


MIDTOWN PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CROSSINGS

ONLINE AND IN-PERSON OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY APPENDIX



Prepared for:



City of Bend

710 NW Wall St., Bend, OR 97703

Prepared by:



JLA Public Involvement

123 NE 3rd Ave, Ste 210, Portland, OR 97232

CONTENTS

Appendix A: Greenwood Avenue Comments	3
Appendix B: Hawthorne Avenue Comments	9
Appendix C: Franklin Avenue Comments.....	18
Appendix D: Additional Comments.....	25
Appendix E: Latinx outreach comments	38
Appendix F: Comments Received by Email	39

APPENDIX A: GREENWOOD AVENUE COMMENTS

Below are the **unedited comments** participants submitted in the online and in-person open house about the Greenwood Avenue designs.

QUESTION 2: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO TELL US ABOUT THE DESIGN CONCEPTS?

Online Comments (73)

- The first option will not be much of an improvement from my point of view.
- I picked concept 1 here solely because it offers the most expeditious route to an improved East/West corridor, and I think it's very important that people see tangible benefits to build more momentum for more expensive longer-term solutions. I would also have liked to see a third option here dedicated the South underpass solely as a completely separated multiuser path way to move towards a concept of ped/bike corridors not directly adjacent to roadways.
- I think that Concept 1 offers the best value for money for the Greenwood crossing improvement. It can be done relatively quickly and cheaply and provides a significant improvement in amenity for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Buffered AND (at least partially) protected bike lanes, please!
- I would like to see the shared use path have barrier separated bike infrastructure that protects bikes in the tunnel with retractable bollards for emergency vehicle use. I would also like the shared use path to be raised so that bikes don't have to go down as far and bike back up upon entering the tunnel.
- Just go big and wider on Hawthorne #1 with physically separated lanes for bikes and peds, and do modest improvements on Franklin and Greenwood - safer access both E and W, flashing Bikes in Roadway signs, more and regular signage, painting, speed humps with bike channels, increased patrolling (What happened to the bicycle police, or dare I say, foot patrols?) for both traffic and seedy feel, etc. Two lanes on Greenwood permanently adds to the traffic problem. Ebikes are here and will only increase, they can better handle the current underpasses. We cyclists deserve to be safer, but safety alone won't increase usage dramatically. A robust Hawthorne bridge is essential for Core Bend development.
- I like Concept 2 but we need a solution NOW so I favor the easiest. Be sure to fix the intersections, especially on the downtown side, to make them more comfortable and safer for people walking and bicycling.
- We need more protection from cars. Please elevate the shared use pathway at least a foot above the roadway and install some sort of barrier that is can be removed / flattened when emergency vehicles need to get through.
- Please, please add true vehicle protection/separation for any bike lanes or shared use paths.
- The shared use path should be protected from vehicles by raising it at least a foot above the roadway, adding a railing, and installing retractable bollards to keep cars off the shared use path while allowing use by emergency vehicles.

- I like this design a lot, as a runner I appreciate the wider walking path, and as a bike commuter I like the bike lane. I am a big fan of slightly raised bike paths (that emergency vehicles can still drive on) to create more of a divide between bikes and cars.
- It is very exciting to see designs to improve the Greenwood underpass! This is one I avoid traveling through by bicycle because of the number of close calls I have had with vehicles because of the lack of protective barriers and the cars' speed of travel. Concept #1 has many elements that will reduce traffic speeds but physical barriers need to be installed to further protect people on the shared use path from cars. Raise the shared-use path at least a foot from the roadway, install a railing, and install retractable bollards at the start of the underpass. These additions will allow emergency vehicles to pass as needed AND ensure that people on foot and on bikes feel safe and comfortable traveling through this corridor. It is unacceptable to have people so close to heavy traffic even on a shared-use path without these additional safety measures. We want to get these designs right so that the midtown crossings are inviting and truly user-friendly!
- Making this underpass one lane will increase road rage among drivers. Please consider leaving all lanes of traffic and improving the sidewalks AND bike lanes
- This underpass is the most dangerous for people who walk, bike, and roll currently. Vehicles travel at high speeds through this area, and it needs to be designed to slow down vehicles and provide physical protection for people of all ages and abilities who walk, bike, and roll. Currently, many people who walk, bike, and roll take longer routes and detours to avoid crossing here. I would support concept 1 only if the new shared use path is raised at least a foot above the roadway with a railing. Retractable bollards could be used to keep cars off the shared path while allowing use by emergency vehicles if needed. A mountable curb does not actually provide protection as any vehicle can come up into the shared use path and for older folks, families with young children, and less confident riders, this will not feel safe. We've seen that with the mountable bike lanes on Reed Market.
- Put a barrier between the "shared use path" and the traffic lane.
- A shared use path here makes no sense. I bike this route 2-3 times a week. The bike lane is generally sufficient- could be swept of debris more, but it's not a very pleasant pedestrian walkway.
- Lower and widen sidewalks to create a singular multi-use path at a higher grade than the travel lanes with the minimum drop necessary for people walking and rolling and keep the vehicle travel lanes narrow. Use retractable bollards to allow emergency vehicles to access the shared-use path in case of emergency, and this would also allow the shared-use paths to be used for vehicles during flooding events. Dropping the facilities for people walking and rolling down to road grade introduces unnecessary and difficult grades for people rolling to overcome, as well as safety concerns without the separation. Consider leaving the existing sidewalk and filling in one travel lane in each direction to create the raised multi-use path as a lower cost alternative.
- I would like to see the Greenwood improvements extend to adding protected bike lanes, wider sidewalks and safer pedestrian crossings west through to Wall St. The current arrangement of 4 vehicle travel lanes, a turning lane and 2 parking lanes is unnecessary, and makes this area inhospitable to pedestrians and cyclists. Given that the mix of businesses here already includes restaurants, theaters and pubs this area would be much better served with more space for people.

- The shared use path needs to be protected from vehicles by raising it at least a foot above the roadway, adding a railing, and installing retractable bollards to keep cars off the shared use path while allowing use by emergency vehicles.
- I avoid this intersection at all costs as a cyclist.
- Neither of these concepts provide good separation of bikes from traffic. Either of these concepts would be very good if they were modified to: 1. raise the bike lane/shared use path to provide vertical separation from traffic or 2. put in automatic steel bollards separating traffic from the bike lane/shared use path. Emergency vehicles could lower them when emergency access is required. Unless there is good separation of the bike lane/shared use path from traffic this will not be safe for all ages/all abilities and will only be used by experienced and confident riders.
- I don't think it's worth spending money on Greenwood. Very few cyclists are going to want to cross at Greenwood and 3rd and then continue on east, and few will use Greenwood coming from the east. Way too high traffic. However, the way the bike lane currently ends at Greenwood and Wall after running west-east continuously from Shevlin Park all the way to that spot, is very hazardous. There is no warning that the bike lane will end, and then there are then cars parked in what should be the continuation of the bike lane after crossing Wall. Those parking spots should be given over to a bike lane at least until past Bond and then there should be "sharrows" and signs that "Bikes may use full lane."
- In my pre-retirement days, I bicycled on Greenwood regularly and it was uncomfortable at best. Without bike lanes east and west of the underpass, I'm unlikely to ride on Greenwood now.
- Add jersey walls between car travel lane and shared-use path and you've got a winner
- As both a driver & a bike rider/pedestrian, I am concerned that constricting from four lanes of traffic to two will exacerbate already congested east-west vehicle traffic. As a bike rider this route is easily avoided by using Portland/Olney. I'd rather see money & effort go toward Hawthorne and Franklin concepts.
- Can there be some kind of awning over the walkway so that debris and dirt doesn't shake down onto pedestrians when trains are going by overhead?
- I'm a year-round bike commuter, and bike lanes often disappear after snow events. Plow push snow and slush into the bike lanes, which either completely block the lanes or turn them into a hellscape of ice or slush. So I'm forced to ride in the car lanes or walk. This turns ~20 minute commutes into 45 minute+ terrifying excursions. Bike infrastructure improvements are good, yes, but they do not function when car traffic is so heavily prioritized to the detriment of bicycle traffic.
- Is there any way to make it a protected bike lane? Using mountable curbs ala Reed Market by the park doesn't make me feel any safer as a bicyclist (it actually makes me feel a little more unsafe because if there's an obstruction in the bike lane, I don't feel safe riding off the mountable curb to avoid an obstruction). Perhaps having a stripe running down the shared use path as well, so pedestrians have an unspoken sign that faster bikes are on the path? Although if I was a pedestrian, I wouldn't walk that close to traffic when there's a raised sidewalk that offers me more protection from motor vehicles.
- If it's not financially feasible to do 2 at least do 1. Something has to be done. Lighting will be important as well as maintenance, keeping it clean and safe.
- This design is exciting. But I'm concerned that there will be no bike usage due to the areas of greenwood that lead into and out of this corridor. The entire approach and road

after the suggested improvements have no dedicated bike lanes. So while the underpass will be a huge improvement, getting into and out of the corridor will still be a nightmare.

- This project should have taken place years ago.
- neither seems like a great solution. I think we could do better.
- While concept two looks to be safer and better for pedestrians, the standard size bike lanes would still be a barrier for many people to bike underneath. Concept one seems like it would be more comfortable for bike travel
- Both options are sub-optimal because they don't provide bikes with separation from cars. You'll never get regular people to use this crossing unless they are separated physically from traffic. If you were to provide a physical barrier on the bike lane with option 2 then you could have kids and families walking riding up high and regular people would have the option to 'graduate' to riding down low once they are more comfortable with traffic. An alternate would be to make the upper lane wide enough for a single bike lane and a wide pedestrian walkway both of which would be elevated and separated from traffic.
- The existing ped/bike lanes are very narrow -- almost too small for a bike and ped or wheelchair and ped to bypass one another -- and Concept 1 doesn't improve that. As a bike rider who has experienced grumpy drivers on road diets, the "mountable ramp" seems inadequate to provide a safe lane.
- Quicker is better...but the savings should be redirected to more bike/ped options elsewhere!
- Liked Concept 2 better. Drawbacks are more short term with construction. Benefits are long term and will help the City comply with the new climate rules.
- Emphasize safety and security for walkers and bikers. Look for creative ways to bring in more light. Skylights in parkway (hwy 53, west Duluth Minnesota).
- We like the idea of a mixed-use path for times when there are not many users and cyclists or runners can hug the wall, but not feel forced against the wall.
- I wish that option 2 from the study were an option. The improvements need to extend to Harriman and 2nd street. I would like to see a mix of infrastructure changes (i.e. the construction of a more functional shared use path) but also more temporary/tactical urbanism related improvements (like planters as a buffer, more vegetation to slow down cars, better striping, signage). And the most important piece - ensuring adequate snow removal during the winter so it can be used year-round.
- Keep the area under the bridge more open and less conducive for the houseless to camp.
- Greenwood could have a three-lane cross section and real on street parking for business. Don't make this a band aid project.
- A comment about all the designs--the best designs may cost the most, but each will permanently alter the city layout. Do we want to be unique and attractive? Or maybe dull and Spartan. The final designs should be the ones that add the most benefit to the city in looks and functionality. It may take longer but we will still be here!
- Consider a physical barrier (bollards) between the vehicle and bicycle traffic for additional safety.
- Just make it less creepy! Option 1 looks lovely, and it's cheaper!
- Option one would miss key safety improvements.

- "Though Concept 2 provides better grades for pedestrians, concern with the wall for bikes. Doesn't feel as open/safer. Hope considering how this ties in to 3rd Street to the east and not just looking at the one block.
- Going with the cheaper concept allows for unforeseen cost increases and possibly having leftover money for improvements in other areas.
- I'd favor doing the Hawthorne bridge before anything else. Both green concepts are woeful band-aids. A ""mountable curb""? Really? The whole point is to keep different users separate from cars, not design in a way for them to easily jump the curb and squash you. Don't waste money here. Do Hawthorne. Then gather resources and fix Greenwood right, dig it out or make another bridge. Keep users separate, eliminate the dark foreboding tunnel that smells like piss and is filled with trash and dirty puddles.
- They are both terrible. 3 lanes will make traffic worse for very little improvement for bike or pedestrians
- Although bicyclists would use Concept 1 or 2, 1 is better because it can be put in place more quickly.
- Paint on the road is not bicycle infrastructure, but at least it's something, sort of.
- Bike lane adjacent and at grade with vehicles needs breakaway physical barriers and a mountable curb for separation while maintaining emergency vehicle access. Both options need to deal with the acoustics of vehicle noise to make it a more inviting experience for bikes and peds.
- I have no problem with how greenwood is currently situated. I walk through there frequently and when I bike, I chose to go to Franklin or Olney. So honestly whatever is the fastest upgrade makes the most sense to me. The tunnel is sometimes gross but it's not patently unsafe. Better lighting and more frequent cleanups would be nice. And the alternate bike routes aren't that much of a detour at all.
- I think lowering and widening the sidewalks to provide visibility is important. From a safety perspective I would feel much more comfortable with concept 2 as a pedestrian because it would give me more visibility which is something currently lacking in that underpass.
- Concept 2 is too dangerous for cyclists. Concept 1 is better, but the mountable curb also endangers cyclists/pedestrians. A full curb would make it more difficult for cars to accidentally veer up onto the ped/cycle path, and I think emergency vehicles could still drive over the full curb when needed.
- I think this will be good because it serves all users in a way that is sustainable and manageable.
- bicyclists and pedestrians will both benefit, and sharing is caring.
- Concept 1 does not provide adequate separation of the shared path from traffic lanes to protect pedestrians - the unusual design might confuse vehicle drivers and pedestrians as well. Concept 2 limits the road-level side-lane to bicycles only, to which both cyclists and drivers are accustomed.
- 1. The shared use path needs better separation from traffic. The shared use path in Concept 1 is not adequate for all ages/all abilities and Concept 2 is scary even for people comfortable riding in heavy traffic. 2. The concept needs to include bikeways from Wall to 3rd. This concept hints that may be coming. But there is no point in improving the underpass for bikes if bikes can't get to the underpass.
- Why do we need the turn lanes? Also, if buffered just means paint that isn't buffered just look how quickly the paint is removed by cars going over it. Overall concept is better

than current but could be even better. Close a lane to traffic on either side use jersey barrier or some other protective barrier. Test the concept then figure out the best implementation.

