



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Meeting Agenda Board of Aldermen



Tuesday, January 9, 2018

7:30 PM

Board Chambers - Room 110

7:30-7:35

A. POETRY READING, RESOLUTIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

7:35-7:40

B. ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS

7:40-7:45

C. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [17-377](#) Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes of November 28 and
December 5, 2017
PURPOSE:

D. WORK SESSION

7:45-8:45

1. [17-381](#) Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Carrboro

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to provide the Board of Aldermen with an opportunity to consider whether to undertake development of a comprehensive plan.

Attachments: [Attachment A - Neighboring Jurisdiction and Regional Plans](#)
[Attachment B - Memo on Comprehensive Planning](#)

8:45-9:45

2. [17-380](#) Transportation Topics: Bicycle Friendly Community Application, Bike Plan and Related Infrastructure
- PURPOSE:** The purpose of this agenda item to provide the Board with an opportunity to discuss progress towards an application for upgrading the Town's Bicycle Friendly Community status, including the bike plan update and possible infrastructure improvements, and associated cost implications.

Attachments: [Attachment A - Carrboro Report Card](#)
 [Attachment B - Bike Ped Planning Grant Overview 2017](#)
 [Attachment C - BOA Minutes 2-21-2017](#)

E. **MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS**

F. **MATTERS BY TOWN MANAGER**

G. **MATTERS BY TOWN ATTORNEY**

H. **MATTERS BY TOWN CLERK**

I. **CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO NCGS 143-318.11 (A)(6) AND (3)**



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number:17-381

Agenda Date: 1/9/2018

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Carrboro

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to provide the Board of Aldermen with an opportunity to consider whether to undertake development of a comprehensive plan.

DEPARTMENT: Planning

CONTACT INFORMATION: Trish McGuire, pmcguire@townofcarrboro.org
<<mailto:pmcguire@townofcarrboro.org>>, 919-918-7327

INFORMATION: The North Carolina General Statutes provide a framework for comprehensive planning and its implementation, with a planning board or commission playing key roles in these efforts. The resultant policies, ordinances, procedures and other means are intended and expected to carry out plans in a coordinated and efficient manner (NCGS 160A-361). Gauging consistency of text and map amendments has been required since 2005; more recent changes will broaden the process of assessing consistency. With the Land Use Ordinance text amendment scheduled for public hearing in late January, the assessment of and provisions for amending plans to ensure consistency will underscore an important benefit of a comprehensive plan - that of presenting the community's integrated vision and implementation, and limiting legal challenges when decisions are consistent with the plan.

The Town of Carrboro has extensive experience in planning efforts at the Town -wide level and also in more focused, topical endeavors (see Land use and development-related, transportation, and environment plans at <<http://www.ci.carrboro.nc.us/750/Planning-Library>>; see the Economic Sustainability Plan at <http://www.ci.carrboro.nc.us/DocumentCenter/View/5061/> ; see capital improvements plans at <<http://www.ci.carrboro.nc.us/250/Financial-Documents>>). Comprehensive planning efforts in the region in which the Town has participated and those in place for neighboring jurisdictions are noted in *Attachment A*. A town-wide visioning effort is approaching its 18th year; a land use planning effort for the Town as a whole was last completed in 1977 (the Facilitated Small Area Planning effort, completed in 1999, encompassed about half of the Town's jurisdiction, and the Downtown Visioning work completed in 2001 focused on about 100 acres of commercially zoned property in the downtown). Ongoing work has referenced and, in many instances, refined or implemented these plans and policies; the Town has not been lacking in the comprehensive consideration of planning and land use questions. The community survey in 2016 indicated general satisfaction among Town residents, though the lack of an updated planning framework for the Town, which resulted from a community visioning process and comprehensive assessment of tools for implementation, has been noted as a limitation.

Agenda Date: 1/9/2018

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

A memo that provides an overview of the purpose, process and timeline/cost estimate for comprehensive planning is attached (*Attachment B*).

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: The cost estimated for comprehensive planning is roughly \$200,000 over 24-month time frame. Staff impacts vary with the level of responsibility for preparation of final products.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Board of Aldermen discuss this matter and convey to staff its interest in proceeding with the initiation of a comprehensive planning effort.

Plans in Neighboring Jurisdictions and Cooperative Inter-local or Regional Plans

- *Plan Chatham Comprehensive Plan 2017* - Adopted February 2017; found here:
 - <http://www.chathamnc.org/home/showdocument?id=34602>
- *Orange County, NC 2030 Comprehensive Plan* - Adopted November 18, 2008; found here:
 - http://www.orangecountync.gov/departments/planning_and_inspections/2030_comprehensive_plan.php
- *Joint Planning Land Use Plan and Agreement* – Adopted and amended through 2015:
 - <http://www.ci.carrboro.nc.us/750/Planning-Library>
- *Chapel Hill 2020 Comprehensive Plan* – Adopted June 25, 2012
 - <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=15001>
- *2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan* – Adopted December 13, 2017
 - <http://dchcmpo.org/programs/transport/2045mtp.asp>
 - see also <http://dchcmpo.org/programs/default.asp> for related and statewide plans



TOWN OF CARRBORO

NORTH CAROLINA

MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DELIVERED VIA: ☐ *HAND* ☐ *MAIL* ☐ *FAX* ☒ *EMAIL*

To: **David Andrews, Town Manager**
Mayor and Board of Aldermen

From: **Patricia J. McGuire, Planning Director**

Date: **January 4, 2018**

Subject: **Comprehensive Planning - Overview of Purpose, Process, Timeframe and Costs**

Purpose. Towns, counties, and regions prepare comprehensive plans for a variety of reasons, the topmost being the creation of a guide for the future, e.g. land use and capital investment, and the schedule and anticipated resource structure for implementation. The process of planning is to frame the provision of municipal services equitably and efficiently and in keeping with the community's vision of the future; the process should be inclusive, transparent, and fair. The best comprehensive plans explicitly recognize the complexity of a place, and provide a means for prioritizing policies or actions, for working through difficult issues and advancing a community's needs and interests. Such plans provide a legal foundation for land use and other decisions, strengthen proposals for inter-agency funding or infrastructure improvements, and can also support other commitments and actions.

Examples of comprehensive plans that have been found to be excellent in their innovation, public involvement, or implementation strategies are noted below. Both are from communities significantly larger than the Town. The agencies recognizing the plans for their excellence are denoted in parentheses. Two that were developed for communities the size of Carrboro are also listed, though they have not been recognized with awards.

2016 Award for Excellence in Comprehensive Planning – Kenton County, Kentucky
<http://direction2030.org/> (American Planning Award)

2014 Award for Excellence in Comprehensive Planning – Winston-Salem North Carolina
<http://www.legacy2030.com/> (American Planning Association)

2011 City of West Hollywood Comprehensive Plan CA – <http://www.weho.org/city-hall/city-departments/community-development/general-plan-2035/west-hollywood-general-plan-2035-and-west-hollywood-climate-action-plan>

2018 Draft – Town of Boone, North Carolina http://www.townofboone.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/CompPlanMerger_12112017.pdf

An article, “No Little Plans: The Evolution of the Comprehensive Plan” from the April 2017 volume of Land Lines describes how “today’s comp plans are vehicles for sustainability, community resilience, and other unifying concept that have virtue” (attached).

Process. Broadly speaking, comprehensive plans are prepared through a process of assessing existing conditions, identifying what and how a community envisions its future, and specifying when and by what means the vision will be achieved. The number of specific steps needed to complete those activities will vary somewhat, but include the following, excerpted from a 2000 *Planning Commissioner* article:

1. Plan – allocate time, human resources, funds, and commitment to the effort.
2. Structure and Schedule – Defining participants, roles/responsibilities – including that of the governing board, determining who will lead the effort, and desired format of final product. A particular consideration for the Town will be how recently completed plans and policies, such as the Climate Action Plan, the Affordable Housing Goals and Strategies, and the Economic Sustainability Plan 2017, among others, would be updated and/or incorporated.
3. Gather and analyze data – mapping, socioeconomic/demographic data, transportation/travel behavior, growth trends.
4. Identify community interests, problems, and concerns/opportunities – Public engagement through a variety of strategies - meetings, surveys, focus groups, committees. Record extensively information that is contributed; answer all questions.
5. Develop a vision for the plan – strategies for doing so vary; anticipate exploring options in step one and deciding on preferred approach.
6. Develop plan goals and objectives based on vision.
7. Develop and evaluate plan options – Using the structure identified previously, fill in the plan’s chapters and engage the public on developing specific actions that would advance the vision defined for the plan.
8. Select and develop preferred option – In a public process, compare options and associated goals and objectives for their fit with the plan’s vision and select that which is most satisfactory.
9. Adopt the plan and implementation schedule – Schedule final outreach and public hearings to ensure ample opportunity for public engagement throughout the process.
10. Monitor and report on the results. Demonstrate commitment, plan for monitoring and regular updating.

