



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Regular Meeting Agenda

November 23, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of October 26, 2020 Minutes
3. Better Block Trailer
4. Discuss FY21 Funding
5. Review Project Evaluation Format
6. New & Ongoing Business
 - a. City Projects Update
 - b. Parking Lot Items
7. Adjournment



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

NAME	REPRESENTATION
Rebecca Brouwer (RB)	City
Sarah Elder (SE)	City
Matt Engwall (ME)	City
Andy Lynch (AL)	Alamance County ETJ
Chelsey Morrison (CM)	Orange County
Patty Philipps (PDP)	City Council Delegate
Sylvia Sichi (SS)	City
Cy Stober (CS)	Development Director
Aaron Davis	Recreation & Parks Director
Audrey Vogel (AV)	City Planner

Public Participation: Jason Smith and James Allen joined the Zoom call.

APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2020, MEETING SUMMARY

SS moved to approve the minutes.

ME seconded the motion.

A unanimous vote supported the motion.

MEBANE OUTDOORS CAMPAIGN CHECK-IN

RB recognized that CS was not yet on the Zoom call and would be needed for Agenda Item #3. She suggested the BPAC adjust the agenda and discuss the Mebane Outdoors Campaign. RB commented the cyclist signs have been posted for a few months and the BPAC may want to collect them soon, especially with the frenzy of election signs. She asked AD to comment on sign distribution.

AD responded most of the distributed signs can be tracked through the Recreation & Parks registration software, a list at City Hall, and a list at the MACC. AD will compile the lists and provide it to the BPAC.

RB asked if the BPAC should collect the distributed signs for a relaunch of the campaign in May, which is bike safety month.

AD replied with support for the proposed plan and remarked collection of the signs before any winter weather is also important.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

SS commented she could collect and return the signs she posted. She asked about the plan for folks who have signs posted in their yards, inquiring if the BPAC should ask the individuals to keep the signs and repost in May or if the BPAC should collect all signs.

RB suggested providing individuals with the option. She asked AD if City staff or a BPAC member should be the point of contact.

AD indicated he did not have a preference and said City staff could assist. AD will share the compiled list via Google Sheet with the BPAC.

RB replied the BPAC would wait to review the Google Sheet and determine which signs remain in control of the BPAC. The BPAC will work with AD on other signs.

PDP expressed her support for a relaunch of the sign campaign in May, noting a need to separate the BPAC signs from the current sign noise.

RB remarked the campaign has been competing with a lot of things, including the pandemic.

SS commented on the unknown of a Dogwood Festival in 2021.

AL asked AD for an update on the tentative plan for the Christmas Parade.

AD replied he had been considering a reverse parade but is now concerned with feasibility. More meetings are needed to determine the logistics. If a reverse parade is not possible, a virtual event is likely. A Downtown parade is unlikely and not being discussed. If a reverse parade is possible, it will likely occur at the MACC.

AL indicated he was not familiar with the term “reverse parade.”

RB replied the floats stay in one place and people move around them.

AL commented the “floats” (cars, tents, trailers, etc.) would be assigned a space large enough to allow for social distancing.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Cars would travel through to see the “floats.” This prevents large groups of spectators in one place.

AL asked if there was a way for the BPAC to capitalize on the graphics designed for the Mebane Outdoors Campaign and participate in the Christmas Parade, noting the BPAC has an awareness component and is not yet a recognizable entity in the Mebane. He suggested it is an obvious in, with bikes and walking. AL noted the Dogwood Festival and Christmas Parade are the seminal events in Mebane and the BPAC should participate.

AD responded a 30-second video from the BPAC for a virtual parade is an easy ask to promote the BPAC.

RB commented she would add events to the Trello Board.

DISCUSS FY21 FUNDING & BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

RB asked staff to introduce this item to the BPAC.