- Even if this takes a bit more time and money, now is the time to make the necessary improvements for the future.
- I like the wider view, seems to be more inviting and safer for pedestrians

In-Person Comments (16)

- Need to protect the path users from cars with fixed bollards at the merge
- Raised widened sidewalks. Provide wide raised sidewalks that continue east side and allow private businesses to have lively patios. Make transitions from bike lane on road to sidewalk.
- In concept 1, you have people walking with kids at the same level as cars. They won't do that if a sidewalk is available.
- I prefer lower sidewalks and improved sightlines from one end to the other.
- Keep the bike lane at street level so it is plowed, swept and maintained with the car lane.
- Grade separated above the roadway for concept two. Consider, if emergency vehicles are a priority, using activated bollards that will allow them to use the shared-use path. Vertical separation is the only way to make this, and all alternatives, more comfortable.
- This one isn't too bad right now as a pedestrian. It really needs cycling improvements most of all, which concept 1 would address.
- Neither - raise and widen sidewalks
- None. Do not waste money on these tunnels. You can widen them, you can paint them, but you will never get rid of the smell of urine. And they're not welcoming. You need a welcoming vision coming into the BCD.
- Reducing from four lanes to two lanes would be awesome and great for Bend!
- CET would love to see increased access to our stops on either side of the crossing. Any upgrades to our stops would be appreciated.
- This design will require much more improvements to the Greenwood corridor going east across Third Street. It is not accessible to cyclists who are east of third street.
- We should improve Greenwood faster, so we have an option while the bridge is being constructed.
- Honestly, I don't like either. The first is basically the same. The second seems like a lot of work for marginal improvement.
- Concept 1 would provide the most space for bikes, this is my preference of the two
- I just want traffic slowed down. I love the slightly raised bike path so that it stands out and emergency vehicles can use it if they want.

APPENDIX B: HAWTHORNE AVENUE COMMENTS

Below are the **unedited comments** participants submitted in the online and in-person open house about the Hawthorne Avenue designs.

QUESTION 4: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO TELL US ABOUT THE DESIGN CONCEPTS?

Online Comments (70)

- Honestly I'm currently against moving forward on any Hawthorne bridge concepts as they all to some degree shoehorn in a structure I to less than ideal space and location. The railroad already has partial grade separation in the upwards direction which causes the bridge to need additional elevation. Ramp grades and steps are problematic in our winter climate. The notion that the bridge be a "viewpoint" when it crosses a multilane highway and railroad in close proximity is faintly ridiculous, the town is already blessed by a multitude of available viewpoints of higher aesthetic value. Any solution that requires an elevator is to me a red flag that the goal has been lost. In short I think it would be better first to find a new home for the extensive petroleum handling facilities along 1st at a site north of town proximate to the railway, then build a master plan for a new mixed use residential/business neighborhood and only then consider this corridor as a part of that larger plan.
- 7.5% is too steep to be usable for most cyclists. Most will have to walk the climb, and the descent will become dangerous. Installing elevators will create an ongoing maintenance expense commitment, and these elevators, like many public elevators, may likely become unsafe and unpleasant places. I think that Concept 2 is the only viable option here. It has the benefit of providing a shorter path via the stairs for able pedestrians, while providing sensible grades for wheeled traffic.
- No elevators - maintenance complexity
- I would like the city to engage with people with disabilities to see if the grades for this project are acceptable. In addition, I would like elevators and stairs to be added so that people that bike, walk, and roll have more options. Furthermore, I would like the off ramp to be closed and for there to be no car parking on Hawthorne to emphasize that this project is a capstone project for pedestrian and bike infrastructure.
- C is the most urban design, allow the street frontages to continue to function, which the other 2 concepts would preclude. I think you should look at a wide woonerf style undercrossing of the RR and elevation of the parkway. This would provide excellent connectivity and allow the mid-town streets to develop into the urban levels contemplated in the Core Area Plan.
- Though I can see some positives in Concept 2, with stairs to bypass the ramps, that option would be a disservice to cyclists who very likely will be the highest use category for the bridge. Concept 3 virtually ignores them by only providing stairs and elevators. To serve its intended goal, of connecting the east and west sides of Bend via a pedestrian friendly route, all non-mechanized means of transportation need to be accommodated.
- The entry/exit needs to be friendly for people, and that means less cars. Can we make the entire corridor car-free? Or at least remove parking?

- These look really cool and I love the out-of-box thinking of adding a pedestrian/bike only bridge. Just please ensure it is well connected on either end to safe infrastructure for those outside of car.
- Cover the bridge. bridges were Covered for their protection. WE You could even have a solar roof.
- I should have rounded switchbacks and the addition of elevators and stairs.
- I think that the long bridge will be the most enticing to commuters and tourists. It clearly says "cross me!" and as a runner and bike commuter, I can totally see traveling across it often!
- A pedestrian bridge over the parkway and railroad into the future Bend Central District will elevate Bend to a new level as a sustainable, healthy, and people-forward city. This is also a huge undertaking. The City needs to engage communities that are both most vulnerable and may benefit the most from the project. This includes older adults, families with young children, and disabled folks. I believe Concept #2 will be the most comfortable, safe, and usable bridge design for most people, but I do not fall into any of the above categories! It seems like Bend can aim for better than the bare minimum for ADA compliance too. So I would like to see the addition of an elevator (with doors on both ends for bicycles and wheelchairs!) and stairs to Concept #2. Rounding the corners of the switchbacks will also improve usability for people in wheelchairs and on cargo bikes. These additions give more people options for easier, more straightforward travel that will make the bridge a truly viable option for active transportation across town. Concept #2 also does the most to make this a logical, uninterrupted corridor for pedestrian travel, adding to Bend's beauty and progressive transportation system. However, it could be even better if the the exit from the parkway onto Hawthorne is closed. This will remove conflict between traffic and people at the western end of the overpass. Also, if adequate access to the businesses and homes fronting Hawthorne can be provided from their rear alleys, removing parking and closing Hawthorne to vehicle traffic between Hill and the parkway should be explored to further enhance the pedestrian user experience. I am excited about the Hawthorne Avenue bridge proposal but I do not want the City to rush the design without considering how it can benefit people of diverse ages and abilities.
- YES! If these are the only choices, I'd opt for Concept 2, however I'd like to offer that, while perhaps more costly, an underpass would far better meet long term community pedestrians and bike riders. The underpass at Hwy 20 is a great example of what is possible. Even if more costly up front, and underpass can be used in winter months and is able to be constructed in a way that accommodates ADA rules.
- Hawthorne is supposed to be an iconic project for people who walk, bike, and roll, and so if we are going to spend all this money on it, we need to make it accessible and usable for people of all ages and abilities. Concept 2 (at least in my opinion as an able-bodied adult) provides the easiest crossing for people of all ages and abilities because the gentle slope lowers the physical effort to get up the ramp and increases safety while descending. The City should be proactively engaging the disabled community, older adults (e.g. Council on Aging), and families with young children at this conceptual stage to ensure the resulting overpass really meets their needs and doesn't just meet minimum ADA requirements. The sharp corners on the switchbacks should be rounded to make it easier to ride various kinds of bikes (e.g. cargo bikes, adaptive cycles) or steer a wheelchair through the switchbacks. Elevators and stairs should also be added to this

concept. The elevator should be designed so that people with wheelchairs or bikes can enter through a door facing the overpass and exit a second door directly onto the overpass without having to turn around in the elevator. It will be imperative that this project is constructed in conjunction with the BCD development and the entire Hawthorne corridor. I'd like to see options explored to ensure there is no conflict between vehicles and pedestrians for this iconic project (e.g. consider removing parking, closing the exit from the parkway onto Hawthorne, consider a car-free corridor).

- Like this crossing concept much better than rebuilding a whole US 97 or RR Xing bridge at Franklin. This option will be used by as many bikers as pedestrians, why would you consider anything that doesn't have a ramp for cyclists?
- Concept 3 seems like a lot of upkeep and kind of defeats the purpose of having a multi-purpose use path - attempting to bring my bike and kid up stairs or an elevator to get across town seems very challenging.
- Make Hawthorne a car-free corridor.
- Consider a concept with the switchback ramps but curved to allow for easier usage for people rolling on bikes. Any alternative with only elevators as the ADA Accessible route is not satisfactory, as they are liable to break down making it inaccessible for people with disabilities. Consider an alternative with all the options combined: the switchback ramps that are curved to provide a ~5% grade for people rolling, elevators that are double sided so people wheeling and using them can enter straight and exit straight, and stairs for that provide a straight path for people walking. The interior of the ramp curve could provide space for a resting area/benches/pocket park/viewing platform too. 7.5% is too steep of a slope to go up ~30 feet - it's difficult on a bike, pushing a stroller, or wheeling a wheelchair. 7.5% with level landings are not comfortable to use for people wheeling.
- 7.5% is not very steep and will be navigable for almost all users. A straighter bridge will be more user friendly, more aesthetically pleasing, and cost less.
- My preference is Concept 2, preferably with a design allowing for wide, rounded switchbacks, not tight corners that would be difficult to maneuver with a bike towing a trailer, for example. Using stairs to bypass switchbacks provides a more direct route for pedestrians. It's good to have both ramp and stair options. Elevators are highly undesirable, with concerns about cost, maintenance, reliability, sanitation and safety.
- There are two bridges in Portland that are exactly the same as Concept 3. Both were built by Trimet and one bridge is maintained by PBOT and the other by Trimet. The Gideon bridge has a useful detail to allow bicyclists to walk their bikes in a ramped gutter up the stairs. These bridges are extremely popular among bicyclists - elevators are large enough to fit a bike plus trailer and elevators are glass for security. Having the elevator will make travel easier in winter during weather events. Elevator maintenance is a fact of life for public agencies and in my view unavoidable with this bridge. Not installing an elevator due to maintenance requirements is not an acceptable reason to discount this option.
- Can we not just have better bike & ped crossing at Franklin and Greenwood. All 3 concepts are not as nice a full greenway connection bridge. Why don't we address Franklina and Greenwood first and then do Hawthorne in the future when it can be done fully
- All three concepts are not good. #1 7.5% grade is pretty steep. #3 too disruptive. 90 degree switchbacks on #2 only best option?
- Lighting- both on the structure as well as the entry/exit points

- An elevator and stairs should be added to this concept to provide for all ages and abilities. The elevator alone is not acceptable because of the risk of mechanical failure and subsequent periods that the bridge would not be useable. The switchbacks should be curved to make it easier for large bikes and wheelchairs to get around the curves. The exit from the parkway should be closed and, if access through the alleys to the houses and businesses along Hawthorne, east of Hill provide adequate access, this block of Hawthorne should be closed to cars. This is a very visible bike and pedestrian facility and users should have to contend with traffic coming off the parkway.
- For Concept 1, I'm afraid the 7.5% grade will discourage wheelchair and many bikers users. It may be within ADA requirements but will be difficult for some people to get up. Please explore other switchback configurations that might be easier for bikers to navigate. The sharp corners may discourage use. I think all access between the parkway and Hawthorne should be removed. If this is a ""premier"" pedestrian/bike project, it doesn't make sense to have cars coming off the parkway at its entrance. It could be just local access to the businesses along Hawthorne and providing parking for those businesses may be possible. If either Concept 1 or 2 is chosen, please build it so it would be possible to add stairs and elevator in the future. The elevator option would slow many people down while waiting for the elevator and, as Portland examples show, the entire overpass could be inaccessible for long periods of time when the elevator is broken.\
- I am a long-time (20+ years) bike commuter in Bend. I ride most of my commuting miles on a singlespeed cruiser bike, within 3-4 miles of my house on the west side. I often ride on errands to mid-town, or to Juniper Swim & Fitness. If you don't design the Hawthorne crossing in a way that will make it easy and attractive to cyclists they will look to use Greenwood or Franklin instead. For that reason, concepts 1 & 3 are non-starters. #1 with a 7.5% grade means it will be too steep for me, a very strong, experienced rider, to make it up riding my cruiser bike, and probably too fast for comfort for some on the descent. Very few cyclists are going to want to stop and get off and climb stairs or ride and elevator (#3). So that leaves #2. I have strong concerns with that concept as well, though of the 3 concepts it seems the most useful to the most people. Firstly, the switchbacks with 90 degree turns. These work well to decrease the gradient, and to slow down the speed of users to safer speeds, but can be awkward. This gradient can be ridden by most people. But I wonder if a corkscrew design with no 90 degree turns has been considered? This would be much more elegant and user friendly. Budget-wise, #2 will be expensive, and will mean probably only having available funds for accomplishing the minimum of repairs to Franklin and Greenwood. I'm not sure that it is the best use of funds. A big concern is how any of these three options connects to the rest of the proposed Low Stress Bicycle Network. Will there be dedicated bike lanes on either side of the bridge? What happens on the east side of the bridge with having to cross 3rd Street? How will that be made safer and more accommodating to cyclists? And then once across 3rd street will there be dedicated bike lanes for moving north and south on 4th street? It would make the most sense forbid lanes to be on 4th street, since both 5th and 6th are discontinuous. I would prefer to have one continuous and safe low-stress east- west route that would run from Skyliners, Galveston, Riverside, Franklin, 10th, and Bear Creek out to 27th, or beyond. (Please add bike lanes to Bear Creek, after it crosses Purcell ASAP! There is a dedicated bike lane all the way to that point, and then it just ends with no warning, and no shoulder, much less a bike lane.

