



# Durham Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Durham Transportation Department · 101 City Hall Plaza · Durham, NC 27701

May 18, 2021  
7:00 PM

Virtual Meeting via Zoom  
<https://zoom.us/j/98678891110>

## AGENDA

### **I. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions, Excused Absences**

**7:03**

- Meeting called to order by Susanne Schmal
- Present: Aidil Ortiz, Susanne Schmal, Emily Egge, Michael Moorman, Dan Clever, Ed Rizzuto, Mike Shepherd, Adam Pyburn, Javiera Caballero, Heidi Carter
- Excused Absent: David Fellerath, Tony Patterson, Amanda De Hoedt
- Absent: George Tait
- Staff/Presenters: Dale McKeel; Office on Youth: Lara Khalil, A'lice Frazier, Nori McDuffie, Jaylen Segers
- Public: None
- Update on new members and openings: Dale reported that on May 17 the City Council appointed Deniz Aydemir (Transportation Planning Policy seat) and Idreese Foxworth (University Students/Facilities seat) to BPAC

### **II. Adjustments to the Agenda**

**7:20**

Council Member Javiera Caballero requested to make comments on the proposed Green and Equitable Infrastructure Bond. She stated that Council has determined there is not enough time to pursue a Bond referendum for Fall 2021, considering all the preliminary work that needs to be done in advance of a bond referendum. The bond won't be on the ballot but it is expected that there will be additional funding in the CIP budget. She is really excited about the proposed budget given the pandemic, but there is an opportunity for residents to weigh in. A bond referendum is likely in 2022, but need to build an advisory council that works with government staff to imagine what this bond would cover, to ensure community engagement, and to support messaging about it in the community.

### **III. Approval of Minutes from April Meeting**

**7:22**

-Emily moved and Mike 2nd - motion passed to approve minutes

### **IV. Public Comments**

**7:23**

-none

### **V. Presentations**

**7:23**

Youth Listening Project (Lara Khalil, A'lice Frazier, Nori McDuffie, and Jaylen Segers)-Reviewed what each BPAC committee does after introductions. Then Ooy gave a brief summary of what they do.

-This conversation was meant to continue thinking about how we can support the findings for their YLP Report.

-One of the main ways that BPAC can support youth in their transit needs by going to where young people are. Instead of making youth come to us, BPAC and others need to go to them. During quarantine, we should attend youth-run/centric meetings. Building bases of connection and doing field

trips to local schools as they open would be a great way to meet young people where they are.

-Emily wondered if there aren't a lot of physical spaces that are safe for youth to gather, are there online spaces that we can attend for connection? There are a lot of youth serving orgs that are still serving young people who can help make connections. Young people said they didn't get enough field trips and we could put field trips together for young people to attend. OOO is currently trying to identify young people are interested in transit to see how they may get more involved.

-There is a conversation running at BPAC to reserve a seat (or more) to be for a young person. Also, the subcommittees can have anyone serve in them and there are no age restrictions and folks don't have to be appointed to participate. This has lots of room for influencing power.

-There is a desire on the part of the OOO to have young people integrated throughout the commission and establishing community agreements for healthy intergenerational functioning. Those partnerships need to be known and understood for everyone so that when times get tough we know why we are doing something that runs counter to societal norms (i.e. intergenerational work).

-Paying people for their time is important.

-Heidi wonders if EngageDurham's outreach around the Durham Transit plan includes youth. OOO plans on doing targeted youth engagement for upcoming survey.

-A good way BPAC can show up for young people is by being in conversation with young people. Reading the report is a great step but staying in constant communication is important too. By preparing for having youth on the commission in an intentional way, it makes us an example to other boards and commissions. What BPAC learns serves the whole and can support others.

## **VI. Committee Reports**

**8:18**

- Education, Encouragement and Engagement Committee Report (Susanne Schmal)
  - Walked through the interlocal agreement and had some suggestions to the dedicated seats.
  - City Council (6 positions)
    - ~~(Move to County and modify) Bicycle Commuting Community~~
    - (keep) Urban Trails and Greenways
    - ~~University students/University Facilities~~
    - (keep) Transportation Planning Policy
    - ~~Recreation/ Recreation Business~~
    - ~~Inter-Neighborhood Council~~
    - ~~(add) Walking/Running/Pedestrian Community for marginalized groups (e.g., Black Girls Run)~~
    - (add) Public Transit / Paratransit
    - (add) 1 at-large seat
  - County Commissioners (6)
    - (keep) Youth/Children Advocacy
    - (keep) Senior Advocacy
    - (add) Disabilities Advocacy
    - ~~Education~~

