

Comments on August 17th Work Session Bike Network Update [revised 9/27]

Part I - General observations

- Staff presented a considerable amount of information, and it was obvious, that a lot of work has been done over the last few years.
- I started multi-tasking by searching on my laptop for relevant materials as the recording played.
- I would give staff a “B” grade because all this relevant information is not easily accessible to the average citizen or perhaps even City Councilors. The parking webpage is a good example of accessible information.

Suggested action- Create a webpage with the relevant documentation posted and/or linked for anyone (including a City Councilor) to see both the big picture and as much detailed as they choose. Here is just an example of content which could be accessible on a webpage.

Logical location: *Transportation & Mobility Department / Traffic engineering*

Example of new page content:

Bicycle Network

[Comprehensive Plan](#) (relevant policies of Chapter 7)

[Transportation System Plan](#) (Chapter 5)

Low Stress Bicycle Network (figure 5.1)

Existing Bicycling Facilities and Paths/trails Map Figure 4.2)

Standards and Specifications

[Design standards 3.3.5](#)

[Road cross section standards](#) pages 3-5

Reports and Updates

[2018 Bicycle Network Design](#)

[Low-stress Bicycle Facility Design Elements](#)

[August 17, 2022 Network Update Presentation](#)

Plans

[Street Function Map](#)

Existing Bicycling Facilities and Paths/trails Map figure 4.2

Low Stress Bicycle Network (figure 5.1)

[Key Bicycling and Walking Routes](#)

Interactive Map...(used in presentation / can't find online posting

Program Tentative Schedule [does this exist?]

Funding assessment [split in near-term, mid-term, long-term spreadsheets. Not very accessible.]

Part II – Next Step For the Bike Network (?)

Staff said the next step for Council was a 2-hour Subcommittee meeting. What is the agenda?

- **CFEC** – Russ said these rules need to be reviewed. He is right. This review should be done before any further finetuning of the “Bicycle Network.”
 - The new rules are now in effect. Here are the rules for bicycling; [660-012-0600](https://www.ci.fremont.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/11111) s
 - For example, identification of “key destinations” 660-012-0600 (2)(c) is needed.
- **Level of Stress** – Staff stated the goal of key routes being either Low Stress Level (LSL) 1 or 2. Please note that all the current routes rely on percentage of “greenway” (LSL 4?) share.
 - Staff mentioned criteria to determine the stress level of a route.
 - traffic volume
 - traffic speed
 - degree of separation from moving vehicles, aka. double striped or physical barrier)
 - But the “Low-stress Bicycle Facility Design Elements Document” also includes
 - the uneasiness of riding next to parked vehicles
 - streets with numerous vehicles turning movements crossing bike lanes.
 - Might be good to know how bikers / staff would rank these five criteria.
 - For example, frequency of vehicles crossing my path would be my #1 concern (I would never ride Hwy 20/Greenwood).
 - I compared the [Street function map](#) to the [Key Bicycling and Walking Routes](#) and found significant segments of key routes are local streets.
 - How do you utilize Low stress 1 or 2 improvements on local streets? (Hint: you don’t. Is staff overselling their proposed Network?)
- **Design feedback** – Here are some examples from a coffee club that includes bikers.
 - Wilson RAB bike lane feels less safe the previous design standard. Rider will stay in vehicle lane instead.
 - Riders have a low opinion of the street bike trail maintenance (debris).
 - CB locations in bike lanes are a hazard.
 - Greenway mini-roundabouts are not appreciated by some riders including one of my favorite city employees.
 - Reed Market Road’s “raised” separated trail (rough surface) is not appreciated and a rider stays in vehicle lane.
- **Miscellaneous** -
 - Re-number routes like interstates. E-W routes are even numbers and N-S routes are odd numbers.
 - Wayfinding will be critical. I struggled with some of the routes during test runs.
 - Some routes would require a lot of assistance keeping on the right path.

- Some of the convoluted routes will be ignored by most bikers

Part III - Questions

By now, Robin will be swearing under her breathe. She has been working on this for years and some of these Johnny-come-lately comments would be painful for her to hear. I am not pretending to be a bike path expert. I know you ride frequently. These are just questions off the top of my head as the meeting progressed. Take them with a grain of salt.

- What will be the best use of the “key routes?” Go to work? Go to school? Recreation? Won’t most riders going to work or to school take the shortest route before rush hour, but most riders recreating might go out of the way to use a LSL # 1 trail?
- Why did the description of the implementation of the first two “key routes seem so piecemeal? WARNING. The public might feel frustrated with the price tag for a piece here and a piece there without much of a “wow factor” to show for it? [I don’t believe the statement bridge “wow” will be appreciated, especially the next time Russ or Eric asks again about the nearly \$750M to finish the TSP’s wish list. The response will be more “are you kidding me?]
- All the routes seem to be combination of LSL # 1, LSL #2, and LSL #4 Greenway segments. What drives the best location?
 - Key destinations as per CFEC rules?
 - More LSL #1 share, less LSL #2 share, less LSL #4 Greenway share?
 - Achieving more of the higher priority low stress level criteria?
 - For me personally, I don’t want to travel on a street with lots of vehicle turning movements crossing my path and certainly, I would avoid riding next to parked cars....
 - **What really should drive location is what is the best route for kids.** Adults can rely on good judgment.
- Finding a route that is mostly a LSL #1 route seems impossible. What if sidewalks were on one side and a separated bike path on the other side where existing right-of-way is an issue?
- Are the staff proposed first N-S and E-W routes the best choices?
 - Route #1 is probably the best north-south route. However, some refinement may be desirable when looking at school locations and/or maximizing LSL 1 reaches.
 - Route #2/10/12 seems piecemeal. There seems to be a modified E-W route that could go farther and meet more LSL 1 criteria.
- What is the agenda for the Council Subcommittee? It sure seems like staff has a lot of groundwork remaining before routes can be finetuned.