- I would be unlikely to use an elevator out of personal safety concerns. Switchbacks are ok if they are wide enough to safely allow two-way traffic. How will bike lanes on Hawthorne connect through downtown (say for someone heading to COCC)? As much as I like the concept of a ped/bike bridge, if the through connection is difficult (such as unprotected left turns across traffic), I would choose another route.
- If there is only money available for one improvement, this would be my preferred alternative.
- I'd rather see more attention given to the crossing at Olney Avenue than Hawthorne, but of these designs I am most excited by Concept 1. Concept 3 seems like a terrible idea. The plaza area will become a homeless camp by day one.
- As long as mobility devices are able to support people on the 7.5% grade, I prefer Concept 1. Otherwise, I prefer Concept 3.
- Elevator only for wheelchair users and bicyclists seems like a nightmare to maintain which will result in a broken elevator and an unusable, expensive bridge for two historically underrepresented groups in the transportation realm. I'm also worried about the 7.5% grade being the bare minimum for ADA compliance. Bare minimum is not groundbreaking, it's not equitable, and it's not a vision of what Bend wants to be. Therefore, it appears switchback ramps it is. How is 2 way bike lane accessed from the east? Will bicyclists be crossing traffic in the 2nd st intersection to access? How do bicyclists get other places after they exit the bridge? Cross scary congested traffic at 3rd St, Greenwood, or Franklin? What does the turn radius on the switchback ramps look like if there are people/bikes/other users going in opposite directions at the same time? What about "S" shapes or corkscrews for the ramps - I lived in Denver and they had a great corkscrew on a bridge that helped peds/bikes cross the interstate. Also, the stairs had a spot for bicyclists to wheel their bikes up the stairs if they preferred that method.
- I understand that cost will be an issue; however, an iconic bridge will help create an identity for the community, as well as all of our visitors and transient traffic who will travel under it. If cost comes into play, please seek out Stakeholders and Shareholders within the community to assist, similar to the roundabout art project. DO NOT do an underpass crossing...haven't we learned enough from Franklin and Greenwood!?
- As a senior woman, I would not be able to use stairs easily and I would not feel secure in an elevator. Switchback ramps would seem to be ugly unless very well designed and that option seems to be without a significant benefit.
- Limit Car traffic on Eastern side to business use only, making it pedestrian-only. Integrate surrounding properties into design. Make the bridge as wide as humanly possible to create a sense of place and make it beautiful.
- Concept 1 is my favorite, with 2 as a second. Please do not implement concept 3. Bikers will never use concept 3 and the goal here is to get people to stop using their cars.
- The no ramps option is bonkers. Why would you build that? Switchback ramps would be super unattractive.
- I prefer Concept 1 due to its more graceful appearance, lesser cost, and avoidance of the elevators
- I like the straight bridge but if its not ADA compliant then it seems like it wouldn't be the best idea or the most equitable, so Concept 2 might be better in that case. Definitely not concept 3 due to it not being bikeable.
- Although I prefer concept 1, I understand it might be problematic for rolling pedestrians. The entire Hawthorne crossing is problematic though because it doesn't connect to

anything. There's no safe way for bikes/peds to get to either side of the bridge so It will not see much use without major connectivity changes to the neighborhoods on either side.

- PLEASE, an overpass to get bikes, peds and wheelchair users out of the flow of traffic and out of the sinky, dirty, funky tunnels! Concept 1: I have used a very similar overpass from UW Seattle campus to the new Husky Stadium light rail station. It's curved, wide and sweeping and a delight to ride or walk. The flat sections seemed to provide enough respite for people to navigate the incline.
<https://www.seattlebikeblog.com/2015/07/21/sound-transit-will-finally-open-that-awesome-bikewalk-bridge-over-montlake-blvd-wednesday/>
- Most effective as a bikeway and reduces the distance traveled to cross. I assume the landings make it ADA compliant. Hawthorne west of parkway should dead end to a turnaround or connect on the city owned land to NW Irving. The "right-off" would not be a good use of the public ROW, and would danger to bike/ped users.
- Definitely prefer option 1 as a biker. I've used option 2 in other cities and the sharp corners are less convenient.
- Option 1 provides the highest possibility for long term success of the bridge because it is the easiest to navigate for all users. Bicyclists will appreciate the straight run design and will not penalize wheelchair users by having to take a detour where able bodies users can use the shorter stair option of Concept 2. While the slope of Concept 1 might be slightly steeper, it will still be under ADA maximums and will be required to have level landings every 30" in rise (approximately 30' length) for resting. I would encourage Concept 1 to be as wide as possible to create a greenway feel as opposed to a narrow bridge. Users should be encouraged to stop along the bridge with multiple seating areas instead of a single 'pause' area (see the HighLine in NYC)
- Don't like keeping on street parking on Hawthorne; especially with traffic exiting the Parkway. Do like the stairs and elevator elements of Option #3. Safety concerns can be addressed with design and lighting. Better for long term access for those people who use mobility devices to get around.
- A well-lit elevator, maybe glass? Large enough for at least two bikes. Elevator easier for somebody in a wheelchair. Would need to keep it safe and clean. Art displays? Small plazas on top? Put a solar panel on the roof? Most users maybe walkers if bikers can also use Franklin or Greenwood. Would a spiral ramp at 4% grade also work?
- Long term elevator maintenance is what got us thinking about how often elevators smell or are used for other purposes. Although we liked the low cost estimate and impact to roads, we picked the first option for its design simplicity and beauty.
- I think this is the most difficult one to decide. I think if Franklin develops concept 2, then bikers will choose that route over the long ramp of concept 1 or the switchback ramp of concept 2. I would say focus on pedestrians on the Hawthorne crossing.
- This would be ideal. Make it as easy as possible. Concept 3 is fine, but concern about the steps when it's winter with ice/snow.
- An elevator is ripe for misuse and abuse, as well as potential safety issue. Why isn't the bridge presented by the citizen volunteers, the one that is a suspension type bridge included in the concepts? Why go with these visually obtrusive concepts? It may cost more but why not attempt alternative funding sources for it?

- I would like to see the city focus on the upgrades to existing issues before starting new projects. If the project were to go ahead anyway, I would choose the least expensive concept 1.
- If bike accessibility is a real priority for Bend (as a bike commuter from Redmond, please make this a priority!), concept 2 is the only one that provides a real, tangible solution.
- Section B in each of the designs looks to have bike lanes almost the same width as the car lanes, which seems ridiculous since cars need considerably more space to travel safely.
- 1) We really, really need a completely separated way for bikes and peds to travel east-west, with more than a mere curb or painted line separating us from autos. 2) This bridge has potential to be very good for side benefits like being one of a few places in town you can actually walk and see the mountains. Always nice to take visitors or direct tourists to such a location, and nice for residents too! 3) When discussing slope of the ramps, it would be very useful to reference an existing city street/block with the same grade, so people can go out and ride or walk and experience what 4.5% vs. 7.5% really feels like.
- Most users will be wheeled. Stairs, switchbacks and elevators a pain for wheels. Outdoor elevators a maintenance problem and a gift to thieves. Give up on 2nd street going mixed use. Too valuable for commerce due to rail access. Living next to railroad too loud. No one wants it but some city planners. Just dumb idea."
- Concept 1 and 2 would be appreciated by bicyclists. Concept 3 would not.
- Incorporate bridge support structure on east side with new commercial or residential building on 2nd street. Elevator for new building structure could also support use of the overpass.
- Switchbacks is probably safest if the width of the turns of the switchbacks are wide enough to accommodate a bike towing a trailer and gaps and gutters for snow clearing. If there is not adequate space for larger turns then the straight bridge. The elevator is a nightmare waiting to happen. There are the obvious problems like breakdowns and line-of-sight issues; but also the less thought out ones like if the elevator would be adequately sized for a cargo bike or bike fiat and would thus prove pointless to many users.
- Elevator maintenance sounds like a nightmare. A small handful of people are going to have to deal with losing their views.
- I want a big, beautiful, expensive, accessible bridge, that is wide enough to support heavy traffic by both pedestrians and cyclists simultaneously
- How about a spiral ramp? The DeFazio bridge in Eugene utilizes one and it works reasonably well. It's not a huge footprint.
- Concept 1 could work if there are heated sidewalks, but too dangerous in the winter and not ideal for anyone with mobility issues. Concept 2 is best of all three but price might be prohibitive. Concept 3, the elevators are going to become trashed and potentially unsafe.
- I dislike the concept of using a bridge to cross Hawthorne. I believe the community will be better served with a ped and bike undercrossing at Hawthorne, allowing emergency vehicle access also.
- Absolutely NO to the other two - the "switchback" design will be too hard to navigate bikes through quickly and everyone will bottleneck. Plus it's ugly. Absolutely NOT to the elevators - it's a huge accessibility and safety issue. This needs to be a thoroughfare for everyone, which should mean equal access for everyone. Forcing 2/3 of travelers (bikes,

those who can't do stairs) onto an elevator to get from one side of the bridge to another is ludicrous. I'm really concerned about the 7.5% grade on the first option, though. That's way too steep for manual wheelchairs. Instead of the switchbacks, could you reduce the grade by adding one big swoop to the north, out over the train tracks and highway? That's the only reasonable thing I can imagine that will be universally accessible!

- While Concept 3 is not bike-friendly, the smaller footprint is more aesthetic, and adequate for pedestrians; bikes will have the other two routes as options. I'm not sure whether the benefits of any Hawthorne crossing outweigh the costs, though - I would suggest doing Greenwood and Franklin projects first, then reassess need for a third crossing.
- I think focus on the one that is most likely to happen. Any crossing there would be great and would go a long way towards a true connection between downtown and midtown. I think it would really make that part of town something special.
- All of the street level bikeways are missing PHYSICAL BARRIER between cars. This is essential to motivate people to use this passage way. Otherwise people won't feel safe and will choose to drive
- I like the lower incline. I think the elevator option would be used as a bathroom, no much maintenance, ongoing problems.
- It would be helpful to know more about what a 7.5% grade would feel like/how steep. Perhaps give another street in Bend as reference. I obviously like the price more of Concept 1 but feel like there is a balance to make sure this is a facility that all users can use. Perhaps something with a 5-5.5% grade for final design that could help lower costs but not make it uncomfortable for elders/bikers/wheelchairs.
- While the Hawthorne Bridge bike/ped bridge may be referenced in a Transportation System Plan does not mean this is a prudent use of funds. How many miles of sidewalk infill or buffered bike lanes could be built elsewhere for the cost of the least expensive of these concepts?

In-Person Comments (23)

- I think this will be likely used by bikes than #3
- Close the "right off" at the Hawthorne's west side and connect with a slow one-way road and north-south bike path. Get funding from developers.
- Add more sweeps to get it to 6 or 7% grade, make a big viewpoint at the top as a tourist attraction, use guardrails (angled, tall) to avoid throwing into highway to Concept 1. Also provide stairs and elevators for folks that can't wheelchair at 7.5% grade for a long distance. Contact Todd Taylor and integrate the design into a private building. He wants to do it.
- Skip this all together and spend \$ on both Greenwood and Franklin. This seems redundant after Greenwood and Franklin improvements.
- I especially dislike concept 3 as a cyclist. The switchbacks seem to dangerous to navigate on a bike. I like the Three Sisters Bridge design.
- The Three Sisters Design is wonderful! It would become an icon of Bend.
- I think this crossing should be priority three. Do Franklin and Greenwood first and then see if people still want a bridge.
- 7.5% is not universally accessible for people with disabilities, even with level landings for that many vertical feet. Stairs should be on all alternatives. Elevators too, as to maintain

accessibility. Elevators, when it breaks down, means the bridge will not be accessible for people with disabilities. Verify if grades meet ODOT and railroad requirements.

- Is there potential to combine switchback and straight approach to provide swift bike access and lower grade?
- As a hand cyclist, concepts 2 and 3 would be very difficult. I'd probably have to still use Franklin! As a wheelchair user, a 7.5% grade is fine. Plenty of city streets are steeper. Public elevators outdoors seems like they'd be expensive, smell and hard to maintain. (And impossible [to use] as a cyclists.) Keep is simple, cheap(er) and sleek.
- Add stairs on first street and near 97. I'm weary of any option that excludes ramps because, in my mind, a major use of this bridge will be bikes. They're not going to use stairs or elevator. And bikes with disabilities who strap into their bike cannot dismount to use elevators. Public elevators always get abused and are just as scary as the Franklin tunnel...Not a good option. My vote is a straight bridge on the east and west side, if possible, or just on the east side (because of Second Street rise) and a switchback on west side if the ramp angle doesn't work. Ideally, straight through. Adding stairs to list and near 97 on the west side would also be good to have both. No need for parking on west Hawthorne.
- The Signature Bridge is my favorite concept - beautiful and elegant. No elevator, if possible. Could get very messy and feel dangerous at night. The Bridge concept feels modern, fresh and new.
- The overall preference. Elevators are a bad idea, they would get trashed/soiled.
- Either concept 1 or 2. Speaking as a woman, I find elevators scary. I wonder who else may get on and I'm trapped and can't leave. Either of these bridge designs will give you what you need to develop the BCD. Crossing over the bridge, a person will get a view of the entire downtown area. It will be a huge "oh wow!" experience. A huge asset to this area of town.
- Signature Bridge
- I think this is a wonderful concept for 20 years down the road after a good bike network is developed on Franklin and Olney as the major east-west crossings. It will need major money to improve cycling east and west from the overcrossing.
- Minneapolis has a good system in place like concept 1
- Hawthorne Bridge should be the priority. Make it beautiful.
- The first is great so bikers can easily go straight over. It's also great the bikers and pedestrians get their own space. I like the bike overpass as an option to try and figure out in other locations around Bend. Concept 2 wastes a lot of space. Concept 3 is really cumbersome for bikers to stop, go up stairs or wait for elevators and then go.
- Elevators would use electricity and require additional maintenance, causing higher ongoing costs in the long run. Down the road, I do not think these would be views as positively. Switchbacks would make the bridge more cumbersome to navigate since it is longer and has the turns. This, as well as stairs, will cause annoyances for cyclists, who would then be more likely to opt for another roadway undercrossing. Three Sisters Bridge would be super cool and visually appealing. I think people would love it.
- I like the simplicity.
- I love the Timber Bridge but also the Three Sisters, if wood was included in that design.
- Concern with it being in a location that homeless congregate

APPENDIX C: FRANKLIN AVENUE COMMENTS

Below are the **unedited comments** participants submitted in the online and in-person open house about the Franklin Avenue designs.

