



UPTOWN REGIONAL BIKE CORRIDOR PROJECT  
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #2  
February 6, 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) provides input on project issues, opportunities, and alternatives to share with the larger community. The Advisory Group meets to provide input to the SANDAG-led project 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 assist in disseminating information and collecting input from their representative organizations and other community members.

Established community groups, such as town councils, resident groups, business associations, and non-profit groups, nominated a person to participate on the Advisory Group. Participants received notification of the meeting date, time and location via email one month in advance of the meeting date, as well as follow-up reminders. Participants received the meeting agenda the Friday before the meeting date.

All Advisory Group meetings are open to all community members. Advisory Group 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 are continually updated on [www.keepsandiegomoving.com/UptownBike](http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/UptownBike).

#### Meeting Objectives

- Recap of the project purpose, goals, scope, area, corridors and final products
- Review key findings from Advisory Group Meeting #1 including visions, issues and opportunities for the project
- Present initial findings from existing conditions analysis focused on connectivity
- Facilitate discussion regarding Advisory Group members' perspectives of potential routes between neighborhoods and destinations, including opportunities and challenges
- Identify Advisory Group members' emerging points of consensus and areas for further study regarding the discussion topics

#### Meeting Format

The meeting format included a slideshow presentation followed by facilitated, small group and large group discussions. To begin the meeting, the project team provided a concise recap of the project overview and key findings from Advisory Group Meeting #1, and asked for any clarifying points or questions from Advisory Group members. Then, facilitated, small group discussions with the Advisory Group and other meeting attendees focused on potential routes within neighborhoods, followed by small group reports to the larger group. Finally, a facilitated large group discussion sought to identify emerging opportunity alignments, as well as alignments requiring innovative design solutions.

Approximately 44 community members attended the second Advisory Group meeting. Of those attending, approximately 30 were Advisory Group members, representing 27 of the 54 community groups invited to participate. Meeting participants received an agenda and a comment card for submitting written comments from the meeting.

## MEETING SUMMARY

Participants signed in and the agenda with other handouts were distributed.

### Welcome and Introductions

Coleen Clementson, SANDAG Principal Planner, introduced herself, and explained her role is to manage the meeting agenda and facilitate discussions at key points. For the benefit of those who did not attend the first meeting, she explained that the role of the Advisory Group is to represent the wide range of community-based organizations and interests in advising SANDAG on development of the project. She introduced the project team and asked for self-introductions from everyone. She then reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda, and asked for any clarifying questions.

### Project Update and Meeting #1 Review

Beth Robrahn, Uptown Bike Project Manager, provided a brief project overview, including project background, area, process and schedule. Beth reviewed key findings from the previous meeting, which are summarized in detail in a summary report. Highlights included the themes related to the project goals, opportunities and issues:

- The project as a catalyst for bringing more people to the community and businesses. Recent findings on economic benefits of projects were cited, including in NYC where sales grew by 49% along portions of 9th after the city's first protected bike lane was installed, 16 times the borough wide growth and a Portland study that found people who bike to stores and restaurants went more frequently and spent more overall than customers who drove.
- A desire to strengthen connections to destinations, and not reinforce existing barriers; safety issues can be addresses through better design.
- Making streets a better experience regardless of your mode choice, especially for people walking and biking while improving connections between destinations.
- The project should improve overall circulation patterns. Robinson Street over the 163 and the base of Washington Street were given as examples of challenging areas within the project corridor.
- The importance of leveraging other planning efforts; when we are able to coordinate with city projects, there is potential to realize greater community benefits

There were no questions or comments from the meeting participants regarding the summary of the first meeting.

### Existing Conditions Analysis: Early Findings

Seth Torma, KOA Corporation Project Manager, reviewed early findings regarding existing level of service on roadways and at intersections within the project area. He also reviewed analysis of the connectivity of neighborhood streets to the major corridors including the following data:

- Vehicular traffic data and analysis of roadways, intersections and ramp meters illustrating the results in a map
- Descriptions of the general categories people who ride bikes for transportation may be associated

- Roadway map classified by the 4 levels of traffic stress (LTS), which correlate with 4 general categories of people who ride bikes for transportation.
- Examples of existing streets representing each LTS/type of rider

The analysis provided a review of thematic opportunities and challenges previously identified by community members.

#### Small Group Discussions Explanation

Beth explained that the group will break out into eight small groups organized by the neighborhood clusters. The neighborhood areas are:

- Old Town > Five Points > Mission Hills
- Mission Valley > Hillcrest > Bankers Hill
- Hillcrest > University Heights > Balboa Park
- Hillcrest > Bankers Hill > Downtown

The purpose of the small group discussions was to identify potential neighborhood routes. Each group used one large map of its neighborhood cluster with the potential bike corridors identified from (a.) the Regional Bike Plan, (b.) the City's Bike Plan, and (c.) existing facilities. The objectives of the small group discussion were:

- Identify all potential neighborhood routes for people who want to ride a bike for everyday trips that connect neighborhood centers and destinations
- For each potential route, identify (a.) its opportunities and strengths as a route, and (b.) its weaknesses and challenges
- If time allows, identify potential innovative solutions to solve weaknesses/challenges.