CS reviewed funding available to the BPAC. With this year’s budget, City Council allocated \$10,000 for the BPAC to use at its discretion to invest in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the City. The City receives external funds through the Powell Bill for resurfacing of City-maintained streets. Striping to accompany resurfacing projects could come from Powell Bill funds; signage would likely not be covered. CS remarked that the City has plenty of signs for bike boulevards since they were ordered in bulk last year. He noted that the \$10,000 remains largely untouched and at the BPAC’s discretion. Recommendations exist in the Bike/Ped Plan. CS also described recent encroachment agreements with the NCDOT for high-visibility and new pedestrian crossings at five locations in the City. The crossings would need to be paid for and completed by the City. CS commented on the increased costs associated with using thermoplastic at the crossings, which is a decision to be made by the BPAC.

RB asked if the BPAC has the option to prioritize the crosswalks by using part of the \$10,000.

CS replied yes, noting the \$10,000 should be plenty.

RB asked if funding the five crosswalks would absorb a large portion of the \$10,000.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

CS responded it would be a large minority and stated his expectation of at least \$5,000 remaining.

RB suggested the BPAC consider how the remaining funds might be allocated. CS agreed.

ME expressed concerns about the bike boulevard on Clay Street. He described safety concerns related to individuals biking on Fifth St and then cutting across Clay where cars are both traveling and parked on the street, sandwiching cyclists between them. ME added he would like to discuss a bike lane on Clay Street or even turning Clay Street into a one-way street that continued to allow parking on both sides. He noted the sidewalk on Clay Street cannot be used by cyclists because of how crowded it is.

CS responded with information on the Better Block Trailer, which is devoted to tactical urbanism to allow for demonstration projects before infrastructure is placed on the ground. The City of Mebane is partnering with the City of Graham on the project. The BPAC could use the Better Block Trailer to test curb bump-outs, pocket parks, parklets, bike lanes, traffic calming devices, and similar ideas prior to committing to any capital projects.

ME suggested that Ruffin may be a better option to explore.

CS replied the BPAC will decide where they should test drive ideas. Staff will coordinate with the City of Graham regarding the trailer and communicate with the BPAC as plans emerge.

SS asked if the City would support a one-way down Clay Street.

CS responded the Downtown Vision Plan does not include a one-way street. It was explored in the Downtown Vision Plan, but a different streetscape was preferred, with that streetscape dependent on City investment in an expanded lot for parking. The preferred streetscape includes widening the sidewalk, dedicating a bike lane, and removing on-street parking. This proposal leaves Clay Street as two-directional.

ME commented this proposal may get more pushback from business owners on Clay.

CS responded that during public meetings support existed for the idea alongside anxiety about from which side of the street parking would be removed. If the City



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

invested in more parking near Clay Street that was ADA-accessible, accompanied by wayfinding signage, and included dedicated loaded zones, the idea of removing on-street parking could be okay.

PDP commented Clay Street sounds like the perfect candidate for using the Better Block Trailer, with the ability to consider parking on each side of the street. She shared that Downtown business owners want individuals to travel safely in the area whether by car, bike, or foot but a fear factor does exist. PDP commented that using the Better Block Trailer will help people consider how different options are beneficial.

RB agreed with PDP. She reviewed the multiple interests at play, including the promotion of bicyclist and pedestrian safety and Downtown economic development. RB commented on how the ability to experiment with ideas may help show that priorities do not have to compete with one another. She suggested forming partnerships with the Downtown business owners and asked the BPAC how further conversations with Downtown leaders would look.

AL commented this could affect how the balance of improvement funds is used.

RB asked if the trailer is free.

CS confirmed use of the Better Block Trailer is at no cost to the BPAC. He stated the need to coordinate with Public Works, Police, and City Council.

AL asked if this item could be placed in the parking lot since it is separate from the use of the improvement funds. He



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

expressed his support of using the trailer and experimenting with ideas.

RB asked ME if his initial comments were directed to ask that funds not be invested in the proposed bike routes through Downtown.

ME agreed and commented he is concerned with promoting a safer path.

AL expressed his support for pursuing the greatest safety impact with the balance of the funds. He commented on how traffic patterns will change as the Bypass emerges. He suggested building up infrastructure