

| <b>Considerations</b>  | <b>Concept A</b><br>Shared Use Path and Buffered Bike Lane on North Side  | <b>Concept B</b><br>Shared Use Paths on Both Sides  | <b>Concept C</b><br>Shared Use Paths and Protected Bike Lanes on Both Side   |
|--|---|---|--|
| Consistency with broader community goals (Bend’s Transportation System Plan, GO Bond)    | While a shared use path improves ped/bike conditions on the north side, the absence of ped/bike infrastructure on the south side limits connectivity for some users.                                      | Lower-stress walk/bike facilities provided on both sides, simplifying travel for vulnerable roadway users.  | Lower-stress walk/bike facilities provided on both sides, simplifying travel for vulnerable roadway users. Protected bike lanes provide additional opportunity to separate people on foot from people on bicycles. |
| Safety and comfort for all users (people walking, bicycling, accessing transit, driving) | Despite the presence of a physically-separated path on the north side, people driving could encroach into the adjacent buffered bike lane.  | Physically-separated paths eliminate potential for people driving to encroach into the walkway/bikeway. Conflict points are limited to intersections and driveways.   | Physically-separated paths eliminate potential for people driving to encroach into the walkway/bikeway. Conflict points are limited to intersections and driveways.  |
| Potential cost   | Lowest cost (\$2.4 million) among the three options (improvements focus mostly on sidewalk/path infill).  | Higher cost (\$4.4 million) than “Concept A” but lower than “Concept C.” improvements include sidewalk/path infill on north side, and minor widening on south side.   | Highest cost (\$16.9 million) among the three options (full roadway rebuild).  |
| Minimizes temporary or permanent impacts to adjacent properties                          | No anticipated right-of-way impacts.  | No anticipated right-of-way impacts.  | High right-of-way impact potential due to higher impervious footprint, full roadway reconstruction, and modifications to most accesses due to raised sections.   |
| Minimizes impacts to natural, historic or cultural resources                             | Smallest “footprint” among the three options. Opportunities to enhance landscape buffer on north side with additional plants and/or trees. Minimizes need for major drainage and stormwater improvements. | Larger “footprint” than “Concept A” but smaller than “Concept C.” Opportunities to enhance landscape buffer on north side with additional plants and/or trees. Minimizes need for major drainage and stormwater improvements. | Largest footprint among the three options. Generally narrower landscape buffers. Major drainage/stormwater upgrades are necessary due to full roadway rebuild.   |