#### Facilitated Small Group Discussions

Facilitators lead their groups through the discussions, apportioning their time to address these questions:

- What are potential routes for people who want to ride a bike for everyday trips that connect the neighborhood centers and destinations? At this point, do not be constrained by what you may believe to be big challenges or barriers.
- For each potential route, what makes this a strong route for people who want to ride a bike for everyday trips? What are the opportunities for each route (e.g., most direct, wide street, traffic calming, minimal parking impacts, etc.)?
- For each potential route, what are its challenges and weaknesses (e.g., steep climb, parking impact, narrow street, etc.)?
- (If time allows) What are some potential innovative solutions to solving the most challenging routes? Don't feel hindered about potential cost, maintenance, environmental impacts, or other factors.

#### Small Group Discussion Summaries

Each group summarized the highlights of their discussion. A volunteer from each group provided a report to the large group. All of the alignments marked on each groups map are shown in figure 1. Highlights from each group's discussion related to opportunities and issues of various alignments follows (the notes from each group, along with the photos of groups' maps are posted on [www.keepsandiegomoving.com/UptownBike](http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/UptownBike)).

Old Town >Five Points >Mission Hills Group 1

Washington

- Grade separated Class 1
- Would not like parking or lane reductions
- Pocket park or resting area
- Connect to trolley stop
- Heavily used by all users
- Grade issue/retaining wall
- Connect to grant Elementary School and Pioneer Park

Presidio & Juan St

- Steep

Fort Stockton

- Wide
- Often used by people in Mission Hills
- Intersection with Goldfinch problematic
- Preferred over Lewis as secondary route

West Lewis

- Narrow
- Leisure route
- Not good for a bike lane

San Diego Ave

- Conflicts with Old town Academy (east side)
- 2-way cycle track on west side

Pacific Hwy

- 2-way cycle track on trolley side (east side)

Congress

- Narrow

Reynard

- Mixed housing & high density
- Less steep grade

Old Town >Five Points >Mission Hills Group 2

Washington

- businesses located in Five Points and at the top
- direct
- reasonable grade
- community gateway
- heavy auto use
- fast traffic

Presidio

- less auto traffic
- switchback could address grade
- circuitous
- bypasses Five Points
- make one-way

University

- more destinations than Washington
- number of lanes

Reynard

- direct connection from Mission Hills to Little Italy

Hillcrest >University Hts >Balboa Park Group 1

Fourth

- wide
- good downhill
- businesses

Fifth

- Wide
- Reasonable grade
- businesses

Robinson

- Congestion
- Narrow
- Sharp turns
- Grade
- University
- Less congested than Robinson
- Connection to North Park

Florida

- Close to autos through park; route from downtown through Balboa Park to University

First

- Dark
- Narrow

Park Blvd

- Connect to downtown
- businesses

University

- Where people want to be

Adams Ave

- High auto traffic
- businesses

Hillcrest >University Hts >Balboa Park Group 2

University

- Where ppl want to go
- Direct
- Fairly flat
- If you can make it safe for everyday cyclists, a lot of ppl would ride it
- One of the few actual routes into Hillcrest
- Biggest uptown/mid-city neighborhood destinations
- Great for business

Park Blvd

- North/south route bisecting uptown
- Lots of businesses
- Connects to balboa park
- Wide enough for cycletracks; part of the streetcar feasibility study, light rail
- Connects to the main trolley station

Washington

- Cycletrack potential
- Access to businesses
- Connectivity between mission hills/hillcrest/north park
- Lots of space if parking is moved off Washington

5th

- Lots of room
- Access between hillcrest/balboa park/downtown
- Drivers can take the 163 from hillcrest to downtown
- Fast traffic; business potential hindered (people don't stop)
- Bike facilities and freeway ramps should not be on same streets

4th

- Downhill all the way to downtown

Mission Valley >Hillcrest >Downtown Group 1

University

- Access to more destinations
- Congestion
- Freeway ramps

Washington

- Latent demand/desire
- Congestion
- Freeway ramps

Robinson

- Congestion
- Change to one-way eastbound
- Parking

Reynard

- Unused center turn lane

First Ave

- Commuter route
- One-way northbound lane for bikes
- Indirect (along with Second and Third)

Fourth, Fifth, Sixth

- wide
- Sixth - heavy parking needs
- Fifth - reasonable grade

Bachman

- Uphill lane protected by parking

Mission Valley

- Connect Camino del Rio S to Hotel Circle S
- Connect SD River path to Fashion Valley path
- Path from Lincoln to Camino del Rio S (through TGI Fridays parking lot)

