

The meeting of the Bend City Council Community Building Subcommittee was called to order at 9:03 a.m. on Wednesday, February 22, 2023, in Council Chambers at City Hall, 710 NW Wall Street, as well as online.

1. Roll Call: Councilors Anthony Broadman, Barb Campbell, Megan Norris

Absent: None

2. Approve Minutes

Councilor Norris moved to approve the August 24, 2022 meeting Minutes. Councilor Broadman seconded the motion. The motion passed (3-0).

3. Transportation Multi-Modal System Discussion

Chief Operations Officer Russ Grayson explained this meeting would be an open conversation with Councilors regarding the transportation network and how projects are prioritized, particularly in terms of bike/pedestrian infrastructure and contracts. Grayson introduced Principal Engineer Garrett Sabourin, Assistant City Engineer Janet Hruby, and Transportation Engineer Robin Lewis before presenting the following slides:

- Transportation Investment Overview and Priorities
- Agenda
- What is the problem we are trying to solve?
- Why are we talking about this?
- Policy Guidance
 - Design Standards
 - TSP Guiding Policies – Transportation System
 - TSP Near Term Projects
 - GO Bond
 - Budget Shown for Recent Contract Approval
- Bike and Pedestrian Standards
 - Bike/Ped Systems – 1st Generation
 - Evolution of Bike System – 2nd Generation
 - Evolution of Bike System – 3rd Generation
 - Current design practices from other areas
- Policy Direction
 - How and when do we get from today's system to the desired level?
 - Policy Questions
 - How are we defining success with bike/ped projects?

- Mapping Tools – Key Routes segments of higher stress
 - Sabourin provided further explanation on the Key Routes system, including the 13 miles of higher stress areas.
- Mapping Tool – Bike System
- Project by Project or Corridor Approach
- What are the Bike/Ped Goals with all these Projects?
- 12 Citywide Key Route Bond Project Schedule
- Budget Considerations
- Key Route Cost Comparisons
- Resolution 3218: 2020 GO Bond Project Descriptions
- TSP Key Route Funding
- Key Route Cost Comparisons
- Discussion and Next Steps

Councilors and staff discussed at length whether to treat the GO Bond as its own program with cost overruns being absorbed within the overall GO Bond budget, or to use general transportation funding to supplement the bond. Staff highlighted community expectations versus City budgets and priorities.

Councilors and staff deliberated over Council guidance, the Transportation System Plan (TSP) versus the GO Bond, and the need to prioritize some projects over others, given limited funding and rising costs. Councilors and staff agreed it was not fiscally possible to put protected infrastructure on every road, but adding wayfinding to existing multi-use off-street paths could allow those paths to be considered finished and free up funding to work on routes that currently have no protected bike/ped routes.

Councilors and staff also touched on the list of projects in the original ballot language for the GO Bond; Abbas stated those projects could not change. Finance Director Janette Townsend clarified that the projects detailed in Resolution 3217 could be adjusted. Councilor Broadman stated if staff needs to make changes, those changes should be brought to the Transportation Bond Oversight Committee (TBOC) and Council.

Council established that staff should work within the limits of the GO Bond's budget.

Grayson cited the Neff and Purcell intersection as an example of a fully designed project on a key route coming before Council, at which point Council deliberated over the project not being up to key route standards; Grayson said staff would like to have those conversations much earlier in the process, which was the impetus for this agenda item. Engineering and Infrastructure Program Director Ryan Oster added that project did in fact meet key route level of stress standards with only a wide shared-use path and not an on-street bike lane; Oster noted staff was not told by Council to design both a path and a bike lane and do not have the budget to do so.

Council and staff discussed Council Goals, public expectation around protected routes, and the disconnect between that expectation and the reality of what is currently possible, given limitations such as right-of-way and available budget.

Grayson agreed to talk to City Manager Eric King and ask the full Council what system staff should be using to get policy direction and feedback on project-specific questions around scope, budget, and schedule.

Councilors and staff discussed the role of TBOC and the feasibility of expanding that committee's role. Staff and Council further discussed key route connectivity, protected routes, and the TSP.

Councilor Campbell stated the importance of keeping the City's promise to the public in terms of the percentage of bond dollars that are spent on bike and pedestrian safety improvements; Councilors Broadman and Norris agreed.

After more discussion around the possibility of expanding TBOC, Councilors determined the entity to give project-specific guidance moving forward would be the Council Community Building Subcommittee, and that GO Bond projects should not draw on general transportation funding. In cases where there is a change in project scope or budget, staff should have that discussion with TBOC. From there, if something needs to be formally changed in a Capital Improvement Program (CIP), that should come before the full Council.

4. Adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Mitsch
Senior Administrative Support Specialist