

Geospatial and Temporal Analysis of Toronto’s Cycling Infrastructure*

A Data-Driven Approach

Ziheng Zhong

September 24, 2024

This paper explores the development of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure. Through a comprehensive analysis of installation dates, upgrades, and comfort levels of bike lanes, this study highlights the trends in cycling infrastructure expansion from 2001 to 2024. A significant focus is placed on the comfort levels of different types of lanes, offering insights into how the infrastructure meets the needs of cyclists. The spatial distribution of bike lanes is also analyzed, revealing discrepancies in access between downtown and suburban areas. The findings emphasize the need for continued investment in both the quality and expansion of cycling infrastructure to promote sustainable transportation in Toronto.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Data	3
2.1	Source	3
2.2	Measurement	3
2.2.1	Variables	4
2.3	Method	5
3	Results	7
3.1	Data Trend	7
3.2	Distributions	8
3.3	Maps	10

*Code and data are available at: https://github.com/iJustinn/Toronto_Cycling_Network

4	Discussion	11
4.1	First discussion point	11
4.2	Second discussion point	12
4.3	Third discussion point	14
4.4	Weaknesses and next steps	15
A	Appendix	17
A.1	Comfort Levels Classification	17
A.1.1	Data	17
A.1.2	Logic	17
	References	19

1 Introduction

Urban cycling plays a critical role in advancing sustainable transportation strategies, especially in rapidly growing cities like Toronto. With the city facing increasing congestion, promoting active transportation modes such as cycling is essential for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, improving public health, and enhancing urban mobility. Since the early 2000s, Toronto has made significant strides in expanding its cycling infrastructure, creating a network of bike lanes, multi-use paths, and shared roadways to support cyclists citywide.

This paper analyzes the evolution of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure over the past two decades, focusing on the installation and upgrade trends of bikeways and their classification by comfort level. Using the ‘Cycling Network’ dataset from Open Data Toronto, the study examines both the spatial distribution of bike lanes and the varying levels of cycling comfort across different regions. The analysis highlights discrepancies between downtown and suburban areas, showcasing progress while identifying regions that remain underserved.

The study’s findings underscore the need for continued investment in both the expansion and quality of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure to encourage more widespread adoption of cycling as a viable mode of transportation. By addressing both the geographic imbalances and comfort levels of bike lanes, the city can better meet its sustainability goals.

The structure of this paper is as follows: the data sources and methodologies are presented in Section 2, followed by an analysis of the results in Section 3, and a discussion of the findings in Section 4.

2 Data

2.1 Source

The dataset analyzed in this study, the Cycling Network dataset (Data 2024a), was retrieved from Open Data Toronto (Gelfand 2020). This dataset is publicly available and is continually updated to reflect Toronto’s ongoing efforts to develop and maintain its cycling infrastructure. It contains geospatial and temporal information about various cycling-related features, including the types of bikeways (dedicated lanes, shared roads, multi-use trails), installation years, and any subsequent upgrades. By offering a detailed history of Toronto’s cycling network development, this dataset plays a vital role in informing both urban planning policies and research into sustainable transportation options.

While the Cycling Network dataset was the primary source of data, other relevant datasets were explored, such as the Road Network File (Canada 2024) from Statistics Canada, which provides detailed geospatial data on all roadways in Toronto. Another such alternative was the Major City-Wide Cycling Routes dataset (Data 2024b), also available on Open Data Toronto (Gelfand 2020). However, this dataset focuses specifically on the large-scale cycling routes connecting different parts of the city, emphasizing connectivity at a macro level. While these two dataset are useful for analyzing high-level transportation patterns, it lacks the detailed, segment-level data—such as comfort levels, installation dates, and upgrade history—that are crucial for a deep analysis of cycling infrastructure. Since this paper focuses on both the growth and quality of cycling infrastructure, the Cycling Network dataset, with its more comprehensive coverage of individual bikeway segments, was a better fit for the goals of this study.

Data used in this paper was downloaded, cleaned and analyzed with the programming language R (R Core Team 2023). Also with support of additional packages which will be mentioned later in the Section 2.3.