Timeframe and Costs. The minimum time frame for this type of effort appears to be 18 months and the typical time frame appears to be around two years from start to finish. Costs appear to vary – An RFQ for the Town of Morrisville released in September 2017 estimates \$200,000 for completion; the website for the City of West Hollywood, California notes \$800,000.

By Kathleen McCormick

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS CAN INSPIRE THEIR CREATORS TO TAP THEIR HIGHEST AND BEST PROFESSIONAL SKILLS, TRAINING, AND VISION—or cause them to question their choice of profession. They often take a couple years to produce and can require extensive community outreach, sometimes with rancorous results—if, for example, the community has strong opposing opinions about a vision for future growth and development.

“Comp plans have the unfortunate reputation of being long, cumbersome documents that talk about vision and not the day-to-day situations that affect people,” says Peter Pollock, manager of Western Programs for the Lincoln Institute.

But Pollock says today’s comp plans are “addressing a much broader range of topics that relate more to people’s lives.” He says comp plans are being used to discuss issues beyond the traditional land use topics, as “vehicles for sustainability, community resilience, and other unifying concepts that have virtue.”

Indeed, sustainability and equity are objectives in recent comprehensive planning efforts in Seattle, Boston, and Denver—all hot-market cities dealing with an influx of knowledge-economy jobs and a dearth of affordable housing. These cities, members of the Big City Planning Directors Institute, sponsored by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, the American Planning Association, and the Harvard Graduate School of Design, have other long-range challenges in

common, including the need for better multimodal transportation systems and stepped-up climate-change resilience. But their approaches to comprehensive planning vary widely, with one city updating policies every year, another updating after a half-century, and a third finding that integrating multiple detailed master plans may be more helpful than a comprehensive plan for long-range planning.

“Today’s comp plans are vehicles for sustainability, community resilience, and other unifying concepts that have virtue.”

“Comp plans,” as they’re known in the vernacular, have been the linchpin of long-range land use planning and regulation since the City Beautiful Movement early in the last century. Local governments may adopt official comprehensive plan documents by ordinance to serve as policy guides for decisions about physical development in communities. They generally offer a vision and goals for future growth and development, and provide a framework for big-picture decisions, from preservation of natural resources to where to build new homes and locate jobs, improve transportation connections, and make capital investments such as utilities, sidewalks, and libraries. Comp plans analyze demographic information and discuss key community challenges and opportunities. Some focus exclusively on land use and development, while others include transportation, utilities, the environment, housing, education, parks and recreation, and other aspects of the

Better multimodal transit and stronger climate-change resilience are prominent goals in the latest comprehensive plans for Boston, Denver, and Seattle (shown here). Credit: Brent R. Smith/Alamy

NO LITTLE PLANS

The Evolution of the Comprehensive Plan



Seattle 2035 directs urban growth into the city to preserve the natural landscape beyond the urban perimeter.

life, form, and physical development of the community. Some plans enumerate city policies with lists of objectives and strategies. As “living documents,” some are updated every year; others every couple decades. Ideally, they’re coordinated with county and regional planning efforts. They often end with implementation ideas for future action.

“There are thousands of comp plans out there, with varying degrees of sophistication,” says David Rouse, research director for the American Planning Association and coauthor of APA’s 2015 *Sustaining Places: Best Practices for Comprehensive Plans*. The publication provides a framework and standards for creating livable, healthy communities in harmony with nature, with resilient economies, social equity, and strong regional ties. APA also established a recognition program for best practices in comp plans (see p. 27).

So what is new and different about comprehensive plans, and how are they being used? *Land Lines* asked long-range planners for Seattle, Boston, and Denver to share their experiences.

Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan

Seattle, one of 10 cities that took part in an APA pilot program to develop best practices for comp plans, has a “landmark sustainability comp plan,” says Rouse.

Adopted unanimously by the Seattle city council in October 2016, the *Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan* is the city’s third generation of comp plans, all focused on sustainability and all directing more urban growth into the city to preserve forests and farmlands beyond. Since it was first adopted in 1994, Seattle’s comp plan has guided growth over 20-year periods, with the city council annually adopting resolutions as policies to make sure the plan reflects current community conditions and values.

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), passed in 1990, requires counties and larger cities to create comp plans, and to update them every eight years. The GMA’s goals include reducing sprawl and directing growth to areas that already have water, sewer, transportation, and other urban services. Each county must draw an urban-growth boundary beyond which urban-style development is not allowed. Comp plans must show that each city has enough land with the right zoning to absorb growth that is expected to occur over the next 20 years. Cities

must also plan for housing, transportation, water, sewer, and other facilities that will be needed, and create plans that are consistent with other plans in the region.

To prepare for the new comp plan, the Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development issued a capacity analysis in 2014 entitled *Seattle 2035: Updating Seattle’s Comprehensive Plan*. It noted that Seattle’s population since 1994 had increased 20 percent, with nearly 100,000 new residents and much greater racial and ethnic diversity. Current growth projections for the city of 652,000 indicate 70,000 additional households and 115,000 additional jobs by 2035. The planning department also issued the Growth and Equity analysis to determine access to opportunity and risk of displacement throughout the city. The report indicates locations with the highest risks of displacement, as well as areas with the greatest access to education, transit, and employment. It features an equitable development framework for growth, a displacement index, and an analysis of alternative growth scenarios and their impacts on displacement.

Seattle’s 2005 comp plan called for the city to embrace growth. The 2016 challenge was different: how could the city leverage growth to build better neighborhoods, create jobs and economic opportunity for all residents, and improve the safety and vitality of the city?

While hundreds of residents participated in the 2005 process, the recent two-year update process, delayed a couple years because of the recession, involved residents in more than 24,000 website visits, 4,800 online open house visits, 2,600 appearances at workshops and meetings, 2,100 online survey responses, and thousands of facebook and Twitter comments. Topping the list of key issues Seattleites expressed was the need for housing that is affordable for middle and lower-income households. Seattle has been facing its worst housing crisis ever, due in part to tech-oriented businesses such as Amazon and Microsoft, which have introduced new residents in the tens of thousands. Mayor Ed Murray has set a goal of building or preserving 50,000 homes in 10 years, with 20,000 of them rent- and income-restricted. Among the new comp plan

policies is an amendment allowing for alternative affordable home ownership opportunities that aren’t common in Seattle now, such as community land trusts, down payment assistance, mixed-income housing requirements, and limited-equity housing co-ops.

The new plan retains the concept that anticipated growth should be focused in the city’s densest areas—the designated urban centers of Downtown, First Hill/Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, Uptown, University District, and Northgate. To maximize public investment in infrastructure and services, the plan also continues to channel growth to 24 urban villages, or mixed-use areas with compact land use and density, such as light-rail station areas. Both urban centers and urban villages are places that already have active business districts, jobs, services, and concentrations of housing, and can accept more, says Tom Hauger, manager of comprehensive and regional planing.

Seattle’s previous comprehensive plan included neighborhood plans with specific visions of how and where development should occur, and made a binding commitment to those visions. To match more recent language in the city’s zoning code, the new plan removed a requirement that upzones—or changes in zoning to allow for more intensive use—must be approved in neighborhood plans before the whole comp plan is adopted. This change allows “a little more wiggle room” to add some multifamily housing to single-family neighborhoods, which comprise about half the city’s 84 square miles, says Hauger. This change now allows for upzoning to occur, even outside the urban villages—if, for example, an area is within the 10-minute “walk shed” of a light-rail station or very good bus service. But Hauger says the city wants to study the issue at greater length and work with the Mayor’s Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) advisory committee on neighborhood boundaries. Hauger says the upzoning debate features “strong arguments on both sides, though the urban villages have enough capacity for 40 to 50 years of growth. So the need to upzone single-family neighborhoods is not necessary today.”

Perhaps the biggest change in the new plan relates to equity. All three of the city's comprehensive plans have expressed the core values of environmental stewardship, community, economic opportunity and security, and equity—though these core values have been reordered with each iteration as community values dictated. A 2015 resolution adopted by city council changed “social equity” to “race and social equity,” and this value rose to the top of the list in the recently adopted plan, to emphasize the need to address disparities experienced by people of color, says Hauger.