QUESTION 6: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO TELL US ABOUT THE DESIGN CONCEPTS?

Online Comments (63)

- The tunnel needs drainage and to be regularly clean. There is constant standing water in the tunnel and now mud/silt built up from summer rainstorms.
- I'm torn on choosing option 1 here as option2 is far better strategically, but option 1 is more pragmatic and achievable in the short term. Also a large factor for me would be the total loss of this corridor during reconstruction when it already sees significant use.
- I don't think it's good value for money to do the full rebuild and widening at Franklin. A better alternative would be to make Franklin one way to motor vehicle traffic and use the other traffic lane as a shared-use path.
- I would like the buffered bike lane and the shared use path to have barrier separation so that bikes are protected from vehicles. In addition I would like the shared use path in the tunnel to be raised up so that bikes and pedestrians don't have to go down so far only to have to go back up out of the tunnel.
- Just go big and wider on Hawthorne #1 with physically separated lanes for bikes and peds, and do modest improvements on Franklin and Greenwood - safer access both E and W, flashing Bikes in Roadway signs, more and regular signage, painting, speed humps with bike channels, increased patrolling (What happened to the bicycle police, or dare I say, foot patrols?) for both traffic and seedy feel, etc. Two lanes on Greenwood permanently adds to the traffic problem. Ebikes are here and will only increase, they can better handle the current underpasses. We cyclists deserve to be safer, but safety alone won't increase usage dramatically. A robust Hawthorne bridge is essential for Core Bend development.
- There is no point in a partial fix for this crossing. Focus on Greenwood first then tackle this one.
- Not good enough! We need to elevate the shared use lane at least one foot above the roadway AND install a barrier of some sort between cars and people.
- Widening will certainly help, but the bike lanes/shared use paths need to be protected. Both actual and perceived safety from cars is paramount.
- The shared use path should be raised at least a foot from the roadway and equipped with a railing to protect people walking, biking, or rolling from traffic.
- I appreciate that the second concept is more costly, time intensive and complex, but it is the inevitable change that is going to have to occur at one point, so the change should

be made now. Option 1 is essentially cosmetic and does nothing to meaningfully deal with the congestion and narrowness that non-vehicle commuters face in the tiny sidewalks. As mentioned in the write up on this project, the current Franklin corridors is the most used by non-motorized traffic of the corridors and that is because of the easy access to downtown and the generally useful pedestrian and biking infrastructure both and east and west up to the corridor.

- Franklin is the crossing used most by people who walk/bike in Bend right now. I tend to go out of my way to cross here instead of other east-west crossings. That's why getting this update right is so important. Concept #1 does nothing to improve travel for people who walk, bike, and roll so it is not worth pursuing. If bikes are expected to travel on the roadway, they must have physical barriers to protect them from vehicular traffic. It makes sense for the full rebuild and widening of Concept #2 to also include a shared use path that is raised at least 1-2 feet from the street and with barriers like bollards to make people feel safer and more comfortable riding alongside cars. We also need physical protection for the bike lane beyond the underpass - paint for buffered bike lanes wears away and does not help people of all ages and abilities feel safe biking. Let's make these undercrossings something that people will actually be excited about using - that's what the GO Bond directed the City to do and that's what will help make Bend a more sustainable and healthy place to live, work, and play.
- I do not support raised bike lanes, but a barrier to protect users would be great. Management of this underpass needs to be part of the plan. How will the bike and pedestrian lane be maintained by city staff on a regular basis?
- The shared use path should be raised at least a foot above the vehicle travel lane with a railing (1) to protect people walking, biking, or rolling from traffic; and (2) for older folks who might need the support. Concept 1 (Widen and Level East Access Only) does not actually improve safety for people who walk, bike and roll, and would be a waste of funds. I'd also like to see an option that preserves the existing structure and artwork that closes down a lane of vehicle travel for Franklin (turn it into a one way) with a raised multi use path with a railing as well. It would be more affordable, avoid the permitting process with the railroad, and provide actual improvements.
- How many reports of criminal activity have there been in the tunnels? How many people have been injured at this undercrossing? I can't decide whether to support a full rebuild of this crossing without knowing which crossing location has the lowest cost to build high-end pedestrian amenities. I would support a full crossing at one location, the one where it makes the most economical sense and where there is highest demand. I don't think people will go out of direction for a new crossing, they'll keep using the one they have in direct path to their destination.
- Franklin is the most significant improvement needed to connect the east and west sides of Bend.

- Concept 1 seems to make absolutely no changes to the current safety concerns with the Franklin Ave crossing - I do not understand why it is even being considered if it doesn't improve safety.
- The Franklin underpass has been scary for a long time. The houseless population often sleep/ take shelter. Cars and trucks often have difficulty sharing the space with cyclists. As Bend's population has tripled this East/ West corridor is in huge need of improvement.
- Consider one way
- The Franklin and Greenwood underpasses are known issues during rain events and stormwater needs to be dealt with so pedestrians and cyclists aren't stranded due to standing water in the bottom. Considering elevating the shared use path.
- Neither of these concepts would be my preference for improving the pedestrian and cycling experience at Franklin. Concept 1 is only a marginal improvement. Concept 2 provides more space for cyclists, but without separation does not meet community expectation for safe cycling infrastructure. And will also be very expensive and time consuming. I encourage the City to look at alternatives that do not require expensive bridge rebuilding but allocate more space for cyclists and pedestrians. Reducing vehicle traffic to one way and creating a wide, separated shared path would achieve this.
- A full rebuild is needed, everything is too narrow. The shared use path needs to be raised at least a foot from the roadway and equipped with a railing to protect people walking, biking, or rolling from traffic. Ideally bikes and peds would be separated. If the rebuild is going to widen let's add even a bit more space and do it right.
- Concept 1 is not an improvement in any meaningful way to the current situation and would be a waste of time and resources. Concept 2 needs to have good separation between the shared use path and traffic. Raising the shared use path a couple of feet and putting in a barrier on the traffic side of the path could accomplish this.
- This is the most important of all the concepts to fully develop east-west routes.
- Concept 2, while expensive, provides a safe and direct east-west connection from midtown to downtown and connects up into a route that already has a decent bike lane all the way from Skyliners to where it unfortunately ends at Bear Creek Rd & Purcell. Concept 1 is a waste of funds. It does little to make biking safer, especially coming from the Eastside. Currently when I ride west from 3rd on Franklin, I am forced to decide between a narrow tunnel or the underpass. The tunnel is difficult to access, given there are often cars at the stop sign on 1st street waiting to turn onto Franklin, and they are blocking the entrance to the tunnel. The existing tunnels are in no way wide enough for a shared use path. Alternatively, if I ride on the road through the underpass, it's not at all comfortable, as I have a wall close by on the right, no shoulder, and fast moving traffic stuck behind me if I take the full lane. I would much prefer to see Concept 2 on Franklin and no new crossing on Hawthorne. Franklin is direct, and interconnected, whereas

Hawthorne is non-continuous and would mean having to travel north or south on 4th to get to Franklin or Greenwood(?) or Olney/Neff to continue east-west. Having dedicated routes on Franklin on the south and Olney/Neff on the north would allow the most flexibility for cyclists.

- Still absent from this design is the protection that a concrete barrier provides to those walking and biking on this corridor. Changing the layout of the corridor without separating car travel lanes (which encourage 30+mph speeds) from people walking and biking will end being infrastructure no one uses.
- Make sure there is plenty of light in the undercrossing.
- I hope both concepts include fixing drainage issues on the sidewalks. I always hate riding through the puddles of unknown liquids in the tunnels. Going eastbound, the bike lane resumes part way up the slope, I take the lane to avoid using the tunnel. A quick improvement would fix the low storm grate just east of the tunnel and allow bikers to get back in the bike land sooner.
- Important travel corridor that could really benefit from improvements. I don't see much improvement in Concept 1 so either go with Concept 2 or concentrate on Hawthorne Crossing.
- Given the flooding at this underpass, a full rebuild needs to happen anyway. Concept 1 makes no sense since it doesn't address the main issue - the bridge tunnels! I do hope with the rebuild we can have some artist murals again. Those are lovely.
- Concept 1 and I quote "Does not provide any improvements for people walking or bicycling in the undercrossing." How is this a pedestrian and bicycling crossings feasibility study then?!? Nothing is being improved. Give pedestrians and bicyclists more space, give them a protected place to transit through (paint doesn't protect people). I feel like there were some alternative concepts floating around that looked really cool for Franklin and weren't part of the City of Bend's current plants. Maybe check in with Ashley Vance staff to get their feedback?
- I recognize that option 2 is very unlikely but it is aspirational and obviously the better of the two. If it's not possible then try for 1 if funding remains.
- Do not spend more than a full Hawthorne Bridge to totally redo this corridor. Do the cheaper option.
- There is really no point in implementing concept 1. It's basically just refreshing the look of both sides of the bridge without actually improving the bridge itself. Waste of money.
- Concept 1 addresses almost none of the major issues with this undercrossing. It's awful that it's even being considered. Again, we can do better.
- I consider Concept 1 to be a lesser solution, but preferable due to the significant cost difference, and the likelihood that a Hawthorne crossing will become the main route

- Seems worth it to wait longer term until we can fund this appropriately to do a meaningful project (concept 2), rather than do something quicker that has minimal benefit for bike/ped (concept 1)
- Both options are sub-optimal because they don't provide bikes with separation from cars. You'll never get regular people to use this crossing unless they are separated physically from traffic. If you were to provide a physical barrier on the bike lane with option 2 then you might get people to actually use the crossing.
- What Bend needs is the Hawthorne bridge. When that happens, I probably won't ride that stanky, scary Franklin underpass. But an underpass is still needed and the surface is currently in terrible condition. Can't ride my commuter bike over the bumps, dips and craters (and humans, and human waste, and trash, ...) So fix the crumbling structures, try to make life a little nicer for the self-propelled.
- If this is the option chosen, focus on getting this right. Yes, accept there will be traffic closures and unhappy people, but if we're focusing on long-term access and ensuring safe travel for people on foot or on bike, Concept 2 does this.
- Franklin is the present crossing I use the most. I often don't like it. It needs a rebuild. Emphasize safety and security. Get in more light. Glass skylights in the parkway that can be driven on?
- This seems like the most important but also the most expensive, so we are concerned for this project. The second option stands out among the two because it actually addresses the issue and the benefits/drawbacks admit this.
- IMO, of the three options, Franklin corridor likely has the best cost-benefit outcome. It is centrally located and could be more easily integrated with pedestrian/bike lanes. Kudos to the planning department for a very well designed presentation!
- Concept 1 seems like a temporary fix, as the connection to the eastside is more accessible, there will be much more bike and pedestrian traffic. let's choose Concept 2 to ensure safety, and not having to redo the project in another 10 years.
- Why even bother with doing concept 1? If you can't afford concept 2 save the money until a complete safety overhaul can be done. Don't be short sighted. This city needs planner with long term vision otherwise you are wasting money!
- This area does not currently feel safe at night. Opening up the tunnel so that the pathway is more visible would make me feel safer walking at night alone.
- This is the homeless tunnel but also the most direct route. Make it safe. Better lights and perhaps cameras?
- As a bike commuter, this is the route I take every day and it is wildly dangerous. Please improve!
- It's wise to move bicycles off the road used by cars.
- Get rid of the tunnels of darkness. Keep peds and cyclists separate from cars, by something more than just a painted line or basic curb.

- If you are not fixing the problems (option 1) don't waste the money. Franklin is a real mess for more than just sidewalks. Fix it right.
- Cyclists would appreciate and use Concept 1 or 2. 2 is too expensive.
- If it takes longer so be it, the result will be much better for a long time
- I think concept 1 is more feasible but in a dream world option two would be amazing. Visibility is really bad in the tunnel, the traffic patterns on with side of the bridge area confusing for all users, and while this generally feels like a safe way to travel on bike and foot it gets really trashy, the drains clog easily and is difficult to negotiate when multiple people are using it.
- Full visibility is really important to a sense of safety and would increase my usage of this corridor
- This is the access we use most often on bicycles and it is especially scary for my husband who has trouble adjusting to the change in contrast when going through the tunnel. It really needs the widening provided by the second option.
- Concept 2: Move bikes up onto multi use pathway in A and C sections and it would get my vote. Concept 1 isn't great either, if its possible to widen the ped tunnels, I think that's the solution.
- let's do this right by going with concept 2, it will serve the community for many decades.
- Its worth the wait and the \$ to do it right - otherwise the PRIMARY issue for people walking and biking is NOT solved. The focus should 100% be for improving the experience for people walking, biking, and using mobility devices. If not done right on this go around, then it will likely have to be redone in the future.
- If the goal is to provide adequate access for both pedestrians and bike commuters, Concept 2 is the only adequate way to get there. The existing tunnels (Concept 1) are not adequate for peds & bikes (I notice your cross-section B doesn't even try to show bikes in the tunnels), which means bike commuters will have to remain using the roadway, which is scary. Concept 1 might work if there is some way to improve bike safety in the roadway undercrossing - maybe reduced speed limits (enforced), better marking (sharrows, etc.), and "bike in tunnel" warning lights.
- 1. The shared use path through the underpass needs to be protected from traffic. 2. Getting the sidewalks down from cross-section A and C to the shared use path in cross-section B may make those sidewalks very steep. 3. The left turn lane onto 1st street may help with vehicle traffic but may make it more difficult for people crossing 1st on foot or bike. Can that intersection be right-in/right-out?
- I'm not sure the Franklin improvements would work or improve usage without addressing the safety of underpass. It seems like it just needs to be completely re-done.
- All bikeways and shared use path need PHYSICAL BARRIERS separating users from traffic. Children and anyone not physically able should feel safe using this right of way without fear of traffic interfering with their travel.