2.2 Measurement

The ‘Cycling Network’ dataset from Open Data Toronto tracks various aspects of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure, such as installation dates, upgrades, street names, and the type of infrastructure (e.g., sharrows, multi-use trails). Each entry represents a segment of the cycling network, where real-world phenomena, such as the construction or upgrading of cycling paths, are documented. For example, when a cycling path is installed or upgraded, the responsible authorities collect information such as the installation year (e.g., 2001) and any subsequent upgrades (e.g., 2021). This data is then digitized into structured entries in the dataset.

To go from a physical event (e.g., the installation of a bike lane) to a dataset entry, detailed records are maintained by the city’s transportation department. These records are geospatially coded (column geometry in this dataset), allowing each cycling path to be mapped precisely in

relation to other city infrastructure. Thus, the phenomena of constructing or updating a bike lane becomes an entry with attributes such as the street name, road class, and installation history. This allows researchers to analyze trends in cycling infrastructure and its expansion over time.

2.2.1 Variables

As mentioned above, the dataset contains several key variables that were used in this analysis:

2.2.1.1 Installation Year

The Installation Year records the year in which a particular bikeway segment was first constructed or made available for use. This variable is essential for conducting a temporal trend analysis, allowing the study to track the growth and expansion of the cycling network over time.

2.2.1.2 Upgrade Year

The Upgrade Year indicates when an existing bikeway segment was upgraded or improved. Upgrades typically involve safety enhancements, such as the installation of protective barriers, widening of lanes, or changes from painted lanes to physically separated lanes. This variable is critical for assessing not just the expansion but also the quality improvements made to Toronto's cycling infrastructure over time. Tracking upgrades helps to understand whether the city's focus has shifted from merely adding new bikeways to improving the usability and safety of existing ones, especially in high-traffic or critical areas.

2.2.1.3 Bikeway Type

The Bikeway Type categorizes the cycling infrastructure into different types, including dedicated bike lanes, multi-use trails, and shared roadways, etc. Each type of bikeway offers varying levels of protection and comfort to cyclists. This variable was not directly used in the study, but forming another crucial variable: Comfort Level.

2.2.1.4 Comfort Level

Each bikeway is assigned a comfort level—high, moderate, or low—based according to the recorded Bikeway Type. These classifications are self-defined, relying on factors such as physical separation from traffic and lane width of each Bikeway Type, detail can be found in [Section A.1](#). This variable is central to understanding the usability of the infrastructure.

Table 1: Raw Coordinates

Geometry
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.4035069136297, 43.6952595244941], [-79.403
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.4036386937994, 43.6349938275931], [-79.403
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.2752236011477, 43.7415816548541], [-79.275
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.4677191149987, 43.7720763078272], [-79.467
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.5481155366534, 43.5902679719901], [-79.548
{'type': 'MultiLineString', 'coordinates': [[[-79.5430542283657, 43.58695658908], [-79.54307

Table 2: Extracted and Cleaned Coordinates

Longitude	Latitude	ID
-79.40351	43.69526	1
-79.40309	43.69535	1
-79.40240	43.69549	1
-79.40364	43.63499	2
-79.40355	43.63519	2
-79.40346	43.63535	2

2.2.1.5 Geospatial Coordinates

Latitude and longitude data are included to map the bikeways and assess their spatial distribution.

2.3 Method

Data used in this paper was cleaned, processed, modeled and tested with the programming language R (R Core Team 2023). Also with support of additional packages in R: `sf` (Pebesma 2023), `readr` (Wickham and Hester 2023), `ggplot2` (Wickham, Chang, et al. 2023), `osmdata` (Padgham et al. 2023), `tidyverse` (Wickham 2023), `jsonlite` (Ooms 2023), `dplyr` (Wickham, François, et al. 2023), `here` (Müller 2023), `knitr` (Xie 2023), `kableExtra` (Zhu 2023).

