southern downtown performed owned by the performed owned owned owned by the performed owned by the performed owned by the performed owned by the performed owned owned by the performed owned owned by the performed owned by the performed owned owned by the performed owned owned by the performed owned by the performe</li></ul>

Pedestrian & Cycling Crossings Study

**Option Evaluation 4** 

#### ON G1

#### **OPTION G6**

expected to accommodate mount of pedestrians tourists, shoppers) during d particularly during the Granville Island and the peninsula.

shift in weekday commuter demand from the Granville he required connections to future commuter network orth and south end and changes would limit the

gins / destinations between South zone and Downtown d West End zones.

sing will also be particularly events in the False Creek

lity of usage by other odes (e.g. skaters and gh the provision of elevators nd by providing a good en the north and south Sea

wide new crossing would ease the capacity for clists.

.

- Accommodates the existing and future moderate pedestrian/cyclist demands along Granville Bridge (i.e. approximately 25% and 15% of the total demand across False Creek respectively).
- Serves primarily commuter traffic during the weekdays and recreational traffic during the weekend (i.e. approximately 20% of the total weekend recreational demand across False Creek).
- The 2 metre wide bike lanes (4 metres overall) or 3 metre wide sidewalks (6 metres overall) accommodates approximately 30% and 10% of the total pedestrian and cycling trips across False Creek respectively.
- Primarily serves origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville and Granville to Oak zones on the south, and the CBD and Downtown South zones on the north.
- Flexibility of usage by other non-motorized modes (e.g. skaters and wheelchairs) is somewhat limited due to the inability to provide a continuous separate bike lane connecting to/from the approach ramps, as well as the need to maintain cross-walks at these ramps.

The potential inability to provide a continuous separate bike lane connecting to/from the approach ramps could hinder the possibility of achieving new capacity over the entire length of the facility.



CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	OPTION
Quality of Trip				
<ul> <li>Travel time</li> <li>Efficiency</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Provides a direct connection for the high pedestrian / cyclist origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville, Kits Point, Macdonald to Arbutus, and UBC to Macdonald zones on the south and Downtown South, the CBD and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Provides a direct connection for the high pedestrian / cyclist origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville, Kits Point, Macdonald to Arbutus, and UBC to Macdonald zones on the south and Downtown South, the CBD and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Circuitous routing for the high pedestrian / cyclist commuter origin/destinations between the Arbutus to Granville, Kits Point, Macdonald to Arbutus, and UBC to Macdonald zones on the south and Downtown South, the CBD and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Circuitous routing for the / cyclist origin / dest Arbutus to Granville a zones on the south, Downtown South zones</li> </ul>
– Access	West End zones on the north.	West End zones on the north.	West End zones on the north; this circuitous routing will result in increased travel times.	gradients).
– User Safety	Good accessibility to/from the existing bike lanes along Cornwall Avenue/Burrard Street on	The proposed 1.5 m inward sidewalk extension results in a narrower pedestrian/cyclist path	However, provides good accessibility and a	However, provides reading and a direct connection
– User comfort	the south side of the bridge and Sea Side Route on the north side (however, less accessible to the Sea Side Route on the south	then Option B1, and correspondingly, a reduced sense of user safety and comfort.	direct connection between the Sea Side routes along the north and south sides.	routes along the north a as to/from Granville Is ramp itself lands south
	side of the bridge).	Good accessibility to/from the existing bike lanes along Cornwall Avenue/Burrard Street on	Allows for complete segregation of pedestrian/cyclists from vehicular traffic (as	Allows for comple
	<ul> <li>Allows for separation of pedestrians / cyclists from vehicular traffic (as well as separation between pedestrians and cyclists with the 3 m outward sidewalk extension) for good user safety and comfort. This benefit is reduced at</li> </ul>	the south side of the bridge and Sea Side Route on the north side (however, less accessible to the Sea Side Route on the south side of the bridge).	cyclists) since a new crossing facility is	pedestrian/cyclists from well as separation beth cyclists) since a new provided solely for resulting in good user s
	the bridge towers for the limited widening variation and is eliminated if no widening is considered at the bridge towers.	<ul> <li>The frequent vehicular and pedestrian / cyclist use of the Burrard Bridge also allows for good personal security (particularly during evenings).</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>However, the anticipate this new crossing facili results in some poss</li> </ul>
	The frequent vehicular and pedestrian / cyclist use of the Burrard Bridge also allows for good personal security (particularly during evenings).			concerns.

