



UPTOWN REGIONAL BIKE CORRIDORS PROJECT
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #3

June 12, 2013

6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Santa Fe Room, Balboa Park Club

2144 Pan American Road West, San Diego, 92101

S U M M A R Y R E P O R T

INTRODUCTION

Community Advisory Group Background

The Uptown Regional Bike Corridor Community Advisory Group (Advisory Group) was formed to provide input on issues, opportunities, and alternatives to share with the larger community. The Advisory Group will meet, to provide input to the SANDAG design team, at each stage of the design phase – kick off, existing conditions analysis, alternative design analysis, and preferred design. Throughout the design phase, Advisory Group members will help disseminate information and collect input from their representative organizations and other community members.

Established community groups, such as town councils, resident groups, business associations, and non-profit groups, were asked to nominate a person to participate on the Advisory Group. The individuals nominated by the community groups invited to participate were notified of the meeting date, time and location via email a month in advance of the meeting date. The meeting agenda was distributed the Friday before the meeting date.

All Advisory Group meetings are open to all community members. Members are encouraged to forward meeting dates and agendas to their respective community groups and distribute information in ways proven to be effective within their community.

Materials presented at Advisory Group meetings, information collected from community members, and future meeting dates will be posted on www.keepsandiegomoving.com/UptownBike.

Meeting Objectives

- Recap (briefly) the project purpose, goals, scope, area, corridors and final products
- Review key findings from CAG Meeting #2
- Explain the alternatives analysis process (Tiers 1-2) and resulting alignment options including:
 - Sections identified as “preferred” (e.g., Georgia St, San Diego Ave, etc.)
 - Sections with options (e.g., Washington and University from Mission Hills to Hillcrest)
- Explain the benefits and challenges of each alignment section related to the project goals and criteria
 - Mobility: Increase choices, connect communities
 - Experience: Improve travel safety for everyone, and create an exceptional biking experience
 - Community: Build on and support related efforts
 - Placemaking: Enhance community identity and public spaces
 - Economic Development : Improve public infrastructure and strengthen opportunities for business development
- Facilitate advisory group members input regarding:
 - additional benefits and considerations for each section with options;
 - the most compelling benefit for each section;
 - the most challenging consideration for each section; and
 - the design concept for each section
- Explain next steps in the process, including:

- Development of the preferred alignment and design concept
- Community outreach activities

Meeting Format

The meeting format included a slideshow presentation with facilitated, small group and large group discussions. The project team provided a recap of the project overview and key findings from Advisory Group Meetings #1 and #2. Facilitated, small group discussions with the Advisory Group and other meeting attendees focused on the benefits and considerations for each section with options requiring additional analysis, followed by small group reports to the larger group. Thereafter, a facilitated large group discussion sought to expand on the small group reports.

Approximately 60 community members attended the second Advisory Group meeting. Of those attending, approximately 24 were advisory group members, representing community groups invited to participate. Meeting participants received an agenda and a comment card for submitting written comments.

MEETING SUMMARY

Information and comments from the following sources were combined to produce this meeting summary:

- Note-takers' notes
- Comment Cards
- "Report-outs" and the related annotated boards/posters

The information is organized using the same format used for the Comment Card, with the following headings:

1. PROJECT UPDATE
2. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS PROCESS AND FINDINGS
3. MISSION HILLS TO HILLCREST
4. HILLCREST – EAST/WEST CORRIDOR
5. HILLCREST – NORTH/SOUTH CORRIDOR
6. 163 to NORTH PARK
7. UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS TO BALBOA PARK (via Georgia St)
8. OTHER COMMENTS

The Comment Card asked for feedback on general corridors and the meeting discussion groups asked for feedback on segments within the corridors, therefore comments are organized within each heading accordingly.

In an effort to capture all of the ideas expressed, all pertinent comments are included in this summary. Comments in **bold** emphasize those that were repeated and/or stated emphatically by the person commenting.

1. PROJECT UPDATE: Please share any comments about the project overview, Meeting #2 outcomes, and related topics.
-

- **Love the protected bike lane options presented**
 - **Like buffered bike lanes**
 - Happy to see progress happening at such a rapid rate!
-

2. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS PROCESS AND FINDINGS: Please share any general comments about the process and findings from the alternatives analysis.
-

Regardless of route, would like to see:

- Reduced lane widths
- Reduced street widths (e.g. Park and Normal)
- Reduction of head-in and diagonal parking
- More parklets and bike corrals

- **Shocked to hear that Park Blvd is “off the table”** as a N/S connection in the near future.
 - Seems short-sighted & wasteful, especially if a project is considered there further down the road

- Fully support 4th and 5th for bike route, proposed “section” is brilliant; number of advantages:
 - a. Traffic Calming by lane reduction and width reduction
 - b. Protected curbside bike lane
 - c. Reduced ped crossing distance
 - d. Greatly improved safety – bikes, drivers, pedestrians

- **University Ave is preferred route choice for infrastructure investment**, plus it has the most regional significance of West/East alternatives due to connectivity potential to NPMC project.