In the first data cleaning process, the focus was on extracting and cleaning geographical coordinates from the ‘geometry’ column, which contains location data in JSON-like format, Table 1 displays how the data was like. A custom function was created to parse the coordinates, filter out invalid entries, and extract the longitude and latitude values. The extracted coordinates were combined into a new dataset shown in Table 2, with unique IDs to match the original entries. Any rows with missing coordinate data were removed, and the cleaned data was saved into a separate file for further analysis.

Table 3: Number of Lane Upgrades by Year

Year	Number of Upgraded Lanes
2018	9
2019	14
2020	46
2021	28
2022	15
2023	12

Table 4: Number of Bikeways Installed by Year

Year	Number of Installed Bikeways
2001	539
2002	12
2003	15
2004	20
2005	65
2006	75

The second cleaning process dealt with the ‘UPGRADED’ column, which contains information about the years when cycling lanes were upgraded. Invalid or missing years were filtered out, and the remaining valid data was converted to a numeric format. The dataset was then grouped by the year of upgrade, with a summary created to count the number of lanes upgraded in each year. This summarized data, Table 3, was saved for use in analyzing trends in lane upgrades over time.

In the third cleaning process, the focus was on the ‘INSTALLED’ column, which records the years when cycling infrastructure was first installed. Similar to the ‘UPGRADED’ column, invalid or missing years were removed, and the data was converted to numeric format. The installation data was grouped by year to count the number of bikeways installed each year. The resulting summary, Table 4, was saved for further trend analysis on the growth of the cycling network.

Finally, the fourth cleaning process involved classifying cycling lanes based on the type of infrastructure. Data from the ‘INFRA_HIGHORDER’ and ‘INFRA_LOWORDER’ columns was cleaned, and missing values were removed. The lanes were classified into three comfort levels: High Comfort, Moderate Comfort, and Low Comfort, depending on their Bikeway Type data, detail of this classification can be found in Section A.1. The classification, along with year data for installation and upgrades, was saved for analysis on the types of cycling lanes and their comfort levels. Table 5 shows how it looks like.

Table 5: Classification of Cycling Lanes by Comfort Level

Installed Year	Upgraded Year	Comfort Level
2001	2021	Low Comfort
2001	2009	High Comfort
2001	2011	High Comfort
2001	2011	High Comfort
2001	2012	High Comfort
2001	2012	High Comfort

3 Results

3.1 Data Trend




Figure 1: Toronto Bikeways Installed by Year

Figure 1 consists of two panels depicting the number of bikeways installed in Toronto by year, alongside a trend analysis of the installation pattern over time. Figure 1a displays the raw count of bikeways installed per year from 2001 to 2024. A significant spike is observed in 2001, with over 400 bikeways installed in that year alone. This likely reflects a major investment in cycling infrastructure at the time. Following 2001, the number of installations drops sharply and stabilizes at much lower levels in subsequent years, with occasional small peaks around 2007, 2011, and 2021.

Figure 1b adds a trend line to the same data, showing a gradual decline in the number of bikeways installed over time. The trend line, sloping downward, indicates that despite some fluctuations, the overall pattern is a decrease in annual bikeway installations. The early 2000s marked a high point for cycling infrastructure development, but after this surge, the rate of installation has steadily declined. This trend might reflect a shift in city planning priorities

or the saturation of available spaces for bikeways in certain areas. The analysis highlights the need for renewed focus on expanding cycling infrastructure to sustain or increase the momentum of bike-friendly urban development.




Figure 2: Toronto Bikeways Upgraded by Year

Figure 2 illustrates the number of bikeways upgraded in Toronto from 2001 to 2023, with panel (a) showing the raw counts of upgrades and panel (b) visualizing the trend. Figure 2a reveals that the most significant number of upgrades occurred in 2015, where nearly 100 bikeways were updated, marking a major peak. Outside of this spike, the number of annual upgrades remains relatively modest, typically fluctuating between 10 and 50 bikeways. Notable periods of increased upgrades are visible around 2012 and 2020, possibly reflecting concentrated efforts to modernize or expand existing cycling infrastructure in those years.