- There is no point in considering Concept 1 since it doesn't even address the basic ped/bike safety issues that make this crossing so dangerous.
- I like the idea of it being open and inviting. Safer options for pedestrians

In-Person Comments (19)

- This is the only option which will increase bike use as well as improve safety.
- Improving the grading and drainage of the sidewalk would be the best bang for the buck. Road can flood but make the paths drain.
- Raise sidewalks and bike path. No need to bike down and up. Go big with the design!! Raise the vision for the community. The next Bond needs to have enough money to do it correctly. Integrate into built environment on each side.
- This should be the number one priority. Make this the preferred east-west route.
- I recognize that concept 2 is more expensive but this seems most needed in the long run since this is a major east-west crossing. I do not feel safe in the Franklin tunnel. As a cyclist, I always share the road.
- Critical to make as big an improvement as possible. It's the most popular crossing and is the worst design currently.
- Neither concept! Concept 3: widening with multiple path higher than road grade. What is the grade of the road going under and out of the under crossing? Putting the walking and biking facilities at road grade will not be ADA grade or accessible. Vertical separation is needed between vehicles and people walking and biking to make it comfortable.
- Provide some separation between bikes and peds on shared path. Mountable curb under bridge so bikes can access street.
- This one badly needs a redo, more than Greenwood.
- Major concerns I have with presented concepts are separating bikes from cars safely. Better to widen pedestrian and bike path and keep both separate from cars. I'd rather see bike and ped raised and car road on its own level. The concept as-is does not seem to consider flooding/drainage. Lowering bikes and peds would just cause splashing and anger when flooding occurs. Even if you fix drainage, there's no need to lower peds/bikes. Instead separate both from cars and keep elevated with widened path on both sides.
- None
- Concept 1 would be great just because it would have valuable changes fast!
- The tunnels are terrible. Any way to remove them is great!
- Concept 2 has the lowest cost overall because it is already part of a network for east-west. We need to build networks not nice oasis between very busy streets that are too busy to ride now.
- Franklin should be the lowest priority.

- Not really excited by either.
- Concept 1 provides no improvements for cyclists as the most dangerous part is not changing with concept 1.
- Pedestrians can go to Hawthorne if they want.
- If you can add some wood into it.

APPENDIX D: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Below are the **unedited comments** participants submitted in the online and in-person open house.

QUESTION 8: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO TELL US ABOUT THE DESIGN CONCEPTS OR YOUR VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF MIDTOWN PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE CROSSINGS PROJECT?

Online Comments (80)

- I live in midtown and commute on bike to the westside daily. I don't particularly favor one of these over the others, I just hope that one of them is made to the safest standard and I will use that.
- I bike the franklin tunnel a lot on my way to work. I'm in favor of any of the changes but the tunnel needs drainage and to be clean regularly. Regardless of what changes are made people are not going to bike it or use it if there is standing water, mud (like how it is currently) and broken glass.
- Greenwood is the easiest, quickest, and cheapest option to make some significant improvements in east-west connectivity, so I believe it should be prioritized ahead of the other longer-term projects. Following Greenwood, I think the Hawthorne Bridge project should be next, as it is an overpass rather than underpass, and provides close connectivity to the Hawthorne transit center.
- Prefer buffered AND protected bike lanes. Prioritize space to pedestrian and bike-use over vehicle (e.g. reduce car lanes). No elevators due to maintenance complexities and cost.
- Each of these projects needs to be done in conjunction with the whole corridor being improved. Simply addressing the actual crossing is not enough. I think Greenwood should be the highest priority because it can be done for the least amount of money and the fastest. I suggest doing a quick build to allow for concept testing right away on this project.
- Hawthorne project #1 can make crossing all the way into the heart of the hope-to-be-developed core easy, and aid general E/W bike and pedestrian traffic, but be sure to make the overpass even more robust. This will take pressure off of the need to

drastically improve the Greenwood and Franklin corridors. Make Hawthorne wider overall, for starters. By the time it is completed, it'll be a 90%+ ebike world, so physically separating bikes from pedestrians, baby carriages, toddlers, and the elderly will be important. Speed bumps in the bike lanes. E/W bike lanes. We know how crazy it's going to be - ebikes barreling through at 20MPH, inexperienced riders, fools, drunken others. If Hawthorne is a legitimate and robust bike/pedestrian corridor, we can strive to make Greenwood and Franklin better, but we don't have to don't go crazy. Greenwood needs to be 4 car lanes, (it's just reality, though hopefully it will be 4 lanes of electric cars), improve the access to the underpasses both E and W as seen in most of the concepts, put up large, flashing BIKES IN ROADWAY signs, repaint lines and signs more often, police the area for both unsafe driving and the general, unsafe vibe (another can of worms), put in traffic slowing devices - speed humps - with channels for all the bikes zipping through, though with the aforementioned increased ebike traffic, bikes will get through more quickly. Shutting down the Greenwood and/or Franklin crosstown arteries will slaughter businesses just when the goal is to make the Central Core the vibrant future. And no kidding, each project will takes months and months and months and months. Also to mention, as much a cyclists, including me who has live and biked in Bend since 1990, it is not realistic to think, ""Build Them and They Will Come"". There can be a significant increase in bike use and pedestrian traffic through improving safety - even if not, we all deserve to be safe - but it's unrealistic to think that we need 12' bike lanes for the hordes. Thanks for asking.

- Walking and rolling as transportation are at least as important as using cars. Let's show it. let's make it safe/safer to walk and roll. Let's make it easy to choose to not use cars so much!
- Summary: All three of the Midtown Crossing projects — which includes the over- and undercrossings and corridors of Franklin, Greenwood and Hawthorne — are essential, overdue and expensive. And they will be well worth the investment. LandWatch is committed to helping effectively and efficiently deliver all three of these much-needed projects to our community. At this time, based on the information and designs provided via the Midtown Crossing Midtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossings Feasibility Study, LandWatch supports moving forward with both 1) Franklin Crossing Option 1 (in tandem with Franklin Corridor improvements); and 2) Hawthorne Crossing Option 1 (in tandem with Hawthorne Corridor improvements). Our recommendations may change as more information about costs, timelines and sequencing becomes available throughout the summer and fall. This combination delivers near-term improvements to our community that improve the accessibility and safety of an existing corridor. It also delivers a slightly longer-term, visionary, iconic and transformative project that sets the stage for Bend's next chapter as a safe, vibrant, equitable and climate-resilient city. This combination also advances the most City Council goals and Core Area redevelopment goals. If existing

(and future) funding is phased and allocated strategically, this combination seems likely to be feasible. Detailed input: The Midtown Crossing Midtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossings Feasibility Study specifically focuses on the under- and overcrossings on Franklin, Greenwood and Hawthorne. The findings and design options don't include corridor improvements. LandWatch understands the narrower scope of this Feasibility Study — and strongly recommends that each of these 'crossings' projects be designed and constructed in conjunction with the related corridor improvements. Our input and preferences include:

- o Deliver near term improvements to an existing corridor/crossing AND start Hawthorne at the same time. At the heart of decision-making about priorities should be two objectives:
- o Move forward and deliver near-term improvements to an existing crossing and corridor that:
 - Meets the most City Council and Core Area goals, including improving East/West connectivity, bike/ped safety, delivering on GO Bond projects, and catalyzing additional mixed-use development and affordable housing in the Core Area.
- o Preference: Franklin Undercrossing Option 1 +
 - Franklin Corridor improvements.
 - Align with CAAB and BURA's prioritization of TIF funds for the Core Area's in the five-year CIP. This will ensure we're getting the most 'bang for the buck' and directing and targeting resources in ways that deliver positive improvements and impactful change efficiently and effectively to our community.
- o Move forward and deliver slightly longer-term and significant improvements with Option 1 Hawthorne Overcrossing
 - This iconic and transformative project may have a longer or slightly longer timeline (Option 1 identifies the timeline as 'moderate') so whichever existing corridor delivers nearer-term improvements, it will be essential to also start on Hawthorne now.
 - Specific costs are still fuzzy but it seems feasible that sufficient resources do/will exist if Hawthorne Option 1 moves forward along with the quicker, lower cost options at either Franklin (Option 1) or Greenwood (Option 1). And it may be that once Hawthorne is in place, more extensive changes to Franklin (Option 2) or Greenwood (Option 2) will not be needed.
- o Exploring design options: Here are some additional elements we'd like to see explored in future design options:

- Greenwood & Franklin: Please consider designs with more vertical separation provided by barrier protection and/or elevated paths and bike lanes.
 - Hawthorne: Please consider exploring options at the east and west ends of the overcrossing that make this corridor car-free and bike/ped-focused — and/or where cars are decentralized (e.g. woonerf)
- Protect people from cars - this means barriers between us.
- I very much desire bike lanes or shared use paths that are truly protected from cars. This is a time to think radically different than we historically have been - transportation infrastructure stays for too long before replacement for age old designs to continue.
- The Greenwood underpass should be completed first because of the three options, it is the simplest and cheapest place to build a crossing that is safe and comfortable for people of all ages and abilities. Completion of Greenwood under crossing improvements will ensure that when Franklin improvements begin, there will be a viable east-west travel option for people who walk, bike, and roll. Shutting the current Franklin crossing down for a long period of construction, without a safe crossing at Greenwood, would make it very difficult for people who walk, bike, or roll to cross during construction. Notably, the pedestrian and biking infrastructure on Greenwood from 3rd Street to the river must also be completed on a similar timeline or this will be infrastructure only a few people use. The Hawthorne bridge is a very exciting signature bridge for people who walk, bike, and roll, but it is going to take a lot of work and time to be completed. It needs a lot of input and community engagement still to meet the needs of older adults, families with young children, and disabled people. Moving forward with improvements to Greenwood first and then to Franklin allows the behind the scenes work with ODOT, the railroad, and community groups regarding Hawthorne (and its additional funding) to be done right. Knowing that we need improved east-west connectivity today and that there are reasonable, lower-cost options available, the Hawthorne bridge project should be developed in conjunction with the Bend Central District redevelopment and be well connected to the bike network. Voters made it clear with the GO Bond that midtown crossings are a top priority. This is a once in a generation opportunity, though, so let's get it right! The crossings must be built to serve all people well and for a very long time!
- "We have a once in a lifetime opportunity to get this right. I'd like to see us dream bigger than the existing options so future generations don't live with our mistakes. All of these designs need to center people, not vehicles. This means all options need to create physical vertical barriers to separate people from vehicles at every single crossing. And they need to be done in conjunction with each corridor to ensure these safer crossings connect to other infrastructure for people who walk, bike, and roll. Greenwood offers the best opportunity for relatively inexpensive on the ground improvements in the near future. There is plenty of right-of-way, no costly excavation, fewer complications with

railroad permitting, and is a great candidate for quick build protected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to test out different facilities before final construction. The pedestrian and biking infrastructure on Greenwood from 3rd Street to the river must be completed at the same time for connectivity and to make the crossing useful. Franklin is already a crossing used by many people who walk, bike, and roll and would serve as a sufficient detour while Greenwood is being worked on. However, if Franklin is shut down, that leaves no safe detour for people who walk, bike, and roll. We will need Greenwood to be well done and done first before any disruption caused by Hawthorne construction or Franklin improvements. While we are excited about a signature bridge for people who walk, bike, and roll, we know the Hawthorne bridge is going to take a lot of work, time, and money to be completed. Not only will the city need to collaborate with the railroad and ODOT, but this project should be developed in conjunction with the Bend Central District redevelopment and be well connected to the bike network. There's plenty of behind the scenes work that can be done while we move forward with Greenwood, and it will also buy some time to figure out how to finance the rest of this pricey project. Finally, voters made it very clear when voting for the GO Bond, that midtown crossings were one of their top priorities, they will need to see some on-the-ground improvements sooner than later! Thank you for all your work and I am looking forward to seeing the next round of designs!

- "I don't currently support any of the proposed ideas. Yes they will improve bicycle access but they don't improve pedestrian access or add any measurable economic benefit for the immediate area. When a pedestrian or disabled person has to go 1/2 mile one way out of their way, the distance becomes prohibitive. And essentially becomes a major deterrent. A bridge or tunnel can be more than just an access path. I suggest a 4th option, to be built at Hawthorne .. cities across the US and Europe are building raised urban parks over highways. This location would be perfect for such a feature, it would become a draw for development, and promote more outside street level activity. A modern raised urban park would help connect old downtown and the future BCD, would help lower the increasing heat island affect of development, allow for future street festivals and activities without being a burden on current transportation uses. I know the initial cost would be greater than what is being proposed but the long term economic benefits of connecting old Bend - new BCD would be massive. The issue of East / West divide could be removed. I will gladly answer more questions and help facilitate a better option, option #4 a raised urban park over the train tracks and hwy 97. ODOT already knows what an overpass for a 4 or 5 lane road costs and knows how to build them - now envision no cars .. groups of trees, tables, small vendor access areas bridging the gap. A new centerpiece for a modern downtown Bend.
- The crossings themselves are very important, but so is the environment leading into them. The west end of Greenwood needs a road diet and more space for pedestrians

and cyclists. The identity of the parkway needs to be resolved - if it is to function like a freeway, access via Hawthorne without safe entry/exit lanes should be closed.