ON G1	OPTION G6
or the moderate pedestrian destinations between the lle and Granville to Oak buth, and the CBD and ones on the north (plus 5%	• Provides a direct connection for the moderate pedestrian / cyclist origin / destination demands between the Arbutus to Granville and Granville to Oak zones on the south, and the CBD and Downtown South zones on the north.
s reasonable accessibility ction between the Sea Side orth and south sides as well	<ul> <li>Poor accessibility between the Sea Side routes along the north and south sides as well as to/from Granville Island.</li> </ul>
le Island even though the buth of Granville Island. mplete segregation of from vehicular traffic (as between pedestrian and	<ul> <li>Allows for separation of pedestrians / cyclists from vehicular traffic (as well as separation between pedestrians and cyclists) along the middle sections of the bridge only, resulting in good user safety and comfort in this area.</li> </ul>
new crossing facility is for non-motorized users, ser safety and comfort.	<ul> <li>However, the potential inability to provide a continuous separate bike lane connecting to / from the approach ramps as well as the need to maintain cross-walks at these ramps, results in poor user safety and comfort along these</li> </ul>
facility during the evenings possible personal security	sections.
	The frequent vehicular use of the Granville Bridge allows for good personal security

(particularly during evenings).

CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	OPTION
Cost / Construction				
<ul> <li>Capital costs</li> <li>Operating costs</li> <li>User costs</li> <li>Environmental impacts</li> <li>Construction duration / disruption</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital cost of construction approximately \$10.1 million.</li> <li>Minor additional operating cost associated with a wider bridge structure.</li> <li>Minimal environmental impacts associated with construction, except noise due to the proximity of 1000 Beach Avenue.</li> <li>Measures will be needed during construction to prevent demolition debris from falling into the water.</li> <li>Construction duration is estimated at 18 months.</li> <li>During demolition and craneage operation, one to two lanes in the vicinity of the work will need to be closed for working space, creating a constriction in bridge traffic flow (including diversion of pedestrian / cyclist traffic to the opposite side of the bridge).</li> <li>A separate study is required to confirm capacity of existing bridge to accept additional loads. No allowance in the costings has been made for existing bridge load capacity upgrades.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital cost of construction approximately \$3.25 million.</li> <li>No significant additional operating cost.</li> <li>No significant environmental impacts associated with construction.</li> <li>Construction duration is estimated at 6 to 9 months.</li> <li>If traffic is channelled into the "final" traffic lane arrangement at the outset of construction, then any disruption will be perceived as minimal.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital cost of construction approximately \$11.9 million.</li> <li>High associated operating cost required to operate the opening/closure of the bridge for passage of marine vessels, including maintenance and regular inspection (anticipated to be \$350,000+).</li> <li>Some environmental impacts associated with construction are expected due to marine impacts and noise. Construction of the south approaches below the existing steel truss will require works in the water.</li> <li>Construction can be expected to be completed within a period of 12 to 18 months. Some disruption of marine traffic can be expected if bridge components are delivered by barge.</li> <li>The centre movable span will likely require modifications to the bridge pier to accommodate anchorage points, bridge seating and bridge machinery.</li> <li>A separate study is required to confirm the capacity of the existing bridge substructure to accept additional loads. Capital costs do not allow for existing bridge capacity upgrades.</li> <li>Marine vessels to be constrained within a limited width navigable channel by buoys / dolphins. If floating buoys or markers are used, the cost will be low but possible impact with the bridge cannot be prevented. If a piled dolphin or fendering arrangement is used, the cost will be tot bridge.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Capital cost of const \$11.1 million.</li> <li>Operating cost associate the new crossing, espect of elevators.</li> <li>Some environmental in construction are expected impacts and noise.</li> <li>Construction duration is and 18 months, with sort traffic and pedestriant Island).</li> <li>The suspended portion fully loaded applies abo location (8 metre cents significant, imposed loat</li> <li>A separate study is requ of the existing bridge to load.</li> <li>No allowance in the cost existing bridge load cap</li> </ul>