In Figure 2b, the overall trend is slightly upward, as indicated by the red trend line. Despite the notable peaks and valleys, the trend line suggests that, on average, the number of bikeway upgrades has increased over the years. The spike in 2015 significantly affects the trend, but even excluding that, the gradual rise suggests that more consistent efforts have been made to maintain and improve Toronto’s cycling network. This trend aligns with broader urban planning strategies focused on making cities more accessible and environmentally friendly by supporting active transportation. The dips in recent years, particularly after 2020, might be influenced by resource reallocation or external factors, such as the global pandemic, which could have delayed infrastructure projects.

3.2 Distributions

Figure 3 provides a breakdown of Toronto’s bikeway network by comfort level and upgrade status. Figure 3a shows the distribution of all bikeways based on comfort level, with the majority of bikeways classified as either Low Comfort (41.6%) or Moderate Comfort (41.1%), while High Comfort lanes constitute a smaller portion (17.3%). This indicates that while




Figure 3: Toronto Bikeway Comfort Level Distribution

Toronto has invested in a significant number of bike lanes, most of them fall within lower comfort categories, suggesting that further improvements, particularly in upgrading existing lanes, are needed to promote safer and more comfortable cycling experiences.




Figure 4: Toronto Bikeway Comfort Level Distribution

Figure 3b, Figure 4a, and Figure 4b offer a deeper look into the upgrade status for each comfort level. For Low Comfort lanes, only 22.69% have been upgraded, while 77.31% remain in their original state. Similarly, for Moderate Comfort bikeways, 23.38% have been upgraded, leaving 76.62% untouched. Interestingly, High Comfort lanes have the lowest proportion of upgrades, with only 18.76% improved, despite representing the most comfortable and potentially most desirable biking infrastructure. These trends highlight a potential gap in Toronto's focus on maintaining and upgrading its most comfortable and accessible cycling lanes, suggesting a need for more targeted investments in high-comfort bikeways to encourage broader use of cycling for transportation.

3.3 Maps



Figure 5: Map of Bike Lanes Locations in Toronto

Figure 5 provides a visual representation of the bike lane infrastructure across Toronto. The lines on the map correspond to various cycling paths, including dedicated bike lanes, multi-use paths, and shared roadways, which span different areas of the city. The geographic coordinates, ranging from around 43.60°N to 43.85°N in latitude and -79.6°W to -79.3°W in longitude, encompass most of Toronto's urban region. This map offers an important spatial perspective, illustrating the extensive network of cycling routes that connect different neighborhoods and areas within the city.

A key observation from the map is the dense concentration of bike lanes in the downtown core and along major roadways, indicating a well-established network in central Toronto. The downtown area's grid-like structure is particularly evident, showcasing a high density of lanes that facilitate easy cycling access within the city's busiest areas. As one moves further away from the city center, the map shows fewer bike lanes, suggesting that suburban regions may have less developed cycling infrastructure. However, there are notable multi-use

paths extending toward the outskirts, particularly in parks and recreational areas, providing important cycling connections for those commuting or using bikes for recreational purposes.

This map highlights the importance of cycling infrastructure in promoting sustainable urban transportation. The wide distribution of bike lanes supports Toronto’s efforts to enhance active transportation options, reduce traffic congestion, and improve accessibility for cyclists. The representation also provides a foundation for analyzing areas where future infrastructure developments could be prioritized, particularly in regions where cycling connectivity appears sparse.

4 Discussion

4.1 First discussion point

The results highlight Toronto’s phased approach to developing its cycling infrastructure, with a significant spike in installations in the early 2000s, as shown in Figure 1. This surge is likely because the dataset started recording from 2001, hence all installations before was counted towards 2001. Further, the fact that government start taking this record and the large number of installations at this period may have reflected political will and public demand for greener transportation alternatives, driven by growing concerns about climate change and urban congestion.

However, after the initial surge, the number of bikeways installed annually began to decline, a pattern that persists to this day. Several factors could explain this decline. First, the initial phase of the bike plan likely focused on areas where cycling infrastructure could be installed with relative ease, particularly in downtown Toronto, where road networks and urban density supported such investments. As the network expanded into more complex areas, such as suburban neighborhoods with fewer existing roadways, the pace of installation slowed. Additionally, the physical limitations of available space in a highly developed urban area may have constrained further expansion, as new bikeways would require more complicated and costly measures, such as road reallocation or shared-use paths.