- Existing crossings at Franklin and Greenwood need to be fixed first and made great before a completely new project, crossing at Hawthorne is started.
- "This is a once in a generation opportunity to connect east and west Bend and the Bend downtown and the new Bend Central District. It needs to be done well because we're unlikely to get another chance. Greenwood should be the first project because it can be done relatively cheaply and quickly. Getting results right away would maintain public support. But, it needs to be done well and the current approaches don't provide safe separation between cars and bikes/pedestrians. The rest of the corridor between 3rd and the river along Greenwood needs to be completed at the same time or we will end up with another isolated piece of bike/pedestrian infrastructure which won't be used to its potential. Completing the Greenwood underpass will quickly provide a safe mid-town crossing and the more complex Hawthorne and Franklin projects can be planned and permitted without as much urgency as would be required if they were the first or only midtown crossings to be considered. The Hawthorne overpass is a complex and expensive project. It should be built in conjunction with development of the Bend Central District. Right now there many destinations, especially at the east end of the overpass so it is the least valuable crossing in the short term. If planned well, it will be a very valuable crossing in the future. The permitting, rights-of-way issues, and funding can be addressed during and after the Greenwood crossing is built and operational. The Franklin crossing is currently the only relatively safe midtown crossing. Even so, it is not a pleasant or comfortable crossing. In the short term, it is a semi-adequate crossing and can provide a crossing during the construction of the Greenwood crossing. While the Greenwood crossing is completed, the new Franklin crossing should be planned and permits and funding obtained so it can be completed as soon as practicable.
- We need MORE...like in Boulder, CO <https://bouldercolorado.gov/services/bike>
- Any of the above options would be an improvement.
- This effort will be a critical link toward improving overall commute options, outside of cars. As we work towards greater infill, we need this effort and more like it!
- Of these three crossings, Franklin seems to be the most used. I would look at Olney again over Hawthorne. YES to the tree-lined option whenever and wherever that's possible.
- I chose Greenwood only because of costs; otherwise, I think Franklin should be done first. Overall, very disappointed in designs. As for design concepts for the Midtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossings project, please use protected bike lanes! If safety is a priority for the city of Bend, then protected bike lanes, sidewalks, shared-use paths are critical. When I drive, I often feel uncomfortable passing bikes where they don't have adequate protection. Paint does not protect people. If a parent doesn't feel comfortable

sending their child on the sidewalk, bike lane, shared use path, then it's not accessible and it's not safe. Let's try to make Bend a great place for families, for retirees, for all of our communities! If we're looking towards the future, let's not use minimum standards that were developed years ago because they will be dated by the time these projects are completed and then they'll have to be updated again to follow new standards. And we'll never have the vision that other great places to live have.

- Greenwood crossing improvements could be completed the fastest, but I very much would like the Hawthorne Ave crossing to be completed as soon as possible.
- I'd really like to see first-class, protected bicycle infrastructure on more than one east-west crossing. I realize the budget is constrained, but we have great options for bikes with each of these crossings. But any path that is next to a roadway should have a physical barrier between the humans and the cars. I would really like to see ""physical separation from cars"" as a core design goal of the project for people on bicycles, so that people can feel safe biking with children, and all people can feel safely removed from cars.
- Concept 2 is clearly a better long-term solution promoting multi-modal safety and connection on this important corridor.
- I think you should continue design of the Hawthorne option 1 bridge and continue to apply for funding. Greenwood's minimal option would be better than nothing. Hawthorne really needs option 2 but highly unlikely to be funded near term.
- "Hello, seems we have access East and West at both Greenwood and Franklin. I would say improve Greenwood first and make it accessible, lighted and wider both sides. I would say second would be to improve Franklin by making it accessible, lighted and wider both sides. Doing Franklin second could buy some time to maybe share expense with the future development of the old Les Schwab Property. Hawthorne crossing is expensive due to the Railroad height. Elevator is wrong. Long ramp would put it about 3rd street. Back and forth is ugly. Drop the Hawthorne Avenue crossing and focus on the two current gateways to Bend. Lived in Bend since 1976.
- To improve Greenwood and/or Franklin first you will bottleneck one of these crossings as work is being done on the other. Build Hawthorne first to elevate this bottle neck issue.
- The problem with the undercrossings for bikes is #1 they're narrow and #2 the 5 lanes of traffic leading up to them and out of them. Forget going in a narrow tunnel with cars either. Franklin and Greenwood are my least preferred way to cross with a bike. Wilson and Olney are preferred since there are a limited number driveways and only three lanes of traffic. I don't see a reduction of vehicle travel lanes (or size) at the greenwood/3rd intersection heading west, so I can't advocate for this option. Beautifying downtown is nice, but it wouldn't encourage me to bike on greenwood. Hwy 20 on greenwood really

just needs an onramp to 97. Pedestrian/bike overcrossing on Hawthorne is the most well thought out and best location.

- Very exciting for Bend
- For pedestrian and bicycle crossings bridges are the WORST option. People will often illegally cross rather than climb the winding ramps and 25+ vertical ft to get to the top of the bridge. Cyclists often will have to dismount and walk up and down the ramps which totally defeats their chosen method of mobility. It'd be preferable to keep sending pedestrians and cyclists to the existing undercrossings than install a new bridge at Hawthorne. Greenwood should be given a road diet between 2nd st and Wall st. The road is missing left turn lanes on either side of the bridge. Traffic would flow much smoother with less conflicts if it was one lane in each direction with a middle turn lane. This would give greatly useful room to the cyclists and pedestrians, and you could even do some work to reduce the risk of flooding in the underpass. The road diet would also improve the intersection flow at the Bond St & Greenwood intersection for cars. Is it a joke that a simple steel bridge is on the historical places? Why would anyone care about a bridge. Bridges are tools first and foremost. They can look nice but if they're not serving the public accordingly NO NORMAL HUMAN GIVES A HOOT IF IT GETS REPLACED. Your average driver might spend an entire 3 seconds looking at a bridge before they forget what they were just thinking about because someone just turned on a blinker and slammed their brakes in front of them.
- City really needs to understand access to the downtown and the impact of reducing access from Greenwood Avenue with the sidewalks, particularly with planned ODOT changes to the Parkway. Franklin Avenue should be the top priority since it was the priority for the BCD group, and provides critical school, park, and central downtown access while being readily implementable.
- bike lines need to be separate, or at least protected. the current 'white line' bike lanes around Bend are simply terrifying to use and do not work. Look at any other town - separate bike paths are the most effective
- There are two significant crossings available. Place improvements and law enforcement to better utilize these areas rather than an overly expensive skybridge.
- For the Hawthorne crossing can you extend the ramps so it's not so steep slope?
- My first priority is a delightful-to-use bridge that will separate bike riders, pedestrians and wheelchair users from hot, stinky, aggressive vehicles and exhaust. A Hawthorne overpass is a statement that Bend prioritizes bike riders and pedestrians (on the East side of town as well as the west side). I guarantee I would drive less and bike/walk more with a safe, friendly, enjoyable Midtown crossing. But surface improvements must happen on Franklin anyway and soon. There are tire-eating cracks, dips and bumps, especially on the north (west-heading) side. (And if you could solve the drug addiction

problem too, that'd be really great. Don't enjoy riding around passed-out humans and their waste in a dank tunnel.)

- There are currently two other crossings within blocks of the Hawthorne concept and a monstrous sky bridge is not needed (this is not what we voted on or for in the bond measure). The Hawthorne crossing will only benefit the ego of a few "future" business owners in midtown and tourists, this has nothing to do with "safety" of Bend residents, please consider other option. If the Hawthorne option moves forward it should be put before voters.
- Hawthorne is the biggest, longest project, but once it's done it would attract so much bike/ped traffic that would otherwise use other crossings. Go for the largest impact, transformative project, rather than settle.
- Can't wait to see these come to fruition! It would be great to also work on somehow improving the safety of the crossings at 3rd street as each of these are completed, so that they can actually connect to the east side as well.
- "What would a regular person need to feel safe?" If we ever hope to get people out of their cars, we can't do the 'bare minimum' and we can't build for experienced riders. I picked Franklin but really both Greenwood and Franklin projects are not great because it is a death-defying ride to get to those crossings. Without major changes to the connectivity on either side we'll get a minor bump in experienced ridership, but regular people will still be left out.
- "Move the bottle drop to an industrial part of town. It is dangerous and an eyesore! The foot bridge doesn't need to have an elevator or stairs. A nice looking simple look is best. I like the raised foot/bike path for the underpasses. Lots of natural light.
- Version 1 is preferable
- Please consider protected bike lines vs buffered bike lanes wherever possible - cars straying into the bike lane happens frequently and makes biking feel less safe.
- This project is vital for meeting the vision of the Bend Central District.
- Not only will the Hawthorne bridge crossing have the ability to be an iconic monument for the City of Bend it will encourage off-street, multi-use circulation between the East and West sides of the city. It will recognize that alternatives to car trips are valued, supported and encouraged by the City. The recent COLW newsletter shared the statistic that 50% of urban trips are under 3 miles. Building the Hawthorne bridge will encourage citizens to get out their cars and use human powered transportation helping to expand the quality of life for all of Bend, reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and help mitigate the many other causes of climate change.
- I'm really pleased with the work to date. Thanks!
- For me personally, Franklin would be a higher priority. The Hawthorne crossing, however, could facilitate the core area urban renewable district if done nicely and be a

showcase for Bend. Pick one project, do it well and complete it. Don't just do a little of all three.

- If the most measured use is the Franklin Avenue undercrossing, how would you plan to reroute that traffic? I didn't see this in the explanation.
- Use tactical urbanism/creative measures to make these more comfortable. Infrastructure helps, but bad behavior by users (cars, bikes, peds) is the real challenge. Adding planters to buffer bike lanes as a physical barrier helps. Signage/stripping helps. The Hawthorne crossing has the ability to be a key project in Bend which would be a huge step toward making the community more bike friendly year-round. Prioritize this and don't be afraid to spend the money to connect downtown and the central districts!
- Make it more obvious for cars where there are major bike corridors. Like painting it green similar to other cities. It is STILL unsafe to bike on either of these under crossings.
- Lots of lighting and maybe a trash can?
- I chose Franklin because this one access downtown and currently feels unsafe when I travel alone at night due limited visibility in the tunnel.
- Greenwood and Franklin are tough retrofit projects. Hawthorne can be the gem. All are needed but Franklin is a better east/west route for bikes and pedestrians
- Please focus on safety of travel, keeping wide open sightlines, so you can see if people are sleeping on the sidewalk under the tracks. If they are there, what is the other route someone can go?
- Please finish the parkway project at Murphy Rd. Need an exit south bound from Bend and a north bound on ramp. Do not spend millions on this project before finishing this project!
- Franklin seems the route that is easier to get across 3rd Street and connect easier on both sides.
- It's important to prioritize the crucial Reed Market railroad overpass above all of these projects. The poor planning of the nearly completed new housing in the area and the poor planning of the soon-to-be additional new housing on 15th Ave will only make an already overly used Reed Market a disaster to drive.
- This is desperately needed to improve safe car/bike use. It will also encourage a greater ridership throughout the year if it is well maintained. The Midtown Pedestrian Bicycle Crossing will reduce pollution as well as parking needs and congestion downtown. Win win!!
- Hawthorne has to be the priority. A bridge is so much better than any tunnel, even a brand new tunnel. And compared to the proposals for revamping Greenwood and Franklin, the bridge at Hawthorne wins hands down. Peds and bikes need meaningfully separate travel from cars, not just paint or small curbs. A bridge would also be an attraction for sight-seeing the mountains and town, would be a better connection east-

west, and have a higher likelihood of feeling safe vs. going through a tunnel. I have some concerns about what would happen to the land under the bridge ramps, it's important to create them in a way that they remain clear of camper and those without homes, which would seriously detract from some of the benefits.

- Give up on 2nd street mixed use plan. It is too valuable as commercial near railroad. Apartments near railroads is a terrible idea for many reasons. No one wants it but some clueless city planners.
- Until Bend deals with the homeless camping issue along and around Hawthorne any project around that area will be a boondoggle. Not sure if any of the planners have visited other cities with ramps in relatively low vehicle traffic and high homelessness population but foot bridges that fit that bill end up being an additional reason for homeless people to set up camp, the ramps will start to smell like piss, graffiti will be an issue, and cops will have another hot spot to deal with. Plus, elevators?!?! That's F-ing ridiculous. If you don't rapidly find that the ramps start to smell like human waste and get covered with graffiti the elevators certainly will. If this project is to be for the greater Bendite putting it on Hawthorne won't attract traffic. If that's what happens I'll stick to dodging traffic on Franklin. FYI this is coming from an avid bicycle commuter/traveler who crosses the parkway frequently.
- Drop the Hawthorne plan! Too impactful, high maintenance, and undesirable termination point on Eastside.
- Can we improve what we have first? Greenwood & Franklin improvements would be great. Olney is great a great east west corridor for bikes, don't forget about it. A new bridge would be rad, but I fear people would still use Greenwood & Franklin. Work on reducing, calming traffic on current east west corridors and improve those for bike/ped first.
- In general, I would like to see a smooth transition between downtown and the BCD, westside and eastside. Greenwood currently has the most customer facing businesses, restaurants, retail, etc to make an enjoyable walk between both areas. Where Franklin and Hawthorne do not, and don't appear to have the potential anytime soon. Also, it appears that one of the options for Greenwood has the lowest price tag and the fastest time frame of the rest. I live on the westside and work on the eastside/BCD and can easily bike or walk to my store. However, because the Greenwood undercrossing and the sidewalk tunnel are very unsafe I drive. I'm sure there are many others who feel the same way and would jump on their bike and/or walk as a result.
- Do both Franklin and Hawthorne at the same time. Add public restrooms near the Franklin underpass.
- I appreciate that the city is giving thought to these crossings and the benefits to non car users. Cars clearly take precedent in the city of Bend, yet many people walk, bike and

roll around town. Better and safer facilities would enable more people to get around without cars, making all of us feel safer.

