

**Eugene Bicycle and Pedestrian
Advisory Committee**



City of Eugene
99 E Broadway Ste 400
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-5291
(541) 682-5032 FAX
www.eugene-or.gov/bpac

Date: Thursday, March 14, 2013
Time: 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
Location: Sloat Conference Room
Atrium Building, 99 W. 10th Ave
Eugene, OR 97401 (Enter from the back alley off 10th Ave)

BPAC Members Present: Sasha Luftig, David Gizara, Jim Patterson, Holly McRae, Edem Gomez, Steve Bade, Allen Hancock, Jeff Lange, Janet Lewis, Briana Orr, Bob Passaro, Susan Stumpf, Anya Dowbrowolski, Joel Krestik

BPAC Members Absent: Judi Horstmann

Staff: Lee Shoemaker, Reed Dunbar, Chris Henry, Tom Larsen, Jim Ball

Members of the Public: Barbara Sussman, David Sonnichson, Chris Watchie, Rich InLove,

Meeting Summary Notes

1. Open Meeting

2. Public Comment

Rich InLove: Two things, first there was a proposal that bicyclists pay a fee and feels that many would be willing to pay a fee to eliminate the perception that cyclists are freeloaders. Second, Willamette Street, if 3 lane, bus stops should be staggered so that traffic can go around and use striping.

Barbara Susman: LCC's Successful Aging Institute. Have partnerships with 30 different agencies and offer all sorts of different classes. Paul's Bicycle Way of Life has been partnering with them but haven't had any takers for bike classes. Handout. Also, Maintenance classes and indoor cycling. Put in InMotion please. Let us know if there are some bicycle gaps in the system. GEARs should talk to her.

3. Approve February 14, 2013 Meeting Summary Notes

Action Requested: Approve Meeting Notes

Approved

4. South Willamette Street Improvement Plan Alternatives

Action Requested: Presentation and Feedback to Project Staff

Chris Henry, Eugene PWE and Chris Watchie, Cogito will make the presentation

- Purpose is to have a detailed discussion on the options (list of 6) before they are reduced to 3 options for further examination.
- Process: stakeholder groups, two community forums (170 ppl. and 300 ppl. respectively), emails, phone calls, community meetings
- To date, there has been a lot of input (including intercept surveys out on the street)
- Will you share what the results were from Forum #2? Yes, that will be available next week.
- What surprised you about your intercept surveys? Always surprised when nobody knows about the project. But there is a whole spectrum of responses (good and bad).
- Summary of project goals (read aloud)
- Decision making: 6 alternatives will be narrowed to 3 based on balance. BPAC is provided an opportunity to provide input today. A proposal will go to the Technical Advisory Committee to accept the 3 options. Also, additional partners will be informed and their input utilized.
- Assumption that BPAC is interested in bike/ped? Yes.
- In all alternatives the curb ramps will be upgraded to ADA standard. Sidewalks have been mentioned for improvement – we're looking for funding. Some people want utility poles moved – there is substantial cost to this (Millions), no funding source identified.
- Will be analyzing either 1 or 2 as part of the review, will also analyze a bike lane option (3 or 4) plus one other.
- There is an expectation that the bicycle boulevards adjacent to Willamette are developed (but as separate projects).
- Timeline: next week consultants start analyzing 3 alternatives. They need time to do that so it will likely be JUNE before the next forum. Can go to BPAC to discuss (after forum). A memo will go to City Council about 6 alternatives and 3 for analysis. Might have a Council work session over the summer. Based on feedback will get from 3 alternatives to 1 recommendation. Staff may make a recommendation that is different than the study, feel there is a responsibility to build a balanced system so Alternative #1 is unlikely to be the staff recommendation.
- Alternatives Review:
 - 1. Maintains as-is: 4 travel lanes
 - 2. 2 SB lanes, TWTL, 1 NB lane
 - 3. 3 travel lanes, 2 bike lanes
 - Most cyclists will prefer Option 3, the pedestrian network is too compromised (no vegetation)
 - Might feel like 18th Avenue, which doesn't feel safe now
 - Desire for green bike lanes (might help make them more visible)

- Better for peds
- Vote to approve Option #3; failed (David G.); thinks there are better options that are a combination of 3 and 4. Want to forward language that states we are opposed to status quo. Need to make a statement. Can we add a statement? It's not beneficial not to decide to vote. We haven't done much since the river trails, We have an opportunity to make a complete street and there is no room for compromise. Can be an elegant design based on what we know and what the city needs. We have a chance to charge the city with a combination of 3 and 4.
 - Vote to approve Option #3. Fail (David G.)
 - Vote to approve Option #3. Pass (2/3 majority)
- 4. 3 travel lanes, 2 buffered bike lanes (buffer from sidewalk width); also no trees (reduced space)
 - Has larger TWLTL, add back to sidewalk, what if 10' travel lanes?
 - 2' buffer is only 7' total, that's only 1' more than Option 3
 - Think this can be tweaked
 - Buffer can be 1" wide. (No, it cannot.) Don't throw this out if it's the one we want.
 - Firmly against Option 4, senior citizens desire wide sidewalks.
 - Can we recommend a combination of 3 and 4? It's possible.
 - Refuse to sacrifice sidewalk widths for buffers
- 5. 3 travel lanes, wide sidewalks (no bike lanes)
 - Is there an opportunity for bump outs? Not really.
 - Speed limits to 20mph? Only if CBD. Is it CBD? Blair is, but it's not clear why it has CBD designation. There are 7 enforcement officers.
 - If we don't have a bike lanes bikes will use the sidewalk. Issues with peds and driveways.
 - Some businesses like this option but don't want bike lanes. Maybe a refinement for cycle tracks?
 - Would the city need eminent domain? Not really, moving out into the street and not into the property line.
 - Won't attract families on bikes
 - This option with sharrows might be good for different cyclists (sidewalk v. travel lane)
 - Won't vote for an option that does not include a bike option.
 - Motion to approve 5 and recommend a cycle track is explored. How will we have an opportunity to refine the alternatives? Forum #3. This is not the last stop.