- ~~Bicycle Club/Organization~~
  - ~~Health/Physical Fitness~~
  - Business/Economic Development
  - (add) Bicycle Community
  - (add) 1 at-large seat
- Emily noted that maybe we should make the city at large seat to be a youth seat and the youth advocacy seat in the county should be just for youth as well.
- There seems to be seems to be some support for removing the business/economic development seat.
- Need to make city and county officials aware of our concerns about the lack of alignment on values concerning BikeWalkNC NC's summit. Want to make sure that we call-in Bike Walk NC on their issues around a deficiency on equity in how they work and give key stakeholders a heads up about these concerns in advance of their conference taking place in November. Heidi advised that a letter be sent in June to elected officials.
- Emily moved and Michael seconded to extend meeting by 15 minutes. Motion passed.
- Development Review Committee Report (Dan Clever)
  - Reviewed responses for Latta Rd. and applicant is incorporating comments about connections to the school. Got responses back on Southpoint mall comments regarding connections to trail but those haven't been processed yet.
  - Also talked about interactive map by Planning about new developments that let's residents make comments on EngageDurham.
- Bike & Pedestrian Plan Implementation / Evaluation Committee Report (Michael Moorman)
  - The PIE committee would like to ask the commission to consider the draft memo (attachment 1 at end of notes), which we would like to send to the Durham Chapel Hill Carrboro MPO (DCHC MPO).
  - An amendment to the CTP proposes to incorporate multi-use paths as the recommended bicycle facility for many roads in Durham County. The memo is asking the MPO to reconsider this approach.
  - Dan moved and Michael seconded that we extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Motion passed.
  - Emily moved and Ed seconded that we approve the letters to be submitted.
- Updates from Liaisons
  - Durham Board of County Commissioners (Heidi Carter) - County is a member of the Vision Zero team and will be attending the institute in June. It is a multidisciplinary team that will represent Durham. County is having a budget meeting on Monday at 7pm.
  - Duke University (George Tait) - no
  - NC Central University (Tony Patterson) - no
  - Recreation Advisory Commission (David Fellerath) - no
  - Comprehensive Plan (Aidil Ortiz & Ed Rizzuto) - outreach team is meeting in early June to go over goals and objectives.

**VII. Old Business**

**9:20**

- Review of Interlocal Agreement and Bylaws (Dale McKeel)  
–this was discussed during EEE updates.

**VIII. New Business**

**9:22**

- DOST Open Space Requests (Susanne Schmal, Dale McKeel)
  - Consider what stipends can be made available in the upcoming budgets for Durham residents to participate in boards and commissions.
  - Emily made a motion to support a budget request and Ed 2nd to support the DOST budget recommendations. Motion passed.

**IX. Adjourn**

**9:31**

**-Ed moved to adjourn. Motion passed.**

## Attachment 1

The Durham Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendment to the DCHC MPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). Our comments are focused on the proposed 'Bike/MUP' map and associated list within the amendment.

We are concerned about the inclusion of multi-use paths (MUPs) as the recommended bikeway option for most of the roads in the suburban and rural tier in Durham County. In summary, we fear this will result in roadways that are not in accord with NCDOT's Complete Streets guidelines and philosophy.

Please review our concerns, observations and requests below:

- As the dominant plan with regard to bicycle facilities, BPAC and reviewing departments rely on the CTP to recommend how roadways should be built by private and public entities. This has resulted in the incorporation of additional roadway width (and proper placement of curb & gutter or ditches) which enables the development of connected and networked on-road bicycle facilities in the future.
- MUPs are an acceptable bikeway facility if they are continuous, part of an overall network or project and easily connect to adjacent bikeway types. However, many roadways are constructed or upgraded by private development, and they are only obligated to build the facility along their site frontage. This will result in many disconnected MUP segments throughout the county with no additional roadway width.
- In the interim period (i.e. the time between the build of a given segment by a developer and the time the bicycle facility is incorporated into a larger network), the additional roadway width provides a refuge for cyclists to allow motorists to pass. A disconnected MUP will be of no use to cyclists in the interim period, and the roadway will not be a 'Complete Street.'
- As observed with other disconnected MUP segments in the past (e.g. the American Tobacco Trail through the Southpoint Mall property prior to Phase E), the MUP will sit idle for years or even decades, and may have to be rebuilt once the roadway is converted.
- If a road is identified to have a MUP, NCDOT would probably not re-stripe the road for bicycle lanes or wide outside shoulder when there is a resurfacing, even though there are no MUPs present or planned to be built.
- If a developer builds a MUP on their side of the road, does that mean a MUP will not be required on the other side of the road (for a future development)?

- Per the Federal Highway Administration’s Bikeway Selection Guide, the higher the speed and volume of a road, the more protective the recommended bikeway. Separated bike lanes or shared use paths are best suited for roads with moderate to high speeds and high volumes.

- Many of the corridors proposed to have MUPs (primarily in the suburban and rural tiers, but some in the urban tier) in the amendment do not carry both high traffic volumes, high speeds, or are scheduled for conversion to this roadway type. Even if they do, on-road separated bike lanes are still an option.

- MUPs can become problematic where there are (or will be) many commercial and private driveway crossings, as motorists are focused more on entering the road than looking out for cyclists on the MUP. They can also be problematic at intersections. FHWA guidance must be utilized when constructing driveway and intersection crossings.

Given these concerns, BPAC strongly urges the MPO to leave on-road bicycle facilities as the default option for roadways throughout the county. However, MUPs can be considered only if the following conditions are present:

- The roadway in question is already an arterial that carries a high volume of traffic with high design speed, or
- The roadway is part of a corridor that will be converted to an arterial (with high traffic volume and high design speed) within the next five years, or
- The roadway is part of an overall project that will install MUPs.

BPAC also recommends the following with regard to bicycle facilities in the CTP:

- In many cases throughout the county and city, on-road protected bicycle lanes will be the best option. In that case, enough width should be granted for the bicycle lane itself as well as space for a buffer.
- BPAC requests that the MPO takes this opportunity to incorporate guidance from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), which is referenced in the NCDOT Complete Streets Implementation Guide.
- BPAC requests that the MPO delays the decision on the bicycle and pedestrian elements of the CTP amendment until these issues are addressed.

Thank you for your time in consideration of our memo, and please let us know if you would like to discuss these items or have any questions.