- Please keep bicycles separate from both cars and pedestrians in a protected bike lane to reduce user conflicts, accidents, and deaths
- More bike friendly crossing and riding
- This is 5 years too late, but a good start Bend. More bikes, less cars = increased tourism and being a greener city on par with Eugene and Davis, CA. CONNECT THE TRAIL SYSTEMS they are disjointed.
- Think about the bicycle greenways concept and whichever one has the biggest impact on improving connectivity of the greenways network should be the one to start with.
- Please, please let's invest limited resources in current infrastructure versus build new (e.g. Hawthorne Ave. crossing) ... let's be judicious with the bond \$\$ and think about long-term maintainability (e.g. strong towns <https://www.strongtowns.org>)
- Just make sure the bikes/peds are up on curbs or protected by metal/concrete bollards. Cars are dangerous to people not in cars. There should be more protection offered to bikes/peds than a line of paint or a mountable curb that drivers can accidentally breach and cause harm to someone.
- parking should be curb tight, with buffered bike lanes along the travel lanes. This is safer for bicyclists at intersections and passengers who are exiting their parked car do not expect bikes to be coming along side, causing more accidents.
- Franklin and Greenwood are not central to downtown; Hawthorne is central to downtown. Hawthorne would be much more visible; and because it is new construction the design will be superior to Greenwood and G=Franklin
- Hawthorne should be focus. Greenwood and Franklin can be done inexpensively.
- Those of us in the Bend Central District believed that the Hawthorne pedestrian/bicycle bridge was always intended, planned and funded through the transportation bond that was agreed to by Bend residents. We would be very disappointed for that priority to be diluted and/or lost. We 100% recommend continuing to fulfill the original promise of building the Hawthorne Crossing. -Mary Angelo, business and building owner in the Bend Central District
- I ride through the Franklin underpass frequently. I live car free and cycle to get around. I prefer option two (extended switchback ramps) on the Hawthorne crossing. Don't even think of using the elevators and stairs. I live at Franklin and Hill and druggies and schizophrenics pass by here all day. They will all use the overpass to get to the recycling center, and drop bottles and create a glass hazard, as they do now in the Franklin tunnel sidewalk. I've had a few flats, and on occasion walk down there and sweep up glass. There is a piss problem too, as I frequently have to ride through pee puddles. It always stinks. The elevators would definitely become urinals. My dream is to have safe, separate or protected bicycle infrastructure throughout Bend. This is the start.

- These projects will be huge for the safe passage of users not driving. Please take the time and care to make sure the solutions focus on creating a PHYSICAL BREAK from traffic. Bikes and pedal aren't several ton death machines and should be treated and designed to pass safely without fear.
- I believe Franklin avenue has the most activity today and highest probability of attracting near term development interest. I'd also like to see some improvements for the lower cost alternative to include better lighting/visibility within the tunnels themselves (windows/lighting into the existing walls?)
- Improve Franklin and Greenwood and deep six the Hawthorne Bridge. Instead of wasting money on the outlandish Hawthorne sky bridge, concentrate instead on sidewalk infills throughout town, especially along collectors and arterials.

In-Person Comments (17)

- Concept #2 (Franklin) please
- Improve north-south bikeways on Hill and Second Streets.
- Go big with Hawthorne first and catalyze the Bend Central District.
- If the BCD wants the bridge, make them pay for it. We should give them a free ride to develop their area that they will profit on for years to come.
- Consider retractable bollards with automated detection for emergency vehicles to allow them to share the raised shared-use path in case of emergency. Why is parking being proposed on Hawthorne Us97 off-ramp?! There is currently no parking there and these spaces would only be accessible from the parkway. Do we want to use the parking to serve local parking? Consider how these facilities function for kids and people with disabilities.
- We need to do this now! Don't wait!
- As a new member of COBAAC, I would to be involved in accessibility planning on this project.
- My vision is that all three crossings would make people prefer to ride bikes, boards or whatever else or walk from midtown to downtown. I'd love to see midtown become an extension of downtown and the way to do that is to make walking welcoming and enjoyable. This means keeping non-motorized vehicle travel off the same level as cars. Hawthorne should be priority because it will provide an option for peds/bikes while you fix Franklin and Greenwood. Franklin should be next because it is so dangerous and awful and will likely be costly to fix. Greenwood can limp along as-is if (when) you run out of money. If Greenwood never gets fixed, fine. If Franklin doesn't, car traffic will continue to be the preferred mode. If/when Hawthorne Bridge is built so many people (myself and at least 20 midtown residents I know) would ride/walk to downtown rain or shine. Hawthorne will change this two for the better and prove Bend, OR cards about livability, reducing car dependency and improving the BCD. Thanks for doing this.

- Give us a bridge! The Salem Bridge with the graceful arches is very pretty.
- It would be preferred to not spend the initial funding all on one project location. Spreading out the improvements would be best. Any improvements to bus stops in the project areas would be beneficial.
- I would like to see the Franklin crossing done first because it is part of a well used network east-west and would require the least amount of money to improve the whole network. Both Hawthorne Crossing and Greenwood would require \$\$ to make these two streets part of a network. So you can no isolate the costs of the project from network costs.
- This to me is a clear winner. The only real issue is integrating it into the other bikeways. As it is now, that crossing is an island.
- The straight bridge seems to be the most effective and appealing solution and has the chance to add another beloved and iconic feature to Bend. It is also the most bang for your buck in my opinion. Since a bridge would be preferred and this is the lowest cost of the three.
- Let's prepare for a pedestrian and bike-centered downtown.
- Want you using natural resources like trees, rocks, flowers, wood.
- The use of natural resources.
- Don't want it in a place where people camp out on. Homeless.

APPENDIX E: LATINX OUTREACH COMMENTS

Below are the **unedited verbal comments** participants gave to project staff at Latinx community outreach events.

GREENWOOD AVENUE

- Prefers the separation of bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Wants more separation even for bicyclists, raise them off the street too.
- Seems like less maintenance for Concept 2.
- traffic signs with Spanish dictation for walkers.
- No preference between two.

HAWTHORNE AVENUE

- Wants the one that is most accessible to people who may be in wheelchair, etc. These ped/bike overcrossings over highways are very common in Mexico.

FRANKLIN AVENUE

- Bend is growing, it's worth it to fully rebuild this and make it better.
- Thinks making it cleaner/nicer will be good enough.
- Concerned about flooding in Franklin today - the other day it impacted her ability to pick up her kid and that worries her for bigger disasters in future. Prefers rebuild of Franklin but knows it's more expensive.
- Would like to see full rebuild but not sure it would happen.
- Thinks doing Concept 1 with lighting additions or things to make tunnel a little more comfortable would be enough.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

- New crossing (Hawthorne) would be best for most connections possible.
- Franklin is the most narrow/inaccessible today.
- All three would be nice, hard to choose.
- Franklin is most congested today.
- Not sure Hawthorne would be used b/c you can just walk to blocks and get to Franklin or Greenwood. Better to improve existing structures.
- Hates Franklin today, it really needs to be fixed.
- Would help support busy system and bus users investing in Hawthorne
- Franklin is the most important b/c it is closer to Bend High where my kid goes to school. Concept 1 for Franklin seems good enough and isn't too expensive.

APPENDIX F: COMMENTS RECEIVED BY EMAIL

Below are the **unedited comments and attachments** participants submitted to the project email. The names of commenters were omitted from this summary for privacy and consistency.

- This sounds like a wonderful idea, but will there be some sort of police presence to keep these underpass area's clear of the houseless community? The Franklin underpass pedestrian sidewalk that is there currently, used to reek of urine and feces. One early morning as I was riding my bike to work, I almost ran over someone sleeping on the sidewalk under the train tracks section of the same underpass.
- I wanted to make the public meeting but sadly missed it. Being a resident of downtown for over 15 years I have spent a lot of time walking both current underpasses. Writing is not my skill set so I left you a message hoping for a return call. I tried to take the online survey but found it VERY incomplete. In fact, I was confused on what input you are actually trying to gain so I can comment publicly? It sounds like you're saying you have millions of dollars and want to build an overpass? Since I walk Greenwood underpass daily, I do remember a counter that was installed a few years ago. It was damaged and

not working and in fact I ended up calling the city to have them come get it because it was a hazard. Not sure if that data is being used at all in your decision? I also am confused at who is responsible for maintaining the pathway currently? They look abandoned and not safe to use, although I have had no issues. Why would we spend \$12m on something new if we can't maintain the current existing asset? It seems like the parking garage which was built but no maintenance or proper thought about how the asset would be used to keep it safe. At a minimum I want to know who will pick up the garbage? Who will repair and maintain asset? I do not see a bridge as a feasible option. I see snow, ice and elevation gain as a major issue. It also is uphill, and many can't physically do that type of incline. I also know as my employees will not walk from the parking garage to the store, 2 blocks, and half the time I must monitor them parking on the street, which is not allowed as an employee here. People will want to most direct route. I do see improving the existing walkways useful. They go to more direct places I feel. I would like to see the scary alley way that does to the railroad tracks be closed. So in short, I see the Greenwood being a priority for me and would like to see it improved.

- I went to the open house on Wednesday. These are my comments on the midtown crossing. The ramp with switchbacks is best. Incorporate stairs into the U end of the switchbacks. There need to be more access points. Don't waste the opportunity to provide access to people coming from the north on both sides to the RR and 97. Incorporate a building into the bridge structure on the east side. Either a building next to the ramp, or commercial space underneath, or both. The deck should be wide enough to accommodate vendors at the ends. ODOT and the RR may object to vendors directly over the highway and RR tracks. Still, the overpass should incorporate structures and amenities that make it an attraction, rather than solely a way for bikes and peds to cross. Include water, sewer and power hook ups on the bridge deck. Make the deck wide with separated bike and pedestrian lanes. For years the Brooklyn bridge in NYC had a combination bicycle pedestrian path. It didn't work. Bikes and peds got in each other's way and ruined the experience of visiting the Brooklyn Bridge. NYC converted one motor vehicle lane on the bridge to a two-way bike lane. The bicycles and pedestrians are now physically separated, and it is once again possible to enjoy a walk over the Brooklyn Bridge as well as commute between Brooklyn and Manhattan by bike. The COB should keep that in mind in designing the bridge deck so that bikes and peds don't get in each other's way. The elevator design is unattractive, both visually and as a means to connect the east and west sides of Bend. Elevators break, and public elevators feel dangerous. Drop it. The long straight ramp is ok, but unimaginative. A 7.5% grade is not too steep, and it won't be an obstacle to most people. But it takes up a lot of room. Think about a corkscrew ramp instead. The Franklin underpass is a lost cause. Redesign is hugely expensive and provides negligible benefits. Concentrate on the bike/ped overpass instead. There is little that can be done to the Greenwood

underpass to improve it for bikes/peds. If you reduce the number of lanes it will become more marginally more attractive to bike/peds while at the same time upsetting to motor vehicle drivers who will experience more congestion. The Greenwood underpass, together with the Franklin underpass, will continue to be chokepoints for motor vehicle travel between the east and west sides. These choke points are limits on motor vehicle traffic between the east and west side. That is not necessarily a bad thing. The downtown and west sides are overcrowded with cars already. Bend's downtown was not built to support a population of 15 or 20k people including their cars, much less the crowds we are now experiencing. Much has been done with parking garage, angled parking, couplets and roundabouts to increase motor vehicle capacity. The west side needs relief from car overpopulation. Congestion encourages using transit, riding bikes, or walking. If Greenwood can be improved without a great deal of expense, fine. But it is not worth a big capital investment. Whatever is done, unless the number of motor vehicles is reduced, Greenwood will continue to be a loud, uncomfortable and feel dangerous to bikers and walkers. Focus on the overpass. Make it attractive and convenient, with multiple access points so that many people can use it. Ask ODOT to contribute. Their parkway cut the city in two, and ODOT should shoulder some of the costs of repairing the damage the parkway has done.

- I was not able to make the open house but I did want to submit my comments directly. The options presented are all big steps forward, but fundamentally they are missing the point; to turn people into bike commuters, we need **protected** bike lanes. This means a tangible barrier between bikes and cars. And in fact this is exactly what the new Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities rules state; bike lanes must be protected. I ask that you go back to the drawing board and create plans for the midtown crossings that **protect** bikes from cars.
- Thank you for the opportunity to see the work completed to date at last weeks open house. Your consultants did a good job of explaining the concepts and fielding questions. On a side note, I discovered my niece works for KPFF. Small world. I came away from the open house with the goal of providing you a detailed feedback on my observations. As a civil engineer for over 40 years, I been involved in planning, design and construction of large infrastructure projects. I have also been a resident of Bend for over 20 years. Please find attached my detailed feedback. The short version is this is the kind of project that go really well or really bad.

To: Roy Rowan, City of Bend

From: Mike Walker

Subject: The June 22nd Midtown Crossing Feasibility Study Open House Presentation

Date: June 29, 2022

First, I wish to thank staff and their consultants for providing this opportunity to view this presentation and ask questions. I have given these concepts considerable investigation and have prepared this feedback which I hope will make the crossings successful.

Background – I am a Civil Engineer with over forty years’ of experience including the planning, design, and construction of large infrastructure projects. In the last 20 years, I have been the managing partner of mixed-use buildings in Bend including a mixed-use building on Greenwood Avenue. At my first job in Eugene, I often commuted by bicycle when conditions were favorable. I want “key low stress bike” routes to be successful.

Summary – Below are the main concerns regarding the information presented and my interpretation of the missing necessary information not submitted. A more detailed discussion is included in an attached appendix.