3. MISSION HILLS TO HILLCREST

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>WASHINGTON ST</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Protected lane, separated from fast traffic	Proposal – sidewalk on both sides
	Difficult merge near University
	Hills throughout
	Very fast traffic

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>WASHINGTON @ GOLDFINCH</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Opportunity for exciting things (an exceptional facility)	Bus access
Opportunity for a contiguous facility	Address danger at ramps (fwy)
Greater separation from cars	Currently high traffic volume (stress)
More direct access to businesses on Washington by Mission Hills residents	Must be a good connection/preferred route for connecting Washington to University (somewhere b/t 3 rd and 6 th)
Opp. To create a visible entry into Hillcrest; currently no sense of arrival coming in on Washington.	How about most infrastructure improvements on University and lesser improvements to Washington?
Possible connection to University Heights	

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Best option; best bet for SD to make an impact for most people	Splitting route to Normal is terrible. Please no!
Most central route through city (La Mesa-Bay); straight shot	
Most amenities already in place (racks, businesses, etc.)	
Mostly flat; only one big hill	

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>WEST UNIVERSITY AVE – ALBATROSS TO FRONT STREET</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Most direct (connecting to other sections of University) rather than zig-zag-ing;	Change lights at Goldfinch; synchronize lights at intersections
Connects real neighborhoods	Convert ramps to bike/ped only;
Safer access to Washington (with closure of ramps)	Level of Service of Wash going uphill
Better connection to International Row	Removal of parking
Opp. Redirect cut-through traffic on the residential portion of University	Stress due to limited ROW
	Cut ramps on University
	Washington is going to be gridlocked if you shut down University

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- The [Mission Hills] town council has talked about making that part of University (part with ramps connecting to Washington) a park anyway.
- **The interchange at Washington and University is the crux of the matter.**
- We also want proper pedestrian experiences (safer access to Washington/International Restaurant Row). These projects should enhance that.

4. HILLCREST – EAST/WEST CORRIDOR

COMMENT CARDS

<i>WASHINGTON ST</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Enough room for cycle tracks without disrupting parking	Too fast! Freeway onramp
Parked car buffers are nice ; place-making, economic development, safer for bidirectional; wide street, lots of room; cycle tracks would totally change the street	A lot of freeway-bound traffic
	Median is already very narrow; how would it be reduced?

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>WASHINGTON @ GOLDFINCH</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Cycle tracks would really change the character (in a good way)	Really wide street
It is continuous – loss of directness ok when quality taken into account (consistency)	Indirect – doesn't serve the heart of district
No parking impacts	Eliminate medians and put the landscape on edges where it can be enjoyed for a sense of place – don't place-make for the automobiles in the center
Good for throughput for bikes	At least narrow the center medians
Will encourage riders	Not as useful as University
Parked car buffers are nice	On a hill; hard for the edges of the demographic (8 and 80)
Placemaking Opportunity, especially with repurposing of median	Not sure how neighborhood will use it – discussion about passers-through vs. locals

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Preferred/best option (and this is already the preferred corridor for bikes/peds in the area)	163 bridge narrowing ; poor biking and walking environment
Increased safety (personal and physical) by having more "eyes on the street" and a protective barrier	Make sure protected from cars backing up when parking
Connected to businesses (economic development)	Parking – possibly – needs to be offset
Placemaking potential	Narrow and wide variations present a challenge

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>UNIVERSITY - FRONT TO 3RD AVENUE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Emphasis on the slow traffic being helpful	Lower speed limits
Attracts a broader demographic	Repeated concerns about consistency – the facilities need to be continuous – don't pull the rug out from under just as the rider gets comfortable
Provides a buffered, continuous experience	Area is already slow moving
Opportunity for more landscaping	Parking reduction may be tough here
Opt 1 – likes the trees in the bulbouts	Can through traffic be eliminated?
Opt 2 – parked car makes good buffer	Be careful of bikes and peds on the same plane (Opt 2) – conflicts
	Walking groups of bar goers will walk on cycle track; drinkers may misuse the facility