“We’ve identified ways in which the city, through growth, could help communities that have been underserved in the past, and could reduce the risk of displacement for those populations,” says Hauger. The new comp plan includes over 120 new policies that relate to social and racial equity. It specifies growth will be reduced in high displacement areas and directed to areas with more transit, education, and employment opportunities. The plan also calls for monitoring growth in locations where low-income households and people of color are at risk of displacement. “The shift to equity, especially with rapid growth, is really the focus of the plan,” he says, “but that’s also a part of sustainability.”

Seattle 2035 calls for more multimodal transit, as shown here in the South Lake Union neighborhood. Credit: plainurban/flickr



Imagine Boston 2030

Boston is a good example of a city where the previous comp plan—called a general plan here—was about land use and development. “But it’s a new day in Boston,” says Pollock, and the new comp plan process has been “about the community, quality of life, and checking on residents’ needs and values.”

In the two generations since Boston issued its last citywide plan in 1965, the city has changed dramatically. The loss of industrial jobs in the 1960s, racial tensions, and other factors led to the loss of about one-third of Boston’s population, which hit a low point in 1980 with 563,000 residents. Since then, the city has rebounded by building a new knowledge-based economy, supported by a legacy of world-class hospitals and universities.

In 2015, anticipating Boston’s 400th birthday in 2030, Mayor Martin J. Walsh launched a new comprehensive plan process (the city is not required to create a comp plan, and city council does not have to adopt or approve a plan). The mayor had two major goals for the plan, says Sara Myerson, director of planning for the Boston Planning and Development Agency (formerly the Boston Redevelopment Authority). The first goal was, she says, “to be a true reflection of Bostonians’ view of the city in the future, because knowing residents’ views about prosperity and shared values would be important when making difficult decisions, and would change the way we govern. The second goal was to move across silos and create a different way to coordinate planning policy.”

Imagine Boston 2030: Expanding Opportunity addresses growth, economic opportunity, and resilience—“with equity at the heart of the plan, and a focus on making Boston more innovative while making the city more inclusive,” says Myerson. A draft of the plan is under review, and a final plan is due out this summer. *Imagine Boston* is the result of four years of planning and two years of community outreach to create a comprehensive policy framework for the city, says Myerson.



Imagine Boston addresses residents’ request for more efficient transportation options. Credit: Denis Tangney, Jr./iStock

Imagine Boston is addressing a broad range of issues—housing, health, education, the economy, energy and the environment, open space, transportation, technology, and arts and culture. Recent changes have prompted the new long-term vision: between 2010 and 2014, Boston grew 6 percent, twice the national rate, adding almost as many residents in four years as in the previous 20. The city’s 2016 population of 667,000 is projected to reach 724,000 by 2030, with 15 percent more jobs and a need for 20 million additional square feet of new office, retail, and industrial work spaces. Boston has also become more diverse, with more than a quarter of all Bostonians born outside of the United States. A wide wealth gap exists between white residents and residents of color, who are now in the majority. Neighborhoods have disparities in educational attainment, home ownership, commute times, and access to healthy food and health care that correspond with levels of wealth and poverty. Housing affordability is a critical need, as 46 percent of Boston households are cost-burdened, spending over a third of their income on housing. To accommodate projected growth, Mayor Walsh in 2014 called for 53,000 new homes across income levels by 2030 (10,000 have been built and another 7,000 are under construction).

Another key issue is resilience: as one of the nation’s top four cities at greatest risk of

flooding, Boston faces increasing temperatures, extreme coastal storms, and climate-change-related sea level rise, which pose significant risks for Boston’s highly urbanized neighborhoods and coastal job centers. Boston’s sea level rose about 9 inches during the 20th century. Between 2000 and 2030, it’s projected to rise at a rate almost three times greater. An estimated \$55 billion in assets are exposed to a 100-year flood event. Planners are coordinating the comp plan work with the Mayor’s Office of Resilience and Racial Equity, supported by the Rockefeller Foundation’s 100 Resilient Cities program, to help Boston plan for and deal with climate-related disasters and other challenges. Boston is planning for climate adaptations with its Climate Ready Zoning, building level adaptations, and district-scale planning.

Imagine Boston planners began extensive community outreach by asking Bostonians to identify their biggest priorities and concerns. Residents responded: housing that is affordable, education that expands opportunity, and reliable and efficient transportation. The community outreach process has yielded responses from 14,000 residents, through traditional open houses, panel discussions, visioning kits, community workshops, online maps, and text-messaging surveys. Some 9,000 responses came from surveys administered by street teams.

“The street teams represented the diversity of Boston,” says Rebekah Emanuel, executive director of *Imagine Boston*, with some teams engaging residents more playfully, using building-block exercises at farmers markets, parks, and other gathering places. They discussed trade-offs and “how people thought growth should be guided in their neighborhoods” and other potential development areas, she adds. Community outreach helped identify five goals for the plan: 1) encourage affordability, reduce displacement, and improve quality of life; 2) increase access to opportunity; 3) drive inclusive economic growth; 4) promote a healthy environment and prepare for climate change; and 5) invest in open space, arts and culture, transportation, and infrastructure. The comp plan also directed five main actions: enhance neighborhoods, expand neighborhoods, develop mixed-use job centers, develop a waterfront city for future generations, and create networks of opportunity.

The city of 49 square miles of land is looking to support residents’ vision of a more connected mixed-use and mixed-income community by fitting more people and jobs into neighborhoods. The comp plan locates “action areas” with capacity to accommodate Boston’s projected growth in existing neighborhoods and commercial cores, and to reduce housing-price pressure, improve access to opportunity, and stitch together the physical fabric of the city.

“Expanded” neighborhoods will vary in size and scale, from development of “neighborhood edges”—or sites on the waterfront, on fringes of stable neighborhoods, or near rail lines—to larger-scale areas with still-vibrant industrial uses that will see significant new mixed-use housing, job sites, and services. These larger, more transformative areas will pilot innovation centers and planning and infrastructure investments to support new office, lab, and industrial spaces. They also will benefit from zoning for climate-change resilience, sustainable building standards, and flood protections, as well as open spaces and places for arts and culture.

Planners reviewed comp plans from a number of other cities, and they found Seattle’s equity and displacement elements particularly applicable to Boston, which is developing a displacement tool kit. “The mayors of Boston and Seattle have had many conversations about growth and displacement,” says Myerson. “That really resonates with us.”

In Boston’s new comp plan, “there’s a real desire to tackle complex urban challenges with policy solutions that cut across silos,” says Myerson. “We’re really creating a hybrid of planning and other disciplines, as a reaction to the complex challenges cities are facing. Many cities are thriving right now, so it’s not about attracting investments, but figuring out solutions to challenges of growth while continuing to build on investments in an innovative economy.”

Imagine Boston also addresses residents’ request for more affordable housing and expanded access to opportunity. Credit: Denis Tangney, Jr./iStock



Denver’s newly restored Union Station has attracted \$2 billion infrastructure and mixed-use development. Credit: tvirbickis/iStock

Denverright/Blueprint Denver

Denver is also taking a different approach to traditional comprehensive planning with a new integrated planning process, called *Denverright*, involving updates in four key areas that will guide local planning for the next 20 years. The city is now halfway through the 18-month *Denverright* process, in which four master plans—the *Blueprint Denver* integrated land use and transportation plan, the parks and recreation plan, the pedestrians and trails plan, and the transit plan—are being updated collaboratively. *Denverright* is an umbrella project for all the plans, bringing the processes together to maximize resources, make the planning process more efficient, and ensure the plans work together holistically to accommodate future growth. *Blueprint Denver* and the parks and recreation plan will be adopted by the Denver city council, but the pedestrians and trails and the transit plans, both overseen by public works, will not.

“The benefit of doing all these plans at once is cross-collaboration and an interdisciplinary approach,” says Kimball Crangle, cochair of the *Blueprint Denver* Task Force. City staff and the cochairs for each plan’s task force are working together to produce a body of policies that will provide a cohesive vision for where and how growth happens. “We see tremendous opportunity in having the plans speaking in the same language,” says Crangle. “They will be dated when we sign them, but at least we’ll be on the same page in terms of how we implement goals across our city.”

“The *Denverright* process is a significant improvement over the previous approach, doing separate plan updates sequentially,” says Brad Buchanan, executive director of Denver Community Planning and Development. The *Denverright* discussions “happen in real time,” he says. “The same questions come up week by week with the forces, and they make sure the priorities of all their plans are shared. It’s a more robust process than we’ve ever done before, with a stockpile of deep and rich research in each area.”