Despite this slowdown in new installations, Figure 2 demonstrates a significant focus on upgrading existing infrastructure, particularly in later years. This shift from installation to upgrades could indicate a strategic pivot by the city toward improving the quality and safety of existing cycling infrastructure. As infrastructure ages and new safety standards emerge, upgrading older lanes becomes crucial to ensuring the network remains usable and safe for cyclists. The peak of upgrades in 2015, for example, might reflect the city’s response to increased cycling activity, demands from advocacy groups, or the implementation of updated cycling policies that prioritize safer and more modern designs, such as protected bike lanes.

This pattern of prioritizing upgrades over new installations also suggests that Toronto’s initial expansion may have left some areas with suboptimal or unsafe infrastructure, particularly in

the form of shared roadways or painted bike lanes that offer minimal protection to cyclists. As urban transportation planning evolves, the focus has shifted toward creating more separated and protected lanes, which are essential for encouraging cycling among less experienced riders, families, or those concerned about safety. This ongoing commitment to improving the infrastructure—rather than merely expanding it—reflects a maturation in Toronto’s approach to active transportation, as planners recognize that quality and safety are just as important as quantity when promoting cycling as a viable mode of transport.

Finally, another crucial aspect linked to the decline in installations could be budgetary constraints or competing infrastructure projects. As urban budgets are stretched across various priorities—public transit expansion, road maintenance, and green space development—the pace of installing new cycling lanes might slow. However, the investment in upgrades suggests that cycling infrastructure remains a priority, even if the focus has shifted from expansion to refinement. Continuing to monitor and analyze these trends will be essential for understanding how Toronto can balance its need for both new installations and the improvement of existing cycling routes to meet its long-term sustainability and mobility objectives.

In conclusion, the first discussion point highlights the evolution of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure from an initial phase of rapid expansion to a more recent focus on upgrading and enhancing the safety and quality of the network. This shift reflects the challenges of balancing growth with maintenance, the need to adapt to changing urban landscapes, and the influence of global best practices and local advocacy in shaping the city’s cycling future.

4.2 Second discussion point

The comfort level classification of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure offers valuable insights into the quality of the city’s bike network, particularly with respect to cyclist safety and usability. As shown in Figure 3, the majority of bikeways fall into the Low or High Comfort categories, with Moderate Comfort lanes—typically those offering relatively protected infrastructure—making up a smaller proportion of the overall network. This distribution suggests that, Toronto has successfully expanded the sheer number of bikeways, the majority could offer the protection and comfort necessary to encourage broader and more consistent usage. However, it is better to see Low Comfort level lanes taking the smallest portion among all.

The classification of cycling lanes into different comfort levels is important because it directly affects who feels confident enough to cycle. Low Comfort lanes, often painted bike lanes or shared roadways, offer minimal physical separation from motor vehicles, making them less appealing to risk-averse cyclists. The lack of protection increases the perceived danger, discouraging people from cycling regularly, particularly in areas with high traffic volumes. For example, a cyclist may feel comfortable using a Low Comfort lane in a quiet residential neighborhood but avoid it entirely on a busy downtown street where traffic and intersections pose greater hazards.

Moderate Comfort lanes, which typically include designated bike lanes, offer more safety but still lack the physical separation provided by protected or High Comfort infrastructure. These lanes are a step in the right direction but may not sufficiently address concerns about safety, particularly in areas with fast-moving or congested vehicle traffic. Moderate Comfort lanes are likely to attract more cyclists than Low Comfort lanes, but they may not be enough to significantly increase ridership across all demographic groups. For instance, studies have shown that women, children, and older adults are particularly sensitive to perceived danger in cycling, and without sufficient protection, these groups are less likely to use the infrastructure regularly.