ION G1	OPTION G6
construction approximately	Capital cost of construction approximately     \$2.2 million.
ociated with maintenance of especially with the installation	<ul> <li>No significant additional operating cost.</li> <li>No significant environmental impacts associated with construction.</li> </ul>
tal impacts associated with pected due to (some) marine ion is estimated between 12	<ul> <li>Although only a short construction duration is required, there will be vehicular traffic disruptions.</li> </ul>
h some disruptions to marine strian traffic (on Granville	
ortion of the structure, when a about 40 tons at each larger centre). This represents a ad load on the existing bridge.	
required to confirm capacity dge to accept the additional	
e costing has been made for d capacity upgrades.	

CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	OPTION
Traffic Impacts				
<ul> <li>Marine impacts</li> <li>Vehicles / buses</li> <li>Ferry systems</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No impacts on vehicular traffic, marine traffic or ferry operations since the existing bridge vehicular lanes and navigational clearances are maintained.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Vehicular traffic impacts since one lane on the Burrard Bridge is removed (likely a northbound lane).</li> <li>Currently approximately 3150 vph northbound during the AM peak and 2850 vph southbound</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No impacts on vehicular traffic since the existing Burrard Bridge is maintained.</li> <li>On a typical sunny Sunday, up to approximately 195 marine vessels (17% of the total marine traffic) may be affected by the low</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No impacts on vehiculexisting Granville Bridge</li> <li>Minimal impacts on marisince no vessels above height were reported</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>during the PM peak.</li> <li>No impacts on marine traffic or ferry operations since the existing navigational clearances are maintained, plus does not "compete" with ferries.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>On a typical rainy weekday, up to approximately 45 marine vessels (13% of the total marine traffic) may be affected by the low level crossing.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>surveys. Vessels over impacted.</li> <li>Private ferry patronage the new crossing (p connection at Granville</li> </ul>
			Private ferry patronage may potentially be affected by the new crossing.	

ON G1	OPTION G6
whicular traffic since the ridge is maintained.	<ul> <li>Some vehicular traffic impacts since two lanes on the Granville Bridge main sections are removed (one lane in each direction).</li> </ul>
marine traffic are expected	
ove 21 metres (70 feet) in	Currently approximately 3350 vph northbound
rted during the marine over this height would be	during the AM peak and 3150 vph southbound during the PM peak.
	No impacts on marine traffic or ferry operations
age would be affected by	since the existing navigational clearances are
(particularly given its ville Island).	maintained, plus does not "compete" with ferries.

CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	Ορτιο
Neighbourhood Integration				-
<ul><li>Neighbourhoods</li><li>Properties</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Potential neighbourhood and property impacts on the northeast side (i.e. at 1000 Beach Ave. and future daycare) due to the close proximity of the proposed outward sidewalk extension.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No potential neighbourhood/property impacts or shadowing effects on the northeast side since changes would be made to the existing road deck.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Potential First Nations land claim issues on south side (CPR Y lands).</li> <li>Potential noise impacts for 1000 Beach /</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Impact to existing build Diner) on the south entrance to Granville several parking space</li> </ul>
– Land use	Results in shadowing effects on the northeast	<ul> <li>Environmental impacts (i.e. air quality and noise) associated with increased traffic</li> </ul>	Burrard Avenue Marina due to operation of the draw bridge.	front of building. <ul> <li>Livability impacts asso</li> </ul>
– Environmental	side, plus possibly violates the North Burrard Bridgehead planning guideline requiring a minimum 10 m clearance to adjacent buildings.	congestion resulting from elimination of one of the existing vehicular lanes. This may be	Views under Burrard Bridge to English Bay would be affected.	Seniors' residents on t bridge. Specifically,
<ul> <li>Economic / development</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Specifically impacts on approximately 67 residential units at 1000 Beach Avenue.</li> </ul>	partially off-set by traffic pattern changes and modal shift.		Granville Street. Cy approx. 6 m (20 feet) over existing parking a
<ul> <li>Views and shadowing</li> </ul>	Shadowing effects and / or decrease in separation public / private space for residential units, plus office and retail spaces. (Set back of approximately 6 m (20 feet), 9 m (30 feet), and 12 m (40 feet) would change to 3 m (10 feet), 6 m (20 feet), and 9 m (30 feet) respectively). Shadowing impact on future day care - set back from bridge reduced from approx. 6 m (20 feet) to 3 m (10 feet).			Shadowing impact on Island.
	<ul> <li>Some potential environmental impacts associated with noise to residents on the northeast side, resulting from the close proximity of the proposed sidewalk extension.</li> </ul>			