<i>UNIVERSITY - 6TH TO 9TH AVENUE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Meets all of the project goals!	Way more parking on south side and businesses that could benefit
Safe, contiguous and consistent	Build a parking structure – it may be viable
More likely to bring in more riders (interested but concerned and 8-80); Meets needs of aging population	Parking already impacted – not that many spaces and hard to get; Mitigate loss of parking on other streets
Will provide the most econ benefit	More landscaping helps with atmosphere
Placemaking opp. (e.g. urban forestry in median & public art)	Not good for the kids or grandparents

COMMENT CARDS:

PENNSYLVANIA AVE	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Low cost ; one of the few E/W connections that's not a freeway on/off ramp	No!
Away from fwy access	Longer route
Away from (forthcoming?) LTS	Cost-benefit for building a bridge is ridiculous

GROUP DISCUSSION:

PENNSYLVANIA - 3 RD TO 4 TH AVENUES	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Only east-west not associated/connected with freeway off-on ramp.	May not meet design goal of increasing ridership , appealing to a wide range of cyclists
Low stress	Would be nice for people who live there but may not benefit anyone else – not much return on investment
	Won't be an exceptional experience
	No econ dev. (detour from the commercial heart)
	Doesn't do placemaking
	Requires a bridge over the 163

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

From on University, from Normal, heading East (not in project area?):

- Put bike lane under the bridge
- Add pedestrian sidewalk that goes up and over the bridge
- Then, at Louisiana, have bikes diverted to neighborhood streets

5. HILLCREST – NORTH/SOUTH CORRIDOR

COMMENT CARDS:

3 RD AVE	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Slower street	Why bother? It's not going to get much better than it is; it's an ok street now, if you want a slow, residential experience and would be better spent on a street that needs help.
	It's already slow/okay as it is; don't spend money on just an ok street; use paint here

GROUP DISCUSSION:

3 RD AVE	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
	People won't use it; There are more negatives than benefits for 3rd
	Too indirect (one block off more major streets)
	Doesn't meet the economic development goal of creating commercial connections
	Parking very limited
	Canyons present a major barrier are require too many turns
	Older neighborhood
	Dedicated bicycle signals/advance intervals/traffic signal priority would make 3 rd viable.

COMMENT CARDS:

4 th AVE	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Applies to 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th : Tons of unused asphalt to install cycle tracks; no need for roads so large; all great candidates.	re: Traffic Calming, do they have to be one way streets? If they have to be one-way, maybe cyclists should go in same direction
A one-way cycle track (paired with 5 th) would allow for a tree/shrub buffer, not simply one pavement for another	Right merge from 4 th @ Pennsylvania; cars going right don't see bikes going straight.
	6th is the best option

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>4th Ave - Washington to Walnut</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Economic Opp (Commercial Corridor) for local businesses	4th AND 5th, maintain throughway to Upas and Laurel
Opp for traffic calming design and improved pedestrian environment	Concerns about safety of a two-way facility
Two-way facility could provide better business access and less salmon-ing (contra-riding)	Should include physical, vertical barrier , but not one that impedes car doors from opening/closing
	Add bike parking
	Redesign Quince connection/triangle, where improvements are planned;
	6th is the best option; people take it, but it's high-stress; why do we want a high stress environment next to Balboa Park?
	Access to the park should be included in this plan, from 4th and 5th and Upas and Laurel.

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>5th Ave</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Good connectivity	Freeway entrance coming up 5th (merge is awful)
Would definitely help the businesses	These streets (4 th and 5 th) are set up to handle a lot of car traffic; why not slow down 6th ave?
	3 rd choice/option

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>5th Ave - Washington to Upas</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
5th is great.	Ensure clear access to Balboa Park
Traffic calming and pedestrian enhancement through bulb-outs	Freeway onramp (for the 5) carries a lot of traffic and needs to be addressed
	This alternative doesn't impact parking
	Offer diagonal/more parking, instead of median or provide parking on adjacent streets
	Add Bike Parking
	How will bus stops be addressed?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- **Why not 6th Avenue? Make 6th safer. Move cars off; there IS capacity.**
- **If 6th is used, couldn't we move some of the stress over to 4th and 5th, connecting to park, no on/off ramps! Most connective!**
- At 4th/Nutmeg 300K + 250K has been earmarked for improvements; should not just be folded in SANDAG project; we should get that money and those improvements too

