

Review of Proposed 10/18/2022 Bend Development Code Amendments

PLTEXT20220451

General Comments

1. **Public Improvement Code** - I applaud the removal of the redundant Public Improvement code. It is never wise to have the same standards and specifications in two places.
2. **Mobility Code** – What is the point of adding this code **now**?
 - a. Cascade East Transit’s Technical Advisory Committee completed its final draft of the [Mobility Hub Feasibility Study Final Report](#) as these amendments were distributed. The next CET step is to amend their master plan to include this document.
 - b. The public has not had a chance to review this CET final report.
 - c. According to Derek Hofbauer, CET, a lot of details still need to be worked out.
 - d. Mr. Hofbauer expects the preliminary work will continue for a couple of years which include a pilot test with very minimal improvements that have not been finalized.
 - e. Public and institutional uses are allowed in most zones already.
 - f. An alternative is to leave in mobility hub definition and stipulate mobility hubs as allowed use in specific zones, but the proposed BDC 3.6.300(D) is not appropriate at this time.
 - g. The precise location and site improvements should constitute a land use decision. The current wording and timing have the appearance of trying to prevent neighborhoods from having any opportunity to comment on the **actual** facilities.
3. **Bikeways** - The stated purpose of these Development Code amendments is to provide “consistency and clarity.” The proposed amendments on Bikeways must be clearer for the layperson and the developer.
 - a. This topic has a lot of terminology which can be made layperson- and developer-friendly by the insertion of a simple summary which demonstrates the relationship of the terminology. This type of summary is more user-friendly than relying solely on hunting through the “definitions” to figure the relation of the different terms.

Bikeway – any road, path or way open to bicyclists.

Access Corridor – separate or shared travel way for pedestrians and bicyclists

Multi-use path – separate from the roadway

Connector multi-use path – to CFEC’s “key destinations”

Primary multi-use path – part of Low Stress Network

Multi-use trail – managed by others

Bike Lane – portion of a roadway exclusive for bikes

Shoulder bikeway – paved roadway shoulder

Shared roadway – roadway shared with vehicles

Greenways

Bicycle low stress network – a mapped system routes in the TSP

Bicycle low stress route – achieves level of traffic stress 1 or 2

Key route – critical route highlighted in the TSP

- b. The Transportation System Plan’s Policy 40 included this action, develop a **Bikeway Design Guide**. I have not found any reference to an actual Bikeway Design Guide

anywhere on the city website. This is what I have found to date. Will there be a “Bikeway Design Guide” or is the following information sufficient?

- i. Section 3.6.1 and 3.6.1.1 – 3.6.1.3 of the Design section of the Standards and Specifications.
- ii. Street sections (R-1A, R-1B, R-1C) of the Standards and Specifications.
- iii. Design Standards Part VI Appendix C, Connector Routes and Crossing Map Version 1.
- iv. Figures 5.1 and 7.2, the Bicycle Key Routes [and] Low Stress Network.

Two critical “design” criteria seem to be missing.

#1. In the Design Standards, page 30 of 64, 3.6.1.1, it states, “*Select the type of facility based on the design parameters required to meet LTS1 or LTS 2 for the speed, volume, condition, and configuration of the street cross-section.*” I failed to figure out how the designer is expected to make this selection. Where are the design parameters to settle on LTS 1 or LTS 2?

Does [ODOT Analysis Procedure Manual Chapter 14.4](#) or [Bend’s Bike Facility Design Elements](#) [an old report that predates the TSP] come into play?

#2. Compare the Wilson Corridor design and the Franklin Corridor Study. The Franklin Corridor study is recommending separate bike paths and sidewalks, both outside the roadway. Wilson Corridor uses both a multi-use path and a LTS 1 Bike Lane. The Wilson Corridor design cost is busting its budget.

Considering how big of a part that bikeways play in the TSP, perhaps the city should create the Bike Design Guide that has all the bike design criteria in one easily located place.

- 4. Parking mandates – The adopted OAR rules for Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) requires Bend to select one of three parking mandate options by the end of 2022. Wouldn’t it be more efficient to make the selection as part of these amendments?**

Minor Specific Concerns

1. Figure 7-2’s note that declares a change to this map may be updated administratively by staff and shall not constitute a land use decision. This is a bad idea. Should staff have free reign to modify this map without giving impacted neighborhoods the opportunity to comment?
2. “Primary multi-use path” definition includes.....”*and/or identified in the engineering standard cross-sections.*” The three applicable street sections only refer to “*sidewalk*” and “*Bike [Lane]*”. This definition needs some tweaking.
3. Will **all existing** Arterials and Collectors “have facilities in compliance with the LSN?” Many of the existing arterials and collectors are on figure 5-2/7-2 [LSN map] are not shown as “routes.”
4. Page 36 [3.1.400(4)(a) – Why are these three qualifications for a second access being modified?
- 5.