As in Seattle and Boston, a vision of sustainability has guided Denver’s comprehensive planning, and it’s evolving through community outreach efforts to include new focuses on social equity and resilience. In 2016, as part of the *Denverright* process, the Lincoln Institute and the Sonoran Institute, in a Western Lands and Communities joint venture, led exploratory scenario planning workshops on future growth and development for the *Blueprint Denver* update. The *Denverright* project is continuing to explore scenario planning with Calthorpe Associates and has created a board game that residents can play at public meetings or online, to weigh in on their choices for where density, transit, and other elements should go in the 155-square-mile city. Denver grew from 468,000 residents in 1990 to 683,000 in 2015, and it’s projected to add another 200,000 residents within 20 years. Citing a housing crisis as the city’s top priority, Mayor Michael Hancock has proposed spending \$150 million over the next 10 years to build more affordable housing.

When Denver city council adopted the 2000 comp plan, the city was a very different place than it is today. The Central Platte Valley’s former rail yard had been cleared of

its tracks, but redevelopment had not begun on the Denver Union Station neighborhood, which has attracted \$2 billion in infrastructure and mixed-use development, with the historic train station restored as a multimodal transit hub for the metro region. Many of the city’s transit lines and station areas that would be built as part of the 2006 FasTracks regional light-rail and bus network did not exist. Large master-planned communities within the city, including Stapleton and Lowry, were in the early construction or planning stages.

The *Blueprint Denver* plan was adopted in 2002 to help implement the 2000 comp plan and to ensure that continuing growth and development would be located in the most sustainable places. *Blueprint Denver’s* goals were to direct development to “areas of change,” to limit change in “areas of stability,” develop multimodal streets, and promote mixed-use development and urban centers. Preserving residential neighborhoods was a big focus of the plan at a time of significant “scrape-offs” and “pop-tops” of existing homes.

Areas of stability, encompassing 82 percent of the city, included residential neighborhoods and were marked for character preservation or new investments. Growth was channeled to

Stapleton is Denver’s renowned mixed-used, mixed-income community on the grounds of the decommissioned Stapleton Airport. Credit: Forest City Stapleton, Inc.



much denser areas of change, including downtown, commercial corridors, and areas around transit stations, as well as the city’s large redevelopment sites.

Blueprint Denver’s role in locating growth, along with a citywide zoning code overhaul in 2010 that introduced form-based and context zoning and allowed over 6,100 acres to be rezoned from single-use to mixed-use zone districts, many of them near existing or planned transit stations, have helped achieve a more sustainable urban form. Since 2002, two-thirds of new housing (67 percent) and jobs (64 percent) occurred in areas of change, according to *Blueprint Diagnostics*, a 2016 analysis report prepared for the *Blueprint Denver* update.

Blueprint Denver is now evolving with more focus on equity issues and resilience in the broadest sense, says Crangle. She says the task force is considering how the city could provide benefits, such as stable affordable housing, parks, trails, transit connections, convenient services, and other healthy infrastructure and amenities, to lower-income neighborhoods undergoing redevelopment and displacement pressures. “In Denver, we have opportunity to spread equity—social, financial, health, general wellbeing. What kinds of benefits do [these neighborhoods] get, and how do we ensure that the people and businesses that have been there for decades can stay?”

Denverright incorporates four master plans, including the parks and recreation plan that encompasses Lookout Mountain, final resting place of Buffalo Bill Cody, and other sites in the Denver Mountain Park system. Credit: Bradley Gordon/flickr

AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION (APA) BEST PRACTICES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

In 2015, APA published *Sustaining Places: Best Practices for Comprehensive Plans* (<https://www.planning.org/publications/report/9026901/>) to define the role of comprehensive plans in developing sustainable communities, and to demonstrate how to turn principles into plans and score the results. APA established a set of standards and a recognition program for best practices in which communities submit their completed comp plans, and APA reviewers score them bronze, silver, or gold. Now in the second year of the recognition program, APA will announce its first gold standard comp plan at its annual conference in New York in May 2017. “Even if cities don’t want to be scored, they can use this document to assess their own comp plans,” says David Rouse, APA research director.



The sun sets over the Mile High City. Credit: nick1803/iStock

“We’re attempting to be bold and allow a broad-based land-use guiding document that allows for change and evolution,” says Crangle. “Twenty years is a long time, a couple of business cycles, and this document can’t be prescriptive. Our job is to provide the foundation for land use to evolve as the city changes and to allow flexibility.”

The comp plan itself is not being updated, and it’s not clear whether it will be, says Buchanan. “Our comp plan is very high-altitude and more aspirational.” *Blueprint Denver* and other specific plans are the primary policy documents for the decision-making process, he says. “When our comp plan was adopted in 2000, these other plans didn’t exist, and since these other finer-grained plans have emerged, there is less reliance on it.” Buchanan says no decision has been made yet, but the question has been asked: “does *Denverright* become the keeper of this family of plan documents going forward, and does it replace the comp plan?”

Value-add for Communities

What is the value of a comp plan in the end? “Planners’ strength is that we know a little about a lot, and we can be great integrators and bring together different elements at play in a city,” says Pollock. “You don’t do that by regulations about heights of buildings, but by bringing people together to achieve goals.”

Although the community process may appear to seek general agreement, comp plans aren’t designed to “reach consensus,” he says. “It’s a huge challenge: how are you using the comp plan to engage the community, and how do you deal with the reality of different goals and visions?” The document will be adopted by the community’s representatives, he says, and while everyone does not get a vote, the comp plan ideally values the whole community’s goals, hopes, and dreams and provides guidance on how to achieve them.

“Those of us who are more aspirational see the comp plan as a way to bring in broad elements but also to incorporate a vision for community,” Pollock says.

Kathleen McCormick, principal of Fountainhead Communications in Boulder, Colorado, writes frequently about healthy, sustainable, and resilient communities.



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Agenda Item Abstract

File Number: 17-380

Agenda Date: 1/9/2018

File Type: Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

TITLE:

Transportation Topics: Bicycle Friendly Community Application, Bike Plan and Related Infrastructure

PURPOSE: The purpose of this agenda item to provide the Board with an opportunity to discuss progress towards an application for upgrading the Town's Bicycle Friendly Community status, including the bike plan update and possible infrastructure improvements, and associated cost implications.

DEPARTMENT: Planning

CONTACT INFORMATION: Christina Moon - 919-918-7325; Patricia McGuire - 919-918-7327

INFORMATION: During the last several months, the Board of Aldermen has received information on transportation issues and projects, including efforts to seek gold status with the Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) program's upcoming application cycle. At the March 17, 2015 regular meeting, the Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution accepting the Town's designation as a silver level Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) and pledging its commitment to pursuing gold status at the next application cycle in 2018. Using the Town's report card (Attachment A), staff has been working with an intern to identify areas noted as needing improvement-big-ticket items as well as "low hanging fruit." One of the most substantial undertakings, in terms of time and money, would be an update to the Comprehensive Bicycle Transportation Plan (<http://www.townofcarrboro.org/737/Bike-Plan>). In November, staff submitted an application for the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian and Transportation Planning Branch 2018 planning grant cycle to receive funding for that effort. Award notification is anticipated for March and, if selected, staff would proceed with an RFQ for transportation engineering consulting services to guide the plan update and associated BFC application (Attachment B).

Comprehensive bicycle transportation plans include a combination of educational recommendations and policy and infrastructure recommendations that inform priorities for requests for transportation funding through the 'call for projects' process. The timing of a bicycle plan update and possible townwide comprehensive planning will necessitate clarification and coordination of priorities - one option could be to include a completed bicycle plan update as an element of a comprehensive plan. Another option could be to expand the transportation planning component for bicycling and other modes, clarify trip purposes and gain a greater understanding of the use of existing infrastructure, so that trips could be directed to particular routes in relation to demand and capacity, and to coordinate Town planning interests into county and regional transportation planning. (Example - by better understanding travel behavior on residential streets throughout town, recreation, walk to school, etc., trips could be directed to particular routes in relation to peak traffic and capacity.) Such planning efforts will

always seek to incorporate the latest technology and engineering - in Carrboro, maintaining and enhancing pedestrian- and bicycle-scale improvements along corridors and intersections. Whenever possible, implementation would be planned to coordinate with other efforts, such as infrastructure replacements or NCDOT resurfacing schedules.

The 1450-foot segment of East Main Street between Rosemary Street and North Greensboro Street was identified for improvements in the Bike Plan (Priority 11). The project recommendation, described on pages 3-28 to 3-30, calls for bicycle lanes and related improvements, noting that if there are right-of-way limitations sharrows can serve as a comparable bicycle facility. A general recommendation was to consider improvements on NCDOT roads, such redesigning a street cross-section with new pavement markings, in coordination with NCDOT's maintenance schedules. NCDOT's planned resurfacing of East Main Street in 2019 provides such an opportunity.