- Vote: recommend Option #5 with recommendation staff explores a cycle track in this round or the next round. PASS (Jeff sideways; not sure cycle tracks are the answer)
 - Getting the next 10% of cyclists will not be accomplished with bike lanes. Let's not forget the bike boulevards, they are more attractive for some, but not all, cyclists.
 - Cannot promise that cycle tracks will be part of the evaluation
- 6. 2 travel lanes, 1 median, 2 bike lanes, roundabouts
 - Could there be places where the median would be traversable? Maybe, that would be a refinement of the alternative.
 - Is this a throw away? Is it viable? It's there for a few reasons. Mostly, it's the safest, but requires the most changes too, and requires the most resources and planning.
 - Concern with roundabouts. Issues with vision impaired and safety.
 - If Springfield is the precedent for roundabouts, then this is not a good option.
 - Probably the most criticism from emergency services.
 - If it's just to study, this one offers the most to gain because we don't know enough about it
 - Would picking this make Option 3 more attractive?
 - Between intersections it is the most safe, but intersections will be problematic.
 - Mid-block crossing doesn't feel safe
 - If median is not raised, people will turn across it
 - Several elements are bad. Cannot use the median that isn't raised. Suggest move Option 5 forward. Feel 5 comes closest. Motion to approve 5.
- Analysis: there is an option that once the preferred alternative is selected that there might be minor modifications to the alternative or additional comparison might be considered.
 - Buses: LTD has a preference to remain in the travel lane. There are no opportunities for pullouts with current widths and adjacent uses. LTD doesn't want to move the bus stops.
 - Okay to use TWLTL to pass a bus? It requires some discretion on behalf of EPD, but can treat the bus as an obstruction and can move around it by using the TWLTL
 - How many bus stops? 8
 - EmX Corridor? No
 - Can there be ramps at bus stops? No, people exit buses
 - There is a stretch on 11th (Bier Stein), there appears to be space to do a pull out.

- It's probably okay for bikes to stop twice an hour for buses in the bus lane.
- Land use plan may bring changes outside the 60' ROW.
- Wouldn't bike lanes be affected by buses? Yes, it would. Couldn't the bike lane be moved to the other side of the curb? Not enough room now.
- Preferred alternative versus staff alternative? After analysis of the 3 alternatives the public will select an alternative. Staff may have another opinion.
- Let's make 3 recommendations based on what we want. 4-lanes does not make sense, feels like a freeway. Hard to cross and brings higher speeds. Neither 1 or 2 should be an option.
- Can we all agree on 1 option? Sure.
- The advantage to analyzing 1 or 2 is that it allows us to compare the alternatives we want with the existing alternative. We need the data to dismiss it. It's okay for you to advance 1 or 2 without BPAC supporting it.
- It's okay to know that better bike/ped access will help businesses. So why do we have to prove it. Option #1 is a failure.
- Who are these people that want Option #1? City gets phone calls "anybody in their right mind can see that 4 lanes are necessary". Also, public process has informed the city that there is a lot of energy around getting more information before deciding. (It's kind of like climate change...)
- Some people think that bikes aren't safe on Willamette. Any data on that? Studies show that facilities make it safer. Also, a TWLTL will make it safer for autos.
- People don't drive the speed limit on a 4-lane. Especially, if it's posted at 25mph.
- Can we vote on either Option 3 or 4? Let's review 3 though 6. Why not review 1 or 2? Let's tell them which to look at.
 - Keep the base, so Option #1
- Lane widths will affect the MMLoS
- Vegetation causes traffic to move more slowly, also affects heat islands and improves ped environment
- Really important to decide between 3 and 4 (no hybrids)
- Other

BPAC recommendations on which alternatives should advance for further analysis:

- Option 3. Passes with a majority vote.
- Option 5 with a recommendation that staff explore a cycle track with this option. Passes by consensus with one sideways vote.

5. Public Works Project Updates

Action Requested: Presentation and Discussion

Deferred to April; some discussion about 18th Avenue administrative order appeal. BPAC will be informed when the hearing is scheduled.

6. Sub-Committee Reports

Action Requested: Information Share

Deferred to April

7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Strategic Plan Update

Action Requested: Presentation and Discussion

Deferred to April

8. Information Share

Action Requested: BPAC and staff Information share

Deferred to April

9. Adjourn