1. The study needs to demonstrate how the concepts meet the stated goals of the GO Bond. The City’s website states irrevocably that addressing east-west congestion and safety are the primary goals of the GO Bond. These goals were established after a city conducted statistically valid survey during December of 2019. The presentation fails to highlight these goals. **Will the city honor their commitment to the public?**
2. Relevant ground conditions need to be considered. The documented traffic count for Greenwood and Franklin Avenues has substantial bearing on what will be “safer and better connections”. Also, each crossing concept needs to demonstrate how the concept is a necessary link in a low stress-west bike route and demonstrate what other route alternates are available to connect east to west. The presentation failed to do so.
3. The Greenwood Avenue crossings have a long list of bad consequences. The concept that requires lengthening Parkway and railroad bridges is DOA (dead on arrival) due to the cost and necessary lengthy task sequencing. Regarding the “road diet” concept, the existing traffic volume exceeds the capacity of a two-lane street (with turn lane) by about 20%. Existing on-street parking will be eliminated. Greenwood Avenue will never be a low stress route. This street functions more like a “business route”.
4. Hawthorne Avenue is advertised as a low stress route, but it will probably never be one. The west portion of the route through downtown and the east portion of the route from 3rd through the Hawthorne Bus station will be stressful. The presentation’s focus on

only the vicinity of each crossing overlooks the seriousness of these existing conditions. Other issues about the geometry and cost are detailed in the appendix. There are safer and better east-west connection options for the bicyclists.



5. Franklin Avenue scores well on many measures; lower traffic volume, safer, low stress bike route, wider existing right-of-way and generally, an immense potential for a great “gateway” for visitors to the existing downtown. The presentation showed two concepts. There is a third concept that should be considered. (See appendix)
6. Here is the phasing priority that should be considered.
 - a) **Phase I** - A new Franklin Avenue concept (see appendix) in conjunction with the completion of the Franklin Avenue Corridor. This corridor has immense potential to build 1) the best low stress route, 2) a great gateway to the downtown, 3) an amenity for the logical starting point for the Bend Central District development, 4) “safety for all” and actually address east-west congestion.
 - b) **Phase II** – Cosmetic improvements and regular maintenance to improve the function and safety of the existing crossings at Greenwood Avenue. The work could be done as part of the street undercrossing drainage project. If over time, completed TSP projects and to-be-determined Climate Friendly and Equitable Community projects lead to less traffic, a road diet may be eventually viable. Realistically, the odds are slim that the traffic will actually decrease if the forecasted 50% increase in population by 2040 occurs.
 - c) **Phase III** – A Hawthorne Avenue crossing should only be considered after achieving some success with the TSP, CFEC and BCD.

In closing, I believe there needs to be a balance between the city’s commitment to the public on addressing east-west congestion while building “safer and better” east-west pedestrian and biking connections. This project can be a win-win if the study takes into consideration all the ground conditions of the crossings and routes. Plus, please base the phasing on the observed outcomes of the aspiration planning instead of assuming what the outcome may be.

Appendix

1. Missing information-

- a) The concept exhibits focused only on the area in the immediately vicinity of each proposed crossing. These drawings **failed** to illustrate how each proposed crossing connects to the balance of the route. Your invite stated this was an “*effort to identify safer walking and biking connections between east and west Bend.*” A lot of work remains to be done.
- b) The handout identifies “need and desire” for safer and better connections. I believe the need and desire used to gauge each concept’s worthiness should also include;
 - To provide an amenity for the re-development of the Bend Central District, and
 - As stated in the opening statement of the 2020 Transportation GO Bond webpage, “*to build priority projects in every part of the city to:*
 - o *Improve traffic flow and east-west connections*
 - o *Improve neighborhood safety*”

[These two goals reflect the community responses to the city’s statistically valid December 2019 survey. Sixty percent of those surveyed said they would support the bond if these two goals were addressed. In response to a second survey question, forty percent said they would not support the bond if these two goals were not addressed. The survey and website contradict a June 22nd statement made that these midtown crossings were the reason the bond was approved.]

- c) No “high level” cost estimates or time requirements were presented.

[Side note – I appreciate the list of preliminary documents posted at the bottom of the webpage.]

2. Critical Background not presented on June 22nd, but needs to be considered-

- a) December 2, 2021 Traffic Count Data ([Source](#)) with connections with the Oregon Traffic Monitoring System;

NW Greenwood Avenue west of 3 rd Street intersection	(23,008 AADT)
NW Greenwood Avenue near intersection with Bond Street	(20,120 AADT)
NW Franklin Avenue near intersection with NW Hill Street	(12,871 AADT)

NE 3rd Street near intersection with Greenwood Avenue

(24,851 AADT)

[Bend population is forecasted to increase 50% by 2040.]

b) Portion of Figure 5-1. Low Stress Bicycle Network (2020 TSP)



- Greenwood Avenue is not identified as a (green) low stress bike route.
- Franklin Avenue is not identified as a (green) low stress bike route.
- Hawthorne Avenue is identified as a (green) low stress bike route.

d) The study should show all the other low stress routes in the vicinity to demonstrate what other options bicyclists have for east-west connection. There are routes to the south and north that may provide safer and better connections. How many routes are needed?

e) Here is a link to Bend's ["low-stress Bicycle Facility Design Elements."](#)

3. Greenwood Avenue Crossing –

a) Extending the Bridges Concept – The presentation made only a vague comment about the expense of this concept. This concept is a “DOA” (dead on arrival) for three strong reasons;

- The concept requires extending the two parkway bridges, the two railroad bridges and the purchase buildings along Greenwood Avenue west and east of the crossing. Using this concept at both Greenwood and Franklin Avenues could take the majority of the entire \$190M GO Bond funds.
- The logistics to sequence the construction tasks to keep the railroad and parkway in operation during construction would take much longer than the +2-year Reed Market Road in comparison. Traffic would back up on the Parkway for miles.
- Securing Burlington Northern Railroad’s (BNR) co-operation will be a huge task.
- For anyone with experience in major infrastructure projects, any concept based on lengthening the Parkway and railroad bridges was doomed from the start and should not have been proposed in the TSP. How many other TSP projects lacked similar feasibility vetting before inclusion in the TSP? For example, the \$17.7M Portland Avenue project was reduced to \$3M after one discussion at a neighborhood association meeting.

b) Road Diet-

- At the presentation, the consultant could not state what the existing traffic volume was but was confident the road diet would not add to congestion.
- The actual traffic volume is readily available. Greenwood Avenue is one of the most heavily traveled streets in Bend with a trip count which is about 90% of the volume of 3rd Street.
- According to the HCM 6th addition, the capacity of a two-lane (with turn lane) street (Greenwood after a road diet) is 18,300 vehicles per day. The December 2021 measured volumes of 20,120 AADT (near Bond Street) and 23,008 AADT (near 3rd Street). A road diet will greatly increase east-west congestion today and then consider the outcome a 50% population increase.
- What will the public think about the city’s credibility when this project increases congestion in direct conflict to the Bond campaign promises and the city’s website statements?

- This concept would also eliminate existing on-street parking that is essential to some of the businesses along Greenwood Avenue.,
- This concept doesn't provide a connection on a low stress bikeway. Mixing bicycles with this volume of traffic is not safe.

[Side note- Compare the traffic analysis of the MPO's Parkway Plan to the City's TSP. The MPO analysis uses the industry standard for performance measures including queuing. Meanwhile, the City's TSP analysis didn't include queuing which is the #1 indicator for the public of congestion. Queuing will stretch from 3rd Street to west of the river. Gridlock will occur.]

4. Hawthorne Avenue-

a) Critical assumptions-

- All the concepts assume that a bridge support is placed within the Parkway or railroad right-of-way. I asked the consultants if the state or BNR has approved this. They admitted that neither entity had approved this design feature yet.

[This is a critical design assumption and should be verified before any additional study is performed. A support within the right-of-way provides flexibility in the profile of the crossing. Without this support, the bridge must span the entire length of the Parkway at a straight grade (no grade breaks).]

b) Challenging geometry-

- Designing a bridge profile at the ADA maximum grade (1:12) requires flat 5-foot landings after every 30-inch rise (landing spacing about every 25 feet). Are there any examples of bridges built using this alternating ramp/landing surface profile? It is hard to imagine how this profile will feel to a bicyclist.
- The typical profile for bridges is a straight grade instead of a combination of ramps (1:12) with flat landings every 25-feet.
- It is probable that a support will not be approved in the right-of-way unless it is demonstrated as the only option. It is not the only option.
- To fit a bridge spanning the entire right-of-way, the design will require a series of switchbacks. Users will find this route is a long, time-consuming (and less convenient) route than the existing undercrossings (Greenwood or Franklin) and other proposed TSP "Key low stress" routes. Will the city close

the existing undercrossings to avoid the embarrassment of the existing routes being the preferred routes?

c) How will this be a “safer and better connection?”

- The TSP claims this route will be a low stress bikeway, but designers will note be able to include low stress elements. I have walked the route from Drake Park to beyond 4th Street. Everyone should walk this route. This route will be stressful in the downtown and in the vicinity the Hawthorne bus station.



- o Bikes will share a motor vehicle lane for most of the route.
- o Route includes several blocks of dangerous riding behind angled in parking.
- o Crossing a busy five-lane 3rd street.
- o The businesses on Hawthorne between 1st Street and 2nd Street will lose all their on-street parking. Where will they park?



- o Riding through the dangerous maze of buses at the Hawthorne transit station. With buses, only one through lane remains.



d) Landmark or boondoggle-

- We don't know what the cost is. (Did the Bulletin suggest a \$43M number recently?)
- What kind of statement do the grandiose concepts send to Bendites and visitors? We prioritize more money on this one crossing than any other TSP project just to make create a "landmark". We prioritize this grandiose concepts when Bend has so many other pressing needs?
- It is wise to announce a grandiose "statement" structure when most of the community is struggling with inflation?

e) Where is the desired Bend Central District re-development?

- The code was adopted six years ago and not one single tall mixed-use project has been built in this district.

- The planners claimed the 2016 code amendments removed barriers.
- After no action for about two years, additional code amendments were adopted to further reduce barriers.
- After six years, the city adopted a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district to generate revenue and then a second program to waive property taxes. The increase in property tax increase is needed to pay the debt service of the TIF district. How does this math work?
- In the last six years, here are the few of the completed projects;
 - Single story mixed-retail building
 - A new tire store which took up an entire block.
 - Two 3-story mixed-use (Office and light industrial) buildings without residential units and where employee parking overflows onto the adjacent streets.
 - NO RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS!
- One pre-application meeting was held for a tall mixed-use building (1st floor retail, upper floors residential). The project is on hold because it is \$20M over budget.
- Will this crossing incentivize development in the BCD? **No.** This crossing will not solve the other obvious barriers which have prevented the BCD from evolving as desired. And now, we finally are experiencing the overdue inflation and rising interest rates. The proposed projects need to be financially viable. The proposed projects need to be marketable.
- This crossing should be the lowest on the priority list. The BCD needs to achieve some of its desired development first.

5. Franklin Avenue

a) Extending bridges are DOA for the same reasons listed for the Greenwood Avenue crossing.

b) Cosmetic concept-

- This was the only other choice presented and the team's disappointment was very evident.
- Staff and its citizen advisory committee spent over two years working on a new transportation system plan for our community. I attended most of the meetings

and reviewed most of the written materials. It was clear from the scale of the entire TSP planning task, many of the proposed projects received little scrutiny and nearly all the committee members had little experience in implementing aspiration concepts. This statement is not intended to be interpreted as a criticism but rather simple fact of the enormity of task. Sometimes other options get overlooked.

- c) There is another alternative that was not considered. It uses some of the design elements from the Hawthorne Avenue Crossing concepts.

6. Recommended course of action for consideration –

- a) Value of a “Kicking the Ground” field trip-

On the Friday after the open house, I walked to the three crossing locations and the surrounding neighborhoods east and west of the Parkway/Railroad. I quickly realized the presented concepts failed to look at the ground conditions beyond the actual crossings. It was an eye-opening experience which I believe everyone (staff, consultants, decision makers and public) involved in any part of the Midtown Crossing projects should do. Here are some easily made observations;


- Franklin Avenue has about ½ the traffic volume as Greenwood Avenue.
- Franklin Avenue doesn’t have the right-of-way width constraints that Greenwood Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue have.
- Franklin Avenue has the most visual appeal as a gateway to downtown.



- Franklin Avenue is adjacent to the two parcels in the BCD which have the best chance of being redeveloped soon as the desired tall mixed-use buildings (former tire store and RV sales sites).
- I believe the first crossing should be at Franklin Avenue because of the three ground conditions mentioned and the immense potential of the Franklin Avenue Corridor. Franklin Avenue Corridor could be a “complete street” with
 - Two through lanes
 - One center turn lane
 - A true “low stress” route that connects via protected (physical barriers) lanes instead of “buffered” (paint) lanes to other planned low stress route in Drake Park and east of 3rd street.
 - All it needs is a new alternative crossing concept.

b) New Franklin Avenue Crossing concept

- Here is a rough draft of an alternative that incorporates elements from the Hawthorne crossing.
- This concept would include the buying of the vacant building at the NW corner of the former tire property.



- This concept has fewer hurdles compared to the other concepts at other locations.

- Minimal hold up from state and/BNMR by spanning the parkway/railroad right-of-way without a mid-span support.
- Lower cost allows the crossing to be built just GO bond funds, not state or federal funds.

c) Franklin Avenue Corridor Potential

- The Go Bond project includes a study to look at how to improve this street corridor which could easily include a real “less stress” bike route design features and other “complete street” features.
- Greenwood Avenue looks and functions as a “business” route. Meanwhile, Franklin Avenue has immense potential to be a great gateway to downtown without all the local “business” travel.
 - Close proximity to potential re-development opportunities in the downtown and in the BCD.
 - A corridor study will have good options to choose from to clean up some of the existing congestion bottlenecks and avoid future congestion on this street as population increases.
 - This corridor can be made to be a safe corridor for all types of users.

d) Phasing of other crossings

- First phase - Franklin Avenue should be the first crossing project.
- Second phase - Cosmetic improvements and necessary regular maintenance can be made at the Greenwood crossing to improve the function and safety of the existing undercrossing. Over time, the completed TSP projects and to-be-determined Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) local regulations may lead to less single occupant passengers (SOV) and more alternatives modes use. Then a road diet could be re-considered.
- Third phase - Hawthorne Crossing should only be implemented after achieving some success with the goals of the TSP, CFEC regulations and the BCD.