High Comfort lanes, on the other hand, provide the greatest potential for encouraging cycling across a broad range of demographics. These lanes, often in the form of protected bike lanes or multi-use paths, offer a physically separated space for cyclists, reducing the likelihood of accidents involving motor vehicles. Research from cities that have invested heavily in High Comfort infrastructure, such as Amsterdam or Copenhagen, indicates that the availability of such protected lanes is a key factor in increasing overall cycling rates and making cycling a more viable and appealing transportation option for all. In Toronto, however, as the analysis shows, only a small proportion of the network is classified as High Comfort. This limits the extent to which the city can fully leverage its cycling infrastructure to promote widespread, sustained usage.

The low proportion of High Comfort lanes can be partly attributed to the early phases of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure development, during which the focus was likely on quickly installing a large number of lanes to meet political and public demands. At that time, lower-cost solutions like painted bike lanes and sharrows (shared roadways) were easier and faster to implement than more expensive, space-consuming, and structurally complex protected lanes. However, these lanes did not necessarily provide the level of safety needed to support a significant increase in cycling activity, particularly among more cautious cyclists. The subsequent shift towards upgrading infrastructure, as discussed earlier, is likely an acknowledgment of the limitations of the initial approach, where quantity may have been prioritized over quality.

Moreover, the analysis reveals that many of Toronto’s Moderate and Low Comfort lanes have yet to be upgraded, as shown in Figure 3b and Figure 4. For both Low and Moderate Comfort lanes, over 75% have not been upgraded, which implies that much of the city’s existing cycling network still operates under outdated or less protective standards. This points to a significant gap between the current state of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure and the standards that are increasingly being recognized as necessary to make cycling a mainstream mode of transportation in urban environments. The failure to upgrade a larger portion of these lanes may stem from budgetary constraints, political will, or challenges in reallocating road space in already congested or car-dominated areas.

One of the most critical implications of these findings is that Toronto’s cycling infrastructure might not yet be sufficiently robust to meet the city’s broader goals of reducing car dependency, lowering emissions, and promoting healthier, more active lifestyles. To truly shift a significant portion of the population towards cycling, the city will need to invest more heavily in upgrading

its infrastructure, particularly in transitioning more of its Low and Moderate Comfort lanes into High Comfort lanes. This is especially important in areas where traffic volume and speed are higher, as these conditions pose greater risks to cyclists and deter people from choosing bikes as a mode of transportation.

Another potential reason for the focus on Moderate and Low Comfort lanes is the spatial distribution of the city's bikeways. As mentioned earlier when showing the result of (**fog-map?**), much of Toronto's cycling network is concentrated in the downtown core, where road space is at a premium. Installing protected lanes in these areas often requires taking road space away from cars, which can be politically and technically challenging. In contrast, suburban areas, where road space is more abundant, could offer better opportunities for the city to build High Comfort infrastructure. Expanding the reach of the cycling network into these suburban areas, while upgrading the comfort levels of existing downtown lanes, could have a transformative effect on overall cycling rates and help make cycling a viable option for longer commutes.

In conclusion, while Toronto has made considerable progress in expanding its cycling infrastructure, the comfort level analysis reveals that much of the network remains suboptimal for ensuring safety and encouraging more widespread use. To achieve its sustainability and transportation goals, the city must focus on upgrading its existing Low and Moderate Comfort lanes and prioritize the construction of High Comfort infrastructure. This shift will be crucial not only for improving safety but also for making cycling an attractive option for a more diverse range of residents, thereby promoting equity and inclusivity in urban transportation.

4.3 Third discussion point

The geospatial analysis of Toronto's cycling infrastructure, as visualized in Figure 5, reveals clear spatial patterns that highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the city's current bike network. One of the key findings is the dense concentration of bikeways in the downtown core, where cycling infrastructure is most integrated into the existing urban fabric. This concentration aligns with expectations, as downtown Toronto is the city's most densely populated and heavily trafficked area, where the demand for alternative transportation modes is highest. The high density of bikeways in the city center reflects a concerted effort to provide accessible cycling options in areas where they are most likely to be used, particularly by commuters and urban residents.