6. SR 163 to NORTH PARK

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Yes! Preferred option	
Straight through connectivity	
Economic development; access to businesses	
Improved personal and physical safety, through "eyes on the street" and separated facility	
Retains parking	

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE FROM VERMONT TO NORMAL</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
MOST PEOPLE Strongly support University; only corridor to cycle – efficiently – from La Mesa to the Bay	Could change diagonal parking to parallel to make space and add parking to side streets;
Convenient connection to the Vermont Street and University Heights	Median reduction presents opportunity to change to more sustainable landscaping and <u>not</u> lose parking
	Concern for preserving the medians; the Hillcrest Bus. Assoc. put a lot of money into them
	Would rather see University as a street car corridor and have the bike facility on Robinson

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE FROM VERMONT TO NORMAL - NORMAL AVE CONNECTOR</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Increased Transportation Choice options by creating a separated facility	Would like to see the facility go beyond Normal (further east?) Is that off the table?
Traffic calming (in a dense neighborhood this is great)	To widen the cycle track , consider reducing cycle track buffer to less than 5'
	Coordinate with the Hillcrest Bus Assoc (re: Farmer's Market)
	This segment would entail a net increase in parking
	Are we going to eliminate right on reds?
	Can we look at stop sign reductions?

<i>UNIVERSITY AVE FROM VERMONT TO NORMAL – HERBERT ST CONNECTOR</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
This will benefit all local residents/users with traffic calming	Consider eliminating parking on one side to create a separate facility
	Street is too quiet to require separation
	To get families riding, must reduce through traffic
	Traffic diversion

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>ROBINSON AVE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
NONE	Not connected to businesses; already a low-traffic option, doesn't need any more help.
	Freeway entrance and exit; not a pleasant cycling experience ; one-way streets seem to have faster traffic, confuse many drivers who don't know the area; ones who do go fast

GROUP DISCUSSION:

<i>ROBINSON @ 163</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
	This further supports University
	Any of the best options here are worse than the worst options on University
	There are lots of cars; Really dangerous for bikes and cars to share space
	Can make the bridge just for bikes; move freeway access and improve safety
	Use Robinson instead of University because of "impending" LRT

COMMENT CARDS:

PENNSYLVANIA AVE	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
	Too far

GROUP DISCUSSION:

PENNSYLVANIA @ 163	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Thinking "outside the box"	Money better spent elsewhere
	Too far off the beaten path
	This is a diversion to me; More people would ride if you did it on University.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- **Consensus of small group discussion: University Ave (and Normal)**
 - Must be separated.
 - Generate economic development.
 - More security/eyes on the street with University
- **Why straight down University, but not into NP?** Infeasible? Doesn't meet the project goals?

7. UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS TO BALBOA PARK (via Georgia St)

COMMENT CARDS:

<i>PARK BLVD</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
Park Blvd in Univ Heights is best segment of that road in town, with less width than southern portion to Balboa Park, extend the UH model southward.	Leave space for future BRT/Streetcar
More direct, yes!	

<i>ZOO DRIVE</i>	
BENEFITS	CONSIDERATIONS
	No!
	You can already use this if you want to

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

In favor of Park Blvd:

If they're already making/re-doing bus line down Park Blvd, might as well plan bike paths in the reconstruction. Save money, plan ahead. Don't re-do the same project 2 years later like we're now doing with University Ave East of the 163 Park and Washington west of 5th to I-5 which both had center median removal, beautification and park re-design within the last few years.

Thank you! **Love the cycle tracks and the buffered bike lanes.** Lanes are good. Sharrows are better than nothing. Bike "routes" are weak.

OTHER COMMENTS: additional comments about the project

As with the NPMC Project (and likely region-wide) **University Ave** [from Mission Hills through Hillcrest to North Park] **is the best route to create a vibrant biking option** with access to many residents (of diverse means, backgrounds and transportation needs) and create a showcase example of what world class multi-modal urban planning looks like. An amazing opportunity we need to embrace now.

Consider:

- Traffic signal synchronization
- **Treatments that allow transit, cycle tracks, travel lanes, etc. to coexist**
- **Traffic calming, traffic calming, traffic calming...**

- **Consistent treatments and good signage are key**, especially in appealing to new riders or people who don't feel safe on existing facilities (moms, kids, non-triathletes).
- My experience with one-way and multi-lane (in the same direction) streets is that drivers go faster and are more likely to harass riders than smaller, two-way streets. Why so many one-ways downtown?
- **Please don't provide good lanes and then remove them when they are most needed...** weird intersections, freeway ramps, etc. "lane ends" ... "you're on your own from here..."