In its review of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) on February 2, 2017, the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) suggested modifying the cross-section of East Main to include protected bike lanes as a recommendation. The new design would consist of a center turn lane, two vehicle travel lanes, and protected bike lanes-if the bike lanes can function on a road with so many driveways. The Board voted to include the TAB's recommendations in its formal comments on the CTP on February 21st, with this particular recommendation listed as number eight, "Change the cross-section of East Main Street from Rosemary Street to Weaver and Roberson Streets to show two vehicle lanes, a center turn lane, and protected bike lanes. The current highway CTP shows that the current cross-section is adequate for the 2040 capacity. The bike and multi-use CTP shows the Campus to Campus Connector along East Main Street from Roberson Street to Lloyd Street as the only improvement." The Board's comments were forwarded to the DCHC-MPO and subsequently included in the adopted CTP (Board minutes from February 21, 2017 included in full as Attachment C).

The Board of Aldermen will recall that the CTP is the fiscally unconstrained 'wish list' of all transportation projects through 2040. In order for the pavement marking changes described to be implemented in conjunction with the 2019 resurfacing, NCDOT has indicated that a study would need to be completed that satisfactorily demonstrated that such changes could be made without causing a detrimental effect to the roadway. A completed study would include the following four elements:

- An operational analysis per the NCDOT Congestion Management Guidelines for existing conditions, proposed conditions at completion and the future design year;
- A functional design to verify the feasibility, constructability and accommodation of multi-modal operations;
- An understanding of the effect of the changed design to other projects such as the intersection at East Main, Brewer Lane, Merritt Mill, and East Franklin; and
- If, the Town and NCDOT mutually agree to the proposed modifications, the Town would have to have the consultant prepare final pavement markings, signing, traffic signal revisions plans for implementation.

Other shorter and longer term potential improvements would likely also need to be considered, including the Campus-Campus connector, the Lloyd-North Greensboro bicycle connection and the possibility of a bike

Agenda Date: 1/9/2018

File Type:Agendas

In Control: Board of Aldermen

Version: 1

connection from Rosemary to East Main via Sunset Drive, Broad, Cobb, and Lloyd streets, use of the rail corridor and the Libba Cotten bikeway, especially in relation to the inclusion of a Carrboro station in the draft 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) as an extension of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (DOLRT).

Staff is seeking information from DCHC-MPO to determine whether the MPO's on-call consultant services may be used for this type of project and likely cost estimates. Estimates for the West Main Street analysis ranged between \$16,000 and \$24,000 in 2012.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: The anticipated cost to update the bicycle plan is between \$45,000 and \$70,000. The planning grant requires a 30% local match. Costs relating to the East Main Street cross-section modification would likely cost around \$20,000. In either case, staff would bring a future agenda item and budget back to the Board for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board discuss these related topics and provide direction relating to obtaining consulting services to analyze potential changes to the East Main Street cross-section.



CARRBORO, NC

Attachment A

TOTAL POPULATION

20,908

POPULATION DENSITY

3,237.0

TOTAL AREA (sq. miles)

6.3

OF LOCAL BICYCLE FRIENDLY BUSINESSES

0

OF LOCAL BICYCLE FRIENDLY UNIVERSITIES

N/A

10 BUILDING BLOCKS OF A BICYCLE FRIENDLY COMMUNITY

	Average Gold	Carrboro
Arterial Streets with Bike Lanes	65%	75%
Total Bicycle Network Mileage to Total Road Network Mileage	43%	56%
Public Education Outreach	VERY GOOD	GOOD
% of Schools Offering Bicycling Education	50%	22%
Bike Month and Bike to Work Events	VERY GOOD	GOOD
Active Bicycle Advocacy Group	YES	YES
Active Bicycle Advisory Committee	YES	VERY
Bicycle-Friendly Laws & Ordinances	VERY GOOD	GOOD
Bike Plan is Current and is Being Implemented	YES	YES
Bike Program Staff to Population	PER 32K	73379

CATEGORY SCORES

ENGINEERING <i>Bicycle network and connectivity</i>	4/10
EDUCATION <i>Motorist awareness and bicycling skills</i>	3/10
ENCOURAGEMENT <i>Mainstreaming bicycling culture</i>	3/10
ENFORCEMENT <i>Promoting safety and protecting bicyclists' rights</i>	3/10
EVALUATION & PLANNING <i>Setting targets and having a plan</i>	4/10

KEY OUTCOMES

	Average Gold	Carrboro
RIDERSHIP <i>Percentage of daily bicyclists</i>	5.5%	5.90%
SAFETY MEASURES CRASHES <i>Crashes per 10k daily bicyclists</i>	100	40.5
SAFETY MEASURES FATALITIES <i>Fatalities per 10k daily bicyclists</i>	0.6	1.6



KEY STEPS TO GOLD



- » Continue to expand the on and off street bike network and to increase network connectivity to parts of town that are cutoff by barriers (Highway 54, railroad) and to Chapel Hill. On roads with posted speed limits of more than 35 mph, such as Estes Drive, it is recommended to provide protected bicycle infrastructure.
- » Develop a system of bicycle boulevards, utilizing quiet neighborhood streets.
- » Make intersections safer and more comfortable for cyclists.
- » Increase the amount of high quality bicycle parking throughout the community and upgrade substandard bike parking.
- » Expand the Safe Routes to School program.

- » Continue to expand your public education campaign promoting the share the road message.
- » Offer a greater variety of bicycling skills training opportunities for adults.
- » Promote cycling throughout the year by offering or supporting more family-oriented community or social rides.
- » Establish a formal communication channel between the Carrboro Police Department and the cycling community. Ask police officers to step up enforcement of both motorist and cyclist infractions.
- » Update your bike plan and establish a dedicated funding source for the implementation.



Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative Program Overview

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative is a matching grant program that encourages municipalities to develop comprehensive bicycle plans and pedestrian plans. The Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation (DBPT) and the Transportation Planning Branch (TPB) sponsor this grant. All North Carolina municipalities are eligible and are encouraged to apply. Counties with populations of less than 50,000 may apply on behalf of incorporated or unincorporated communities within their jurisdiction. Calls for proposals open annually.

Program Background

Communities throughout North Carolina have begun to place more emphasis on providing facilities for biking and walking. A desire for better modal choices, the demand for more walkable and bikeable communities and a focus on smart growth initiatives have combined to highlight the need for better, more complete bicycle and pedestrian transportation systems. Comprehensive planning documents are an integral part of developing these systems, and can guide both local and state efforts to improve conditions for bicycling and walking.

To encourage the development of comprehensive local bicycle plans and pedestrian plans, the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation (DBPT) and the Transportation Planning Branch (TPB) have created a matching grant program to fund plan development. This program was initiated through a special allocation of funding approved by the North Carolina General Assembly in 2003 along with federal funds earmarked specifically for bicycle and pedestrian planning by the TPB. The planning grant program was launched in January 2004, and it is currently administered through NCDOT-DBPT. Over the past fourteen grant cycles, 183 municipal plans have been selected and funded from 429 applicants. A total of approximately \$5 million has been allocated. Funding for 2018 is around \$400,000. Additional annual allocations will be sought for subsequent years.

Who Can Apply

All North Carolina municipalities are eligible and are encouraged to apply for a planning grant. **Counties with populations of less than 50,000** may also apply on behalf of incorporated or unincorporated communities within their jurisdiction. Due to the limited amount of funding, counties with populations greater than 50,000 are not eligible to apply, nor are colleges/universities or other non-municipal entities. Applications submitted and received for previous grant cycles do not carry over — municipalities/counties must re-apply each year to be considered within the current process. Please note that all applications and relevant documents will be accepted via email only (see Application Instructions for more information).

Municipalities/counties who currently have bicycle plans and/or pedestrian plans, either through this grant program or otherwise, may also apply to update their plan provided it is at least five years old.

Smaller municipalities (below 5,000 population) are eligible to apply for a **joint bicycle and pedestrian plan**, but still have the option of applying for a stand-alone pedestrian or a standalone bicycle plan. Municipalities/counties with populations of 5,000 and over may choose to apply for funding to undertake either a bicycle plan or a pedestrian plan in any given fiscal year. Municipalities/counties may apply for funding for the other type of plan in subsequent years. Funding is intended to support the development of a comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian transportation plan. If neighboring municipalities wish to file a



joint application, please contact DBPT for instructions and guidance.