However, the map also exposes a noticeable gap in cycling infrastructure as one moves further from the city center. The relative sparsity of bike lanes in suburban and peripheral areas suggests that while downtown residents enjoy a well-connected cycling network, those living in the suburbs have fewer options for safe, comfortable bike routes. This discrepancy may limit the overall effectiveness of Toronto's cycling infrastructure, as it primarily serves those in the urban core while potentially neglecting a significant portion of the population. Suburban

residents, who often have longer commutes and fewer public transit options, could benefit greatly from expanded cycling infrastructure that offers a viable alternative to car travel.

The lack of infrastructure in suburban areas could be attributed to a variety of factors. Suburbs typically have lower population densities and wider roads, making cycling infrastructure less of a priority in urban planning compared to the densely populated downtown core. Additionally, suburban regions tend to have more car-dependent cultures, where cycling is not as ingrained as a common mode of transportation. The existing infrastructure may therefore reflect historical priorities that favored cars over active transportation. However, as cities like Toronto strive to reduce traffic congestion and meet climate goals, expanding cycling infrastructure into these suburban areas could be a crucial step toward encouraging more sustainable transportation choices.

Furthermore, the map shows the importance of major recreational areas, such as parks and waterfronts, in Toronto’s cycling network. Multi-use trails, which provide High Comfort lanes, are particularly prevalent in these areas, offering scenic and safe routes for cyclists. While these trails are beneficial for recreational cycling, they may not be fully integrated into the city’s transportation network, limiting their utility for commuters. Connecting these trails to the downtown core and other major employment hubs could improve their role in promoting cycling as a legitimate form of daily transportation rather than just a leisure activity.

Lastly, the map highlights potential future opportunities for infrastructure expansion. Areas with sparse cycling routes could be prioritized for new installations, especially where there is existing road capacity or public demand for safer cycling options. Identifying and addressing these gaps will be crucial as Toronto continues to grow and seeks to make its transportation system more equitable and sustainable. The current infrastructure is heavily concentrated in downtown areas, but future developments could focus on creating a more geographically balanced network, ensuring that all residents, regardless of location, have access to safe and convenient cycling routes.

In summary, the geospatial distribution of Toronto’s cycling infrastructure reveals a well-connected downtown network but highlights the need for more investment in suburban areas and better integration of recreational trails into the broader transportation system. Expanding the reach of cycling infrastructure into underdeveloped areas will be key to making cycling a viable transportation option for a larger portion of the city’s population.

4.4 Weaknesses and next steps

One key limitation of this study is the reliance on the ‘Cycling Network’ dataset from Open-DataToronto, which, while comprehensive, might not capture informal or emerging cycling routes that are not officially recognized. Additionally, the dataset may not include newer infrastructure developments if updates were delayed in publication. Future research should integrate real-time data collection techniques or alternative datasets (e.g., crowdsourced information) to ensure that the analysis reflects the most current state of the network.

Another weakness lies in the classification of comfort levels, which, while useful, is a simplification. Comfort in cycling can be influenced by numerous factors beyond infrastructure type, such as traffic density, road conditions, and seasonal weather. A more nuanced classification that incorporates these additional factors could provide a more accurate assessment of how comfortable Toronto's cycling network truly is for different types of cyclists.

Next steps should include focusing on identifying areas with fewer bike lanes and lower comfort levels, particularly in suburban areas. These regions could be targeted for infrastructure upgrades and expansion to promote greater equity in access to safe cycling options. Additionally, analyzing cycling usage patterns, perhaps through mobile GPS data or surveys, would offer valuable insights into how the infrastructure is being utilized, helping city planners to make data-driven decisions in future expansions or upgrades.

Table 6: INFRA_HIGHORDER and INFRA_LOWORDER Columns from Raw Data

INFRA_HIGHORDER	INFRA_LOWORDER
Sharrows - Wayfinding	Sharrows - Wayfinding
Multi-Use Trail	Multi-Use Trail
Multi-Use Trail	Multi-Use Trail
Multi-Use Trail	Multi-Use Trail
Multi-Use Trail - Entrance	Multi-Use Trail - Entrance
Multi-Use Trail	Multi-Use Trail

A Appendix

A.1 Comfort Levels Classification

A.1.1 Data

The classification relies on the infrastructure types defined in two key columns: INFRA_HIGHORDER and INFRA_LOWORDER, shown in Table 6. As the author explained on the original dataset page (Data 2024a): “‘INFRA-HIGH’ refers to the highest classified cycling infrastructure type installed on this segment. ‘INFRA-LOW’ refers to the lowest classified cycling infrastructure type. The hierarchy is based on the quality and comfort of the bikeway type, with routes that are shared with vehicles as the lowest comfort, and the greater the separation / dedicated space, the higher the comfort and classification.”

