

## Memo

**To: Denise Boswell, Ph. D.**

City of Wilson

**From: Jennifer Lewis, AICP**

The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

**CC: Jim Bradshaw, Dennis Patton**

Upper Coastal Plains Council of Government

**Scott Lane, Chris Lukasina, Alison Carpenter**

The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

**John Vine-Hodge**

NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation

**Re: Minutes for Meeting #3 of the Wilson Bicycle Plan Steering Committee**

**March 26, 2008 at the City of Wilson Operations Center**

---

### **Attendee List:**

Denise Boswell, City of Wilson

Jim Bradshaw, Upper Coastal Plains Council of Government

Bryant Bunn, City of Wilson

Jim Davis, COWs

Will Deaton, City of Wilson

Kathy Garner, City of Wilson

Janet Holland, City of Wilson

James Lamm, COWs

Jennifer Lewis, The Louis Berger Group, Inc

Chris Lukasina, The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

Dennis Patton, Upper Coastal Plains Council of Government

Craig Smith, Wilson Police Department

Kevin Whalen

### **Meeting Summary:**

#### **Introductions**

Jennifer Lewis and Denise Boswell began the meeting by leading brief introductions. Jennifer also presented the day's agenda.

#### **Public Outreach**

##### *Marketing Efforts*

Following introductions, Denise and Will Deaton presented information on the Plan's public involvement process so far. As displayed in the presentation, the City staff has made extensive efforts to ensure that outreach has been made to include as many citizens of Wilson as possible. Will and Denise indicated that, to date, the City has distributed over 1500 flyers about the Plan,

issued a Press Release which was the basis of an article in the Wilson Daily Times, and participated in Channel 8's "Around Town" television show to promote the Plan. In addition, City staff has presented the Plan and accompanying survey to six neighborhood association meetings in the City and eight City boards and commissions. An email has also been sent out about the Plan and the survey to numerous employees of various organizations and to students at Barton College.

#### *Open Houses*

Jennifer next presented on the Open Houses held on March 19, 2008, and some of the results to-date of the survey for the Plan. Open Houses to present the Plan to the public were held from 4 to 7 pm at two separate locations: the Reid Street Recreation Center and the Recreation Park Community Center. Maps of the preliminary proposed projects and routes were presented and food, drink, and copies of the survey were available. Handouts were also available, which included a brief description of the project and the list of preliminary proposed projects. Participants were invited to draw on maps the roads where they would like to see improvements, destinations they would like to ride to, and places that they already ride. Participants also had the opportunity to speak directly with Bicycle Plan staff on hand. Overall, the Open Houses garnered **36** participants – a substantial number for a place of Wilson's size.

#### *Survey*

Jennifer also presented the results of the survey as of March 23, 2008. The survey had been extended from its original deadline of March 21 to March 28, 2008. As of March 23, 2008, there had been 245 online survey responses and 205 paper survey responses. Out of the online survey respondents, over 90 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they would like to ride their bicycles more. Popular destinations for bicycling for online survey respondents included to the park, neighborhood, store, and work. Popular reasons for bicycling for online survey respondents included exercise and recreation. Jennifer indicated that the paper survey responses may have different popular destinations and reasons for cycling, but that it would be likely that the enthusiasm for improving bicycling conditions in the City of Wilson would remain the same.

#### *Bicycle Ride*

Another element of the public outreach effort thus far was a Bicycle Ride held on March 8, 2008. There were approximately 10 participants, most of whom were members of the Cyclists of Wilson (COWs) group. The route for the ride included parallel streets to Nash Street from Airport Boulevard south to downtown and the park at Williams Day Camp on Canal Drive and Ripley Road. Some of the ideas that were generated by the Ride participants include: addressing signalized intersections of issue, creating a marked bicycle route similar to the Robin Run, developing wayfinding signage for bicycle routes, providing a greenway connection to the YMCA on Airport Boulevard, and identifying a parallel, safer route to Airport Boulevard.