Submitting an application for planning funds is a competitive process. However, an effort will be made to award grants based not only on the merit of the proposal but to achieve statewide geographic distribution as well. Consideration will be given to funding a cross-section of municipality types.

In addition to the traditional bike and pedestrian planning grants, DBPT recently opened up the application process for **corridor plans**. Any municipality eligible for a planning grant has the option to apply for a more targeted planning grant in a specific location within their municipality. Examples include downtown business districts, targeted higher education corridors, potential shared use path connections, etc. Like the planning grants mentioned above, selection of these projects will be based on a competitive review process.

The Role of MPO's and RPO's

The relevant approval processes and procedures of MPO and RPO organizations should be followed by any municipality applying for funding. **A resolution by the local MPO and or RPO is required.** It is strongly encouraged that the appropriate resolution be sent in with the grant application (via email), which is due by 5:00 pm on Thursday, November 9, 2017. Staff from the MPO or RPO may assist with preparation of the application and should also be part of the steering committee guiding development of the plan.

Important Dates

Key dates for the 2018 NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant Initiative are shown below. (Subject to change.)

Activity	Date
Issue Call for Proposals	August 7, 2017
Application submission deadline - 5:00 pm (Thursday)	November 9, 2017
Awards Committee makes recommendations to NCDOT	January, 2018
Board of Transportation gives approval	March, 2018
Municipalities notified of award	March, 2018
Municipal Reimbursement Agreement executed and Notice to Proceed issued	Within 6 months from award notification
Plan completion deadline	Within 12 to 18 months from Notice to Proceed

Plan Development

Plans shall be developed by consultants that are prequalified by NCDOT. Also, a full-time permanent employee of the municipality must be assigned as project manager to oversee/coordinate the plan development. A task force/steering committee must also be formed to oversee development of the plan.



This group should include relevant local staff, regional planning staff, advocates and representatives of stakeholder groups as well as a DBPT staff member. The level of funding provided to a municipality for plan development will be determined by estimated cost and a matching grant formula.

Any plan developed with these funds must be comprehensive in nature and be a stand-alone plan. While NCDOT encourages the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian elements in local comprehensive plans, transportation plans, land use plans, recreation plans, greenway and open space plans, etc., applications for funding to develop such elements is not within the scope of this grant.

An outline of required content standards has been developed to assure that plans are comprehensive in nature and to help the municipality/county identify all bicycle or pedestrian needs, priorities and opportunities for improvements. (See documents under Content Standards for NCDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, (<https://connect.ncdot.gov/municipalities/PlanningGrants/Pages/Planning-Grant-Initiative.aspx>). This tool will assist communities to address not only the infrastructure needs of users but also to develop construction project priorities; review local policies and guidelines and recommend favorable changes; identify opportunities for the implementation of education, enforcement and safety programs; and to develop encouragement and awareness initiatives. In addition, the plan will identify projects that can be integrated into the local and county Comprehensive Transportation Plans and project prioritization.

Other resources for plan development may be found at the bottom of the Planning Grant Initiative page. Links to planning and design guidelines, safety and education programs and initiatives and current research and development for bicycle and pedestrian planning can be found in this section. <https://www.ncdot.gov/bikeped/>

Completed plans can be found in this section. <https://connect.ncdot.gov/municipalities/PlanningGrants/Pages/default.aspx>.

Matching Grant Formula

NCDOT planning grant funds will be provided on a sliding scale, based on municipal/county population, as shown in the table below. Neither in-kind services nor other state or federal funds from NCDOT can be used for local participation.

Municipal Population	DOT Participation	Local Participation
Less than 5,000	90%	10%
5,000 to 10,000	80%	20%
10,000 to 50,000	70%	30%
50,000 to 100,000	60%	40%
Over 100,000	50%	50%

Estimated Costs

Average costs associated with the development of comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian plans vary greatly depending upon the size of the municipality/county and the complexity of issues to be addressed. A range of estimated costs for plans developed by consultants is shown below. The cost of all plans funded through this initiative shall be within these established ranges. After awardee



notification, the specific cost of the plan will be determined through discussions between NCDOT and the municipality/county and through contract negotiations between NCDOT/municipality/county and the selected consultant.

Population	Estimated Consultant Costs		
	<i>Bicycle Plan</i>	<i>Pedestrian Plan</i>	<i>Corridor Plan</i>
Less than 5,000	Combined - \$35,000 to \$40,000		\$30,000-\$60,000
5,000 to 10,000	\$40,000-\$50,000	\$35,000-\$40,000	
10,000 to 50,000	\$45,000-\$70,000	\$40,000-\$60,000	
50,000 to 100,000	\$65,000-\$100,000	\$55,000-\$75,000	
Over 100,000	\$95,000-\$190,000	\$70,000-\$110,000	

Smaller municipalities (below 5,000 population) are eligible to apply for a joint bicycle and pedestrian plan, but still have the option of applying for a stand-alone pedestrian or a standalone bicycle plan. Smaller municipalities (<5,000 population) applying for a stand-alone plan should use the estimated costs for the 5,000 to 10,000 population.

Staff costs and in-house services are not eligible for reimbursement with these grant funds. Allowable expenses include consultant costs associated with plan development and delivery; GIS/mapping services, as appropriate; preparation of technical illustrations and graphic design/layout of plan undertaken by consultant; non-staff costs associated with data collection and public involvement activities; and, printing/copying of plan and maps.

All electronic files, maps, technical illustrations, etc. produced with these funds will become the property of the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and the funded municipality/county.

Selection Process

DBPT and key planning professionals will conduct a preliminary review of all applications for completeness and general appropriateness. Applications that pass the initial screening will then be reviewed by the Planning Grant Initiative Awards Committee. This group will include DBPT and individuals with professional experience in developing, administering, and/or implementing bicycle plans and pedestrian plans. These individuals will represent municipalities of varying sizes, MPO's and RPO's, COG's and other appropriate agencies and organizations. The Awards Committee will review each proposal and evaluate it based on the stated vision, goals and needs of the municipality; comprehensiveness of scope; understanding of issues and opportunities; level of local commitment; and, feasibility of successful plan completion. The Awards Committee will forward their recommendations to the NCDOT for final approval.

Selection Criteria

The Awards Committee will consider the following elements in evaluating applications for bicycle and pedestrian planning grant funds. Successful proposals will address the following:



- Identify critical local needs for planning and/or implementation of infrastructure improvements
- Identify targeted roadway, adjacent land and existing conditions for corridor plan that are most realistic for maximizing existing infrastructure and improving conditions
- Demonstrate an understanding of needs of the particular modal user (bicyclist, pedestrian)
- Recognize the need to serve diverse populations
- Focus on the development of a comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian transportation system
- Identify how having a bicycle or pedestrian plan would help improve the health of a community
- Assure assignment of appropriate level of staff to oversee / undertake plan development
- Consider policy issues and describe how multi-modal transportation needs will be incorporated into municipal processes
- Recognize the value of developing education, enforcement and awareness initiatives
- Demonstrate widespread local support:
 - Include a strong local endorsement to undertake plan
 - Demonstrate commitment of elected officials and senior staff to carry out recommendations of plan
- Demonstrate an understanding of interrelationships with other plans:
 - Recognize opportunities to integrate with Comprehensive Transportation Plan
 - Identify potential projects for state funding
 - Identify opportunities to coordinate with other municipal, county, regional and state plans
- Demonstrate involvement of local, regional and state organizations:
 - Involve appropriate local and regional agencies and organizations in plan development
 - Appoint or utilize a local steering committee / task force
 - Identify valid partnerships for various plan development and implementation elements.
 - Include letters / endorsements that reflect type, variety and strength of support from partnering agencies, organizations and individuals
- Promote current transportation plans and initiatives:
 - Build on existing municipal or regional initiatives; coordinates with regional or neighboring community plans
 - Communicate potential for implementing existing goals and policies
- Develop realistic aspirations:
 - Show an awareness of / describe a realistic plan implementation strategy
 - Identify tasks and include a realistic time line for plan development
- Address development of modal interconnectivity (where applicable)

Conditions of Project Award

NCDOT offers the option to the local government to either handle the grant administrative responsibilities (RFP, consultant selection, project invoicing, etc.) themselves or delegate this to NCDOT-DBPT. Described below are the overall process and primary responsibilities. Dates are estimates.

NCDOT Administration of Grant Process

- In March 2018, DBPT will send the local government a municipal reimbursement agreement.