Both columns are crucial because they give complementary information about the physical features of the bikeway. By selecting these columns and ensuring that no missing values remain, the dataset is prepared for classification.

A.1.2 Logic

The comfort levels are defined using a custom classification scheme based on the infrastructure types. The classification assigns a comfort level to each bikeway segment depending on its physical characteristics and separation from traffic:

A.1.2.1 High Comfort

Segments with infrastructure types labeled as “Protected” or “Multi-Use.” These bikeways generally have physical barriers separating cyclists from motor vehicles, such as fully separated bike lanes or paths shared with pedestrians but removed from vehicle traffic. This category

offers the highest level of safety and comfort, making it appealing to a wide range of cyclists, including families and less experienced riders.

A.1.2.2 Moderate Comfort

Bikeways labeled as “Bike Lane” in either column are classified as “Moderate Comfort.” These lanes are typically painted or designated lanes on the road but lack the full physical separation that would offer more safety. While these lanes provide cyclists with their own space, they are adjacent to motor vehicle traffic, which may make them less comfortable for some users.

A.1.2.3 Low Comfort

All other types of bikeways, not falling into the protected or designated bike lane categories, are classified as “Low Comfort.” These may include shared roadways where cyclists must navigate mixed traffic, offering little or no physical protection from vehicles. These segments are considered the least comfortable and safest for cyclists, often deterring usage by more risk-averse cyclists.

This classification method ensures that each bikeway segment is categorized into one of the three comfort levels based on its infrastructure type, enabling a detailed analysis of the usability of Toronto’s cycling network.

References

- Canada, Statistics. 2024. “Census Geography: Reference Guide.” <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/92-500-X>.
- Data, Toronto Open. 2024a. “Cycling Network.” <https://open.toronto.ca/dataset/cycling-network/>.
- . 2024b. “Major City-Wide Cycling Routes.” Transportation Services. <https://open.toronto.ca/dataset/major-city-wide-cycling-routes/>.
- Gelfand, Sharla. 2020. *Opendatatoronto: Access the City of Toronto Open Data Portal*. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=opendatatoronto>.
- Müller, Kirill. 2023. *Here: A Simpler Way to Find Your Files*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here>.
- Ooms, Jeroen. 2023. *Jsonlite: A Simple and Robust JSON Parser and Generator for r*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=jsonlite>.
- Padgham, Mark, Robin Lovelace, Bob Rudis, Maëlle Salmon, and Johannes Signer. 2023. *Osmdata: Import 'OpenStreetMap' Data as Simple Features or Spatial (Sp) Objects*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=osmdata>.
- Pebesma, Edzer. 2023. *Sf: Simple Features for r*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sf>.
- R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Wickham, Hadley. 2023. *Tidyverse: Easily Install and Load the 'Tidyverse'*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Winston Chang, Lionel Henry, Thomas Lin Pedersen, Kohske Takahashi, Claus Wilke, Kara Woo, Hiroaki Yutani, Dewey Dunnington, and Al Iversen. 2023. *Ggplot2: Create Elegant Data Visualisations Using the Grammar of Graphics*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggplot2>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Romain François, Lionel Henry, and Kirill Müller. 2023. *Dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>.
- Wickham, Hadley, and Jim Hester. 2023. *Readr: Read Rectangular Text Data*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>.
- Xie, Yihui. 2023. *Knitr: A General-Purpose Package for Dynamic Report Generation in r*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=knitr>.
- Zhu, Hao. 2023. *kableExtra: Construct Complex Table with 'Kable' and Pipe Syntax*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>.