Mission Valley >Hillcrest >Downtown Group 2

Fourth & Fifth

- Dedicate lane to bicycle facilities
- Businesses are an advantage
- Create nice amenities
- Look at how Long beach accommodated businesses
- Getting developed and denser
- Vehicle speeds are a major concern; traffic calming would improve street for people walking and biking
- A connection through the park would be nicer

Third

- More direct than other proposed routes
- North of Upis, consider Fifth > Washington > Fourth > Lewis > Montecito > Bachman to keep route close to businesses

Sixth

- Good option to connect to Balboa Park

Washington

- East of Third, preferred over Robinson
- Connect west portion of Mission Hills from Downtown – Fifth > Washington > Fort Stockton > Hawk > Lewis
- Businesses located

Robinson

- Used by people driving cars to avoid congestion on Washington [University]

Bachman

- Good connection from Mission Valley
- Blind spot at hospital is a problem
- University
- Reduce land widths

Hillcrest >Bankers Hill >Downtown Group 1

Third and Second

- Could be better options than 6th, 5th, 4th
- Great neighborhood street

Walnut

- Connect third and Fourth
- Fourth and Fifth
- Do not need 3 lanes, convert lanes for bike facility

Sixth

- Opportunity for path along park
- Eliminate lanes in both directions, add separated bike lanes

First

- More gradual grade
- Opportunity for cycle track

Park > Village Place > El Prado >Laurel

- Should have dedicated bike lanes
- Bike lanes through Balboa Park important

Richmond

- An existing good connection [to Balboa Park]
- Continue through park over 163 at Quince, along 163 to 6th

Juniper, Grape, Hawthorn, Cedar, Ash

- Good east-west connections to Pac Hwy & Little Italy
- 163

Washington

- Difficult to ride in current configuration

State > Reynard > Dove

- Not good to ride

Robinson

- Narrow
- Vermont St bridge connection important

University

- Needs cycle track
- One-way bike couplet Park to First
- 8<sup>th</sup> > Balboa Dr > Park > 6<sup>th</sup>

Park Blvd

- Continue to A St

Balboa Dr and Upis

- Needs better infrastructure for bikes



Hillcrest >Bankers Hill >Downtown Group 2

First

- Steep grade
- Interchange concerns
- Connect to Robinson

Third

- Easy route

Park Blvd

- Robinson to C
- State
- Connects Little Italy to University
- Good alternative but lots of constraints

Fifth

- At Laurel, heart of Bankers Hill, commuters don't stop
- Want more businesses, concerned about loss of parking
- Cycle track opportunity; more activity attracts more people walking and biking, promotes businesses
- Freeway ramps an issue
- Upis to Washington for vehicles, reconfigure to angled parking on one side

Sixth

- Connect to Robinson
- Add angled parking

University

- Fast moving vehicles

Pennsylvania

- Seems possible if constraints are resolved; bridge
- People riding use when Sixth is congested

Balboa Dr

- Split bikes and peds
- Low traffic
- Connects to Balboa; Richmond > Quince > Balboa Dr

El Prado

- Good east-west route

### Discussion: Emerging Alignments, Potential Solutions

Coleen summarized the key points and overall themes based on the group presentations and facilitated a group discussion. The discussion was intended to address the following general questions:

- What emerging opportunity alignments do you see that connect the neighborhoods for people who want to ride a bike for everyday trips?
- Are there additional alignments within or connecting the neighborhoods that you would suggest? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
- Which alignments may be the most challenging? What are potential innovative solutions, regardless of their cost, impacts, etc.?

The discussion points were recorded on the wallgraphic and map during the discussion. The main ideas and considerations drawn from the discussion are listed below.

- Project should connect to Balboa Park and businesses
- University versus Robinson
- Separate facilities are needed (they provide safety for the users)
- Opportunities to create bike facilities along business areas
- Topography and grade are issues
- Transit opportunities if connected to Old Town Transit Station
  - Make sure that there is multi modal connectivity
- Consider topography and speed differential between bicycles and vehicles, which is one of the reasons why separate facilities make sense.
  - Presidio Place could allow cars downhill but not uphill
  - Few east- west connections
- Keep in mind all the other planned projects and join forces to make something good
- Provide supportive facilities at key locations/destinations (amenities)
- Bike improvements make for better streets for pedestrians and in turn for business
  - Design carefully and take everybody into account
- The byproduct of this project is that cycling is made visible. Bicycles have their own place, no longer an intrusion on the vehicle's space
  - Safety and health is encouraged

### Next Steps and Closing Remarks

- Beth reviewed the next steps in the process including summarizing this meeting's findings, completing the existing conditions analysis, developing the potential alignments, and convening Advisory Group Meeting #3, possibly in late April 2013.