- NCDOT/DBPT maintains a short on-call list of experienced, pre-qualified consultants to prepare bicycle and pedestrian plans funded through the Planning Grant Initiative Program. DBPT staff will select a firm to prepare a community's plan whose skills match the needs of the local jurisdiction (with input from the local government when necessary). Consultant assignment will also be influenced by current workload/available staff. Final plan development cost will be negotiated between DBPT and the selected cost with final cost falling within the plan cost range noted earlier in this document.
- Agreements between the locality and NCDOT will be signed in April – July 2018. The locality will be responsible for the local match at this time.
- Plan start date is anticipated in July/August 2018.
- The consultant will be responsible for submitting quarterly progress reports to NCDOT.
- NCDOT-DBPT will handle all consultant invoicing and all other related documentation.
- The local government will establish the project steering committee consisting of local citizenry. A primary local contact will serve as the liaison between the locality, consultant and NCDOT.

Local Government Administration of Grant Process

- In March 2018, DBPT will send the local government various documentation including a municipal reimbursement agreement and grant recipient administrative procedures spelling out local responsibilities.
- The local government will draft a request for proposal and post the request for proposal and solicit firms. (DBPT will review and approve.)
- The local government will develop and document an equitable consultant selection process.
- Once the firm is chosen by the local government, the locality and selected consultant will develop a contract and scope. (DBPT and NCDOT External Audit will review and approve.)
- Agreements between the locality and NCDOT will be signed in April – July 2018.
- Plan start date varies, but based on prior experience, will likely occur 6 or more months after award notification, so September/October 2018 or later.
- The local government will establish the project steering committee consisting of local citizenry. A primary local contact will serve as the liaison between the locality, consultant and NCDOT.
- The local government will submit to NCDOT quarterly progress reports.
- The consultant will bill the local government directly throughout the plan development process. After payment, the local government can request reimbursement monthly to quarterly from NCDOT based on local match percentage. Supporting documentation is required.
- Unspent funds may be withdrawn from municipalities that fail to meet timely benchmarks in the plan development process.
- After project completion, the locality will need to maintain all documentation, accounting records, project records, etc. to substantiate costs incurred for 5 years from the date of final payment.



- Since this program is partially funded with federal dollars, the local government will be subject to certain federal audit requirements. Expectations will be spelled out in the agreement.

As outlined above, whichever grant administration process pursued, the funded municipality/county must be willing to execute a legal agreement with the NCDOT prior to receiving funding. This agreement will outline the responsibilities of each party, the terms of reimbursement and the deliverables. This agreement must be executed within six months of being awarded the grant.

The municipality/county must be willing to submit the final plan to the Town/City/County Council or other approving authority for adoption.

Costs incurred before receipt of a Notice to Proceed are not a reimbursable expense.

For grant processes administered locally, it is expected that awarded municipalities/counties will have twenty-four months from the date of receipt of an NCDOT written Notice to Proceed to complete the plan. For plans administered by NCDOT, it is anticipated that selected consultants will have twelve months from the date of receipt of an NCDOT written Notice to Proceed to complete the plan. Final timeframes will be determined during creation of agreements and finalization of consultant contracts.

Municipalities/counties must credit the North Carolina Department of Transportation for project participation in the plan document, in all press releases and other announcements and promotional materials related to the project.

All electronic files, maps, technical illustrations, etc. produced with these funds will become the property of the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation and the funded municipality/county. GIS files created for plan development must adhere to NCDOT's PBIN geodatabase standards (for more information see: <https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/BikePed/Pages/PBIN.aspx>).

Additional Conditions of Project Award

According to General Statute legislation, NCDOT's Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation is required to produce an annual report on the implementation of projects identified in funded plans. Therefore, local governments receiving funds for the development of bike and/or pedestrians will be required to annually respond to a project implementation survey mechanism.

As stated in the legislation (§ 136-41.5): "The Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation of the Department of Transportation shall submit an annual report by May 15 on the progress of projects identified in plans (i) submitted to the Division over the 10-year period prior to the report and (ii) funded from Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Grant funds. The Division shall submit the report required by this section to the chairs of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee on Transportation, the chairs of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Department of Transportation, and the Fiscal Research Division of the General Assembly."



Administration / Technical Assistance

Staff from the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation (DBPT) will be available to either (a) directly administer the grant process as described above or (b) to assist the municipality/county with administering the grant process by answering questions and providing guidance in developing an RFP to solicit consultants, as well as, final consultant selection and approval. DBPT staff will also provide various forms of technical assistance, attend steering committee meetings and review/approve plan drafts throughout the plan development process.

How to Apply

The application deadline is 5:00 pm Thursday, November 09, 2017

1. The application form is available as a fillable PDF document. The application is designed so that applicants can download the application form and complete the form electronically for submittal. Application form and relevant documents will be accepted in digital format only and should be emailed to Nick Scheuer at nrscheuer@ncdot.gov, with subject title, 2018 Planning Grant Initiative Application – Your Municipality (or County) Name. Every effort should be made to convert any additional files to PDF format. (There is a maximum 25 megabyte application packet size for emailing per municipality).
2. Please use only the space provided to answer the questions. The 2018 *Planning Grant Application* and *Application Instructions* can be found in the right-hand column of the following page: (<https://connect.ncdot.gov/municipalities/PlanningGrants/Pages/Planning-Grant-Initiative.aspx>).
3. The signature of an authorized City/Town/County staff member is required in the space provided on the first page of the application for the proposal to be eligible for consideration (e.g. City/Town/County Manager, Administrator, Mayor, etc.). Please also print the name and title of this signatory in the space provided. The first page should then be scanned and either added to the application or included as a separate document.
4. A resolution from the municipality is required. A resolution from an MPO or RPO, as appropriate, is also required. Arrangements should be made far enough in advance to allow time to acquire the appropriate resolution so that it may be sent in with the application.
5. Other specific information on how each application packet should be formatted may be found under “Submission Instructions” section of the *Application Instructions* document (<https://connect.ncdot.gov/municipalities/PlanningGrants/Pages/Planning-Grant-Initiative.aspx>)
6. Applications will be accepted via e-mail only.
 - Maximum application packet size per municipality must be no larger than 25 megabytes.
 - Completed application form and relevant scanned documents should be converted to PDF format.
 - Online/links references to large files like maps is preferred.



Email to:

Nick Scheuer at nrscheuer@ncdot.gov

Subject: 2018 Planning Grant Initiative Application – Your Municipality Name

For questions:

Nick Scheuer, 919.707.2608



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Meeting Minutes Board of Aldermen

Tuesday, February 21, 2017

7:30 PM

Board Chambers - Room 110

Present: Mayor Lydia Lavelle, Alderman Damon Seils, Alderman Sammy Slade, Alderman Bethany Chaney, Alderman Michelle Johnson, Alderman Jacquelyn Gist

Absent: Alderman Randee Haven-O'Donnell

Also Present: David Andrews, Town Manager, Catherine Dorando, Town Clerk, Nick Herman, Town Attorney

POETRY READING

Gary Phillips, Carrboro's Poet Laurette, read a poem called "My Grandmother."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mayor Lavelle and the Board of Aldermen acknowledged the sad and sudden passing of Mike Canova, the Town's longtime Code Enforcement Supervisor. They spoke of their memories of Mike Canova and expressed sympathies to his family and coworkers.

COMMENTS FROM DAVID COLLINS, CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

David Collins, the Chair of the Board of Adjustment, provided thanks to Dorian McLean, Marty Roupe, James Thomas, and Bob Hornik for their work as staff for the Board of Adjustment.

COMMENTS FROM BOB PROCTOR ON BOLIN CREEK

Bob Proctor stated that paving along Bolin Creek is unnecessary.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2017 AND FEBRUARY 7, 2017

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALDERMAN CHANEY, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SEILS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2017 AND TO TABLE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 7, 2017 UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE SIX, ABSENT ONE (HAVEN-O'DONNELL)

REQUEST-TO-SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON LAND USE ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SIGNAGE

The purpose of this agenda item was for the Board of Aldermen to consider setting a public hearing on text amendments to the Land Use Ordinance relating to construction fence wrap signage.

A motion was made by Alderman Chaney, seconded by Alderman Seils, that this resolution be approved:

A RESOLUTION SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING ON AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CARRBORO LAND USE ORDINANCE PROVISIONS RELATED TO SIGNAGE

WHEREAS, the Board of Aldermen seeks to provide ample opportunities for the public to comment on proposed amendments to the Land Use Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Aldermen sets a public hearing on March 28, 2017, to consider adopting "An Ordinance Amending the Carrboro Land Use Ordinance Provisions Related to Signage."

