

---

**TARPO Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning Framework Steering Committee Meeting # 2**  
**January 23, 2015**

---

Following a round of introductions, Matt Day (TARPO staff) facilitated a group discussion of the draft goals and objectives for the plan, a copy of which was provided to the meeting attendees as a handout. The group first discussed the proposed vision statement, and no revisions were recommended to that draft statement – *“The Triangle Area Rural Planning Organization will work with its state and local partners to create a connected and effective network of safe and accessible facilities for use by bicyclists and pedestrians throughout the region.”* The group then discussed each of the draft goals and the draft objectives and action steps listed for each goal – the following comments were made on the draft goals and objectives (the original draft language can be seen in the attached handout):

Goal 1 – “Plan a robust bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure within the TARPO region that serves users of all ages and ability levels and allows safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian transportation.”

- Add language about public engagement in the planning process (including tools such as Wikimaps for collecting input)
- Add language about non-engineering improvements (programmatic improvements)

Goal 2 – “Implement appropriate bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of the construction of new roadways and the improvement of existing roadways.”

- Under Objective 2.3, add an action step about requiring developers to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities as properties are developed
- Under Objective 2.1, clarify that both the RPO staff AND the local government should participate in project scoping
- Add an objective related to a process for tracking implementation of planned improvements
- Under Objective 2.1, change the word “considered” to “applied” with regard to the NCDOT Complete Streets policy
- Under Objective 2.3, recommend that local governments use the NCDOT Complete Street Design Guidelines as part of their development review process

Goal 3 – “Increase funding for bicycle and pedestrian facility construction and maximize the benefits of bicycle and pedestrian projects that are funded for construction.”

- Add language discussing modernization projects in STI (which are essentially hybrid bike-highway projects, with benefits to both modes), and ways to improve the scoring of these projects – example could include recommending use of different scoring criteria within our NCDOT regions/divisions
- Add an objective discussing education about local funding options (and make this education part of the plan report)

Goal 4 – “Promote healthy lifestyles and improve the quality of life for residents and visitors in the community through improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.”

- Under Objective 4.1, add language about programs for bicycle availability for low-income persons
- Under Objective 4.2, add language about school siting, and how these siting decisions have a major impact on accessibility by walking and biking
- Under Objective 4.3, add language about how the system should be designed to accommodate everyone “from 8 to 80” or to accommodate a 13-year-old daughter
- Add language about promotion and programs (non-engineering solutions)
- Add language about partnering with related agencies (such as health departments) outside the typical transportation and planning agencies
- Add an objective related to recreational use of bike/ped facilities, the health benefits of recreational use, and the need to coordinate with recreation plans
- Under Objective 4.4, discuss speed as a major safety factor – language about considering reduced speed limits in areas with bicycle and pedestrian usage (or potential usage); maybe classified by type
- Benefits bike/ped infrastructure can have in reducing vehicle travel (quality of life, air quality, health/physical activity, reduced traffic congestion, etc.)

Goal 5 – “Benefit the regional economy through improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.”

- No recommended revisions

Following the discussion of goals and objectives, the group moved on to a discussion of criteria that could be used to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian projects as part of the NCDOT STI process. Matt Day provided an overview of the process TARPO currently uses to score projects for STI points, as well as a draft list of potential changes to that process (which was provided to meeting attendees as a handout). The committee noted the following comments/concerns to be considered in the development of these criteria:

- Should we focus on transportation use, or on recreational use? There are benefits of both. The committee discussed how transportation –focused projects in more developed areas tended to score better on the NCDOT’s scoring criteria and were more likely to be funded than projects with a primarily recreation purpose.
- Give greater weight to the safety criterion (instead of giving each criterion equal weight)
- Does the process result in TARPO prioritizing more expensive projects? Should cost be part of the scoring process? There was some discussion that this may not be necessary, since bicycle and pedestrian projects are programmed at the statewide level (there is no specific required set-aside percentage for bicycle and pedestrian projects within each division, so it is less likely that large bicycle and pedestrian projects would eat up the available money within a division).
- Should the scoring process be revised with every iteration of STI (every two years)? Should this be spelled out in the plan?

- On the connectivity criterion, consider giving greater weight based on the intensity of the uses that are being connected (e.g. connecting to a college could have greater weight than connecting to a rural crossroads community).

The committee ran out of time to complete the planned small group activity on identifying priority corridors. The committee chose to meet again in three weeks to complete this exercise and wrap up any remaining discussion items – this in addition to the originally-planned third committee meeting, which will likely be in March.

Online versions of the maps may be found at

[http://www.tarpo.org/topics/gis/bike\\_ped\\_mapping\\_app/index.html](http://www.tarpo.org/topics/gis/bike_ped_mapping_app/index.html).

The next steering committee meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2015 at 10 am at TJCOG.

Attendees:

Matt Day, TARPO

Cheryl Collins, NCDOT Transportation Planning

Darius Sturdivant, NCDOT Division 8

Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7

Phil Bors, Chatham County (citizen member)

David Montgomery, Lee County

John Mueller, Moore County (citizen member – alternate)

Theresa Thompson, Moore County

Mike Ventola, Moore County (citizen member)

Heidi Perry, Orange County (citizen member)

Bret Martin, Orange County

Richard Sloane (interested citizen)