ON G1	OPTION G6
puilding (ex Granville Island ith side, just north of the ille Island. Elimination of aces and loading zones in	<ul> <li>No potential neighbourhood / property or economic/development impacts since no changes to the existing Granville Bridge structure are proposed.</li> </ul>
associated with noise to the on the northwest side of the ally, 4 - 6 units at 1515 Cycling ramps would be eet) from Seniors' Building ng area. on Building 11 on Granville	<ul> <li>Potential environmental impacts (i.e. air quality and noise) associated with some possible increased traffic congestion as a result of elimination of two of the existing vehicular lanes (one in each direction). This may be partially off-set by traffic pattern changes and modal shift.</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	OPTION B1	OPTION B2	OPTION B3	ΟΡΤΙΟΝ
Urban Design / Appearance	•			
<ul> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Aesthetics</li> </ul>	The Burrard Bridge is a very significant heritage resource (Category A evaluation) that is of high historic and symbolic value to the	• The Burrard Bridge is a very significant heritage resource (Category A evaluation) that is of high historic and symbolic value to the	<ul> <li>The Burrard Bridge is a very significant heritage resource (Category A evaluation) that is of high historic and symbolic value to the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No heritage impacts sinot considered a he (also, existing roadway)</li> </ul>
- Aestrieucs	City of Vancouver.	City of Vancouver.	City of Vancouver.	altered).
– CoV image	Potential significant compromise to the Burrard	· Least intrusive option from a heritage and	Some potential significant compromise to the	Aesthetically, the view
<ul> <li>Additional public amenity / space</li> </ul>	Bridge's heritage value and aesthetics from both the perspectives of the Road Gate and Sea Gate <i>partis</i> (i.e. monumentality, symmetry and containment).	aesthetics point of view, however, there may be some impacts to the Road Gate and Sea Gate <i>partis</i> (based on the proposed configuration).	Burrard Bridge's heritage value and aesthetics from the perspective of the Sea Gate <i>parti</i> only, where distinguishability will be a major consideration.	will be affected by the n facility, particularly as and shores.
	<ul> <li>For the Road Gate parti, the following primary elements could experience potentially high impacts – "torch" pylons, concrete towers (if also widened at this point), concrete handrails,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>For the Road Gate <i>parti</i>, the following primary elements could experience some potential impacts – "torch" pylons (assumed local outside widening), curved retaining walls and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>For the Road Gate <i>parti</i>, no impacts since the existing Burrard Bridge roadway surface will not be altered.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>With the new cross opportunity for addition available (e.g. benche etc.), particularly at the</li> </ul>
	curved retaining walls, perceived width of roadway and views from the bridge.	perceived width of roadway.	However, for the Sea Gate <i>parti</i> , the following primary elements could experience some	Opportunity to enhance features of the bridg
	<ul> <li>For the Sea Gate <i>parti</i>, the following primary elements could experience potentially high impacts – concrete piers, concrete handrails,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>For the Sea Gate parti, the following primary element could experience some potential impacts – sweep of rising roadbed (assumed local outside widening at the "torches").</li> </ul>	potentially high impacts – concrete towers, gradual sweep of the rising roadbed and views of the bridge.	current image provide
	gradual sweep of rising roadbed and views of the bridge.	<ul> <li>Maintains the bridge's current image as a City gateway to downtown and False Creek areas</li> </ul>	Opportunity to enhance / degrade the existing features of the bridge with respect to the current image provided.	
	<ul> <li>Maintains the bridge's current image as a City gateway to downtown and False Creek areas as there are no significant changes to the bridge's external appearance.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>as there are no significant changes to the bridge's external appearance.</li><li>With the proposed 1.5 m inward sidewalk</li></ul>	<ul> <li>With the new low level crossing, there is good opportunity for additional public amenity/space available (e.g. benches, rest areas / viewing</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>With the proposed 3 m sidewalk extension, the opportunity for additional public amenity/space is available (e.g. benches and rest areas /</li> </ul>	extension, there is less opportunity for additional public amenity/space available.	points, parking, etc.) both along the bridge and the bridge ends.	
	viewing points).			