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the draft ordinance is referred to Orange County, the Town of Carrboro Planning Board for consideration and recommendation prior to the specified public hearing date.

This the 21st day of February 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Slade, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils, Mayor Lavelle and Alderman Johnson

Absent: Alderman Haven-O'Donnell,

INFORMATION REGARDING RESEARCH ON THE ACCESSIBLE ICON PROJECT IN THE TOWN OF CARRBORO

The purpose of this item was to update the Board of Aldermen on the Public Works Department's research into the possible implementation of the new wheelchair Accessible Icon Project for the Town of Carrboro.

Staff will continue to work on the project and bring further information back as it becomes available.

DETAILED PREVIEW - WORKING DRAFT OF TOWN CODE AMENDMENTS TO MODIFY LIVESTOCK PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO CHICKENS AND RABBITS

The purpose of this agenda item was for the Board of Aldermen to receive the draft Town Code Amendments pertaining to chicken and rabbits in preparation for the upcoming public hearing on related Land Use Ordinance amendments.

Alderman Gist asked if roosters were allowed. Tina Moon, the Town's Planning Administrator, stated that roosters are allowed unless they become a nuisance. Alderman Seils suggested that people contact the Town with their opinions on roosters.

Alderman Slade stated that it would be helpful to have a table tied to the space requirements for turkeys and geese because they are larger than chickens.

Alderman Chaney asked why there is a three fowl minimum and why eggs can't be sold out of homes.

Staff will bring back further information during the public hearing set for February 28, 2017.

COMMENTS ON THE DCHC-MPO COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The purpose of this agenda item was to approve comments that will be forwarded to the MPO Board on the draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

A motion was made by Alderman Slade, seconded by Alderman Seils, that this resolution be approved:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE DCHC-MPO COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the state of North Carolina mandated that all MPOs create a Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) to address future needs; and

WHEREAS, the draft DCHC-MPO CTP includes highway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian recommendations for the Town of Carrboro; and

WHEREAS, projects submitted through the SPOT prioritization process are expected to come from an adopted CTP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen that the Board authorizes that the following comments be conveyed on behalf of the Town:

- 1) The Carrboro Board of Aldermen supports transit improvements and is cognizant of citizen concerns relating to the increasing costs for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit project and the North-South Corridor Bus Rapid Transit project, as well as the potential need to reallocate funding for other transportation projects such as bike and pedestrian improvements, which may provide more direct benefit to Carrboro residents. Timely dissemination of updates relating to both the cost and scheduling of these projects will be critical to their success moving forward. Enhanced feeder bus services and access improvements, including direct access, that will enable Carrboro residents to utilize these transit projects to the same extent as their neighbors will likewise be essential.
- 2) Consider maximizing high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) as a managed use for the I-40 expansion.
- 3) Future transit proposals should explore and better articulate the pros and cons of bus rapid transit and light rail, taking into account cost, infrastructure, flexibility, route design and other relevant factors.
- 4) A direct transit connection from Carrboro/Chapel Hill to RDU Airport is highly desired.
- 5) The Town is pleased to see that the draft CTP is, in general, consistent with Carrboro's policy of widening road corridors to accommodate bike/ped improvements rather than vehicular travel.
- 6) The Board reiterates its preference to accommodate anticipated capacity needs on NC 54 west through intersection improvements rather than a substantial widening that would be inconsistent with the land use policies along the corridor.
- 7) The Board reiterates its support for expanded bus service frequency and expanded nighttime and weekend service.
- 8) Change the cross-section of E. Main Street from Rosemary Street to Weaver and Roberson Streets to show two vehicle travel lanes, a center turn lane, and protected bike lanes. The current highway CTP shows that the current cross-section is adequate for the 2040 capacity. The bike and multi-use CTP shows the Campus to Campus Connector along E. Main Street from Roberson Street to Lloyd Street as the only improvement.
- 9) Change the cross-section of Hillsborough Road from W. Main Street to N. Greensboro Street to show narrower vehicle travel lanes and protected bike lanes. This roadway is heavily traveled by cyclists and pedestrians, including many children going to and from Carrboro Elementary School. The current highway CTP shows that the current cross-section is more than adequate for the 2040 volume. In fact, the Volume over Capacity is only 0.3 (4000 vehicles for a capacity of 11,600). This indicates that there is plenty of roadway here to dedicate to bicycles.
- 10) Add an off-road multi-use path from Carrboro to Hillsborough along Old 86 and/or make other improvements to this road to improve the safety of cyclists and drivers.

This the 21st day of February 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Slade, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils, Mayor Lavelle and Alderman Johnson

Absent: Alderman Haven-O'Donnell

PRESENTATION OF THE PARKING STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this agenda item was for the Board of Aldermen to receive a presentation on the updated findings and associated recommendations as a precursor to adopting the document as a Parking Plan.

Timothy Tresohlavy, representing VHB, provided the report to the Board.

Alderman Gist asked about liability issues related to businesses sharing parking. She stated that it is important to question the assumptions of the use of the parking garage and stated that a lot of the parking is people going to the university and using Carrboro lots for park-and-ride.

Alderman Seils stated that he may speak with Brian Litchfield about the possibility of a shuttle during the Farmers Market.

Alderman Slade asked how many businesses are grandfathered into not meeting the Town's presumptive parking standards.

A motion was made by Alderman Chaney, seconded by Alderman Seils, that this resolution be approved.

A RESOLUTION RECEIVING A PRESENTATION ON THE PARKING STUDY AND SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FINAL REPORT

WHEREAS, The Town of Carrboro entered into a contract with VHB Engineering in November 2015 to conduct a parking study of the downtown; and

WHEREAS, the report and recommendations are nearing completion.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Aldermen, receives the presentation on the draft findings and sets a public hearing on April 25th, 2017, to consider adopting the final report of downtown parking study.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the draft report is referred to the Town of Carrboro Planning Board, Transportation Advisory Board, Economic Sustainability Commission, Northern Transition Area Advisory Committee, Environmental Advisory Board, and the Recreation and Parks Commission for consideration and recommendation prior to the specified public hearing date.

This the 21st day of February 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Slade, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils, Mayor Lavelle and Alderman Johnson

Absent: Alderman Haven-O'Donnell

DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR SHARED ROSEMARY PARKING LOT

The purpose of this item was to discuss options for management and maintenance of the shared parking lot at Rosemary and Sunset.

This item was moved to March 7, 2017.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN, FY 2017-18 THROUGH FY 2021-22

The purpose of this item was to present to the Board of Aldermen a proposed 5-year Capital Improvements Plan (CIP),

Arche McAdoo, the Town's Finance Director, made the staff presentation.

Alderman Gist asked staff to report back on how the CIP translates into the tax rate. She also asked to see how the Town's CIP in comparison to the County's CIP.

Alderman Chaney suggested that the report be brought back a future date when more is known about the financial expenditure projections.

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALDERMAN GIST, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SEILS THAT THE REPORT BE ACCEPTED AND FURTHER INFORMATION BE BROUGHT BACK AT A LATER DATE TO ALLOW THE BOARD TO ADOPT THE CIP. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE SIX, ABSENT ONE (HAVEN-O'DONNELL)

CONSIDERATION OF COLORFUL CROSSWALK DESIGNS AND LOCATIONS

The purpose of this agenda item was for the Board of Aldermen to consider various options for colorful crosswalks at two locations in Town.

Bergen Watterson, the Town's Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. She discussed the safety questions with the Board and indicated that she can report back on if one of the designs is in fact safer than the other.

Alderman Chaney asked if there is a way to monitor if the colorful sidewalks make a difference in safety.

A motion was made by Alderman Slade, seconded by Alderman Seils, that this resolution be approved.

A RESOLUTION TO PURSUE COLORFUL CROSSWALKS IN CARRBORO

WHEREAS, the Board of Aldermen has expressed interest in painting colorful crosswalks at various locations on Town-maintained roads, and

WHEREAS, pedestrian safety and comfort are high priorities for the Town, and

WHEREAS, Public Works staff can install the crosswalks in-house for an estimated cost of \$600 each.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen that the Board directs staff to refer the colorful crosswalks located at Laurel Avenue and East Weaver Street to the Transportation Advisory Board and the Arts Commission and to report back regarding the safety questions.

This the 21st day of February 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Slade, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils, Mayor Lavelle and Alderman Johnson

Absent: Alderman Haven-O'Donnell

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALDERMAN GIST, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SEILS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE SIX, ABSENT ONE (HAVEN-O'DONNELL)