#### Preliminary Projects and Ranking Discussion

Jennifer next presented to the group the list of preliminary projects that have been identified through input from the Steering Committee and a technical analysis of compatibility of routes. In total, there are 38 separate projects that have been identified which cover over 40 miles of road in Wilson and 26 separately named roads. Jennifer stated that not all of the projects will be able to be built first, so it will be necessary for the City to prioritize them. The goal of the day's

activities was to determine the criteria that should be used to prioritize this list of projects, and also to generate a reduced list of preliminary top priority projects. To prepare the Committee for the prioritization discussion, Jennifer quickly reviewed the types of facilities that can be used to improve a roadway for bicycling, and then briefly discussed each of the projects on the preliminary project list.

One of the treatments that is recommended for some of the preliminary projects is “Traffic Calming” or “Road Diet”. Jennifer presented material about traffic calming and road diets. She indicated that these treatments mean that the road should be narrowed or other improvements should be made to reduce traffic speeds on the road prior to instituting a bicycle lane or similar facility. Without these improvements and the accompanying reduced vehicular traffic speeds, the roads may be unsafe for bicyclists in spite of the presence of a bicycle facility such as a bike lane or sharrow. One thing that should be noted, however, is that road dieting or traffic calming can sometimes be more expensive than simply painting bike lanes or sharrow symbols.



**Figure 1. Jennifer Lewis facilitates a discussion of project priorities.**

Group members identified two revisions to the projects:

1. Extending one of the Nash Street projects from Lodge Street to Pender Street.
2. Eliminating the multi-use path on Forest Hills for a connection between Lakeside and Chelsea Drive and instead providing a route up the new extension of Lakeside to Chelsea Drive. An improvement will be necessary at the intersection of Lakeside Drive with Forest Hills Drive to ensure safe crossings for cyclists.

Jennifer began the priorities discussion by asking the Steering Committee members to think about the one project on the preliminary project list that they would like to have completed first, no matter the cost. She then asked Steering Committee members to identify the two main reasons why they picked this project. Steering Committee members next presented their project and their reasons to the group.

The results were recorded on an easel as follows:

Road Name	Criteria #1	Criteria #2
Black Creek	Destination for shopping, work	Unfunded on TIP (there is an opportunity to plan before it goes forward)
Kenan	Parallel to Nash, therefore access to destinations	Central location
Airport: Nash – Raleigh	Shopping/destinations (YMCA, park, residences)	Safety
Nash & Parallel	Central – provides many links to next projects	Need for access to destinations

Airport: Nash – Raleigh	Destinations	Safety
Packhouse	Safety	Access to safe areas to ride in the county (Exercise destination)
Nash	Destinations to shopping, work	Already lot of bicyclists
Pender	Destinations to shopping, work	Already lot of bicyclists
Tilghman: Corbett – Ward	Access to school	Safety
Nash: inside Ward Blvd.	Centrally-located, most visibility (good starting point for other projects too)	Connectivity
Nash	Main thoroughfare	Connectivity

During the discussion, Committee members discussed the importance of access to shopping, work, and schools in comparison to other destinations such as parks and recreation facilities. Jennifer presented to the group the factors that she often uses to evaluate projects, including service to destinations, constructability and project expense, and project purpose. She also

outlined to the group the three criteria that she recommends any top priority list should meet in order to be deemed an adequate and equitable list:

1. Projects on the list serve a variety of users
2. Projects on the list serve a variety of destinations
3. Projects on the list serve a wide range of geographic areas (equitable location of projects)



**Figure 2. The Steering Committee evaluates project priorities.**

Next Meeting

In the next meeting, Jennifer will present an analysis of the final survey results and a prioritized list of the preliminary projects based on the criteria identified in the March 26 discussion, cost and constructability estimates,

and survey input. The group will be asked to evaluate this list for final presentation in the Working Paper No. 2, which will include cost estimates for the projects, recommendations for policy and programs, and preliminary priorities. The next meeting is scheduled for April 23 at 4:00 pm in the City’s Operations Center.