ON G1	OPTION G6
ts since Granville Bridge is heritage bridge structure adway surface will not be	<ul> <li>No heritage impacts since Granville Bridge is not considered a heritage bridge structure.</li> </ul>
view of the existing bridge he new suspended crossing as viewed from the water	<ul> <li>No significant aesthetic impacts associated with the removal of two vehicular lanes along the bridge (conversely, no significant enhancements either).</li> </ul>
rossing facility, there is itional public amenity/space nches, rest areas, parking,	<ul> <li>With the removal of two vehicular lanes and given the nature of the bridge, there is limited opportunity for additional public amenity/space available.</li> </ul>
t the bridge ends.	<ul> <li>Maintains the bridge's current image as there are no significant changes to the bridge's</li> </ul>
ance / degrade the existing ridge with respect to the rided.	external appearance.
	-







FALSE CREEK PEDESTRIAN & CYCLING CROSSINGS STUDY



#### www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/falsecreek

# FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The False Creek Pedestrian and Cycling Crossings Study has explored a range of options to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities in the False Creek area in an effort to ultimately encourage more cycling/walking to and from Downtown Vancouver. These recommended improvements will assist the City of Vancouver in achieving their future transportation goals.

### **KEY FINDINGS:**

**#1.** Improvements in the Burrard Street Bridge Corridor – this corridor should be given the  A new crossing significantly improves user comfort for those currently using the Granville Street Bridge Corridor.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**#1.** Burrard Street Bridge Corridor – further evaluation of Options B1 and B2 should be undertaken to better understand their full costs and benefits, such as impacts to traffic flow and the heritage aspects of the bridge structure, and to take the conceptual configurations to a more detailed design level.

### **#2.** Granville Street Bridge Corridor – further

highest priority, in particular, Options B1 (Outward Sidewalk Extension on Both Sides) and Option B2 (Inward Sidewalk Widening on Both Sides). This corridor and options are preferable for the following reasons:

- Pedestrian and cycling demand is currently high, and will continue to be high, along this corridor.
- Options B1 and B2 are strong candidates from a trip usage and quality of trip perspective.
- Significant safety issues currently exist due to the limited sidewalk width, high demand, and shared usage. It is important that these issues are addressed in the near-term.

**#2.** Improvements in the Granville Street Bridge Corridor – there is a need to better connect the north and south shores of False Creek and Option G1 (New Crossing Facility Suspended Beneath Bridge) holds great evaluation of Option G1, which considers the possibility of a new crossing facility suspended underneath the existing bridge, to better understand how it would best 'fit' within the Granville Island area and to assess the structural feasibility of such a crossing.

**#3. 'Toolbox of Local Improvements'** – all future studies should consider the range of local improvements in ensuring all facility improvements are 'seamless,' safe, and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists.

**#4. Cambie Street Bridge Corridor** – with the planned developments in the eastern parts of False Creek, further evaluation of Options C2 (Outward West Sidewalk Extension) and C4 (Adjust Lanes to Provide Southbound Bike Lane) should be considered in the longer-term.



potential for the following reasons:

- A new crossing fills the void for an improved connection for both recreational users and commuters between the north and south shores of False Creek.
- A new crossing facility improves accessibility between **Granville Island and** downtown.

# YOUR OPINION COUNTS...

Thank you for your participation and interest in this study. Please take the time to share your ideas, questions, and comments with the resource team members in attendance... or, complete one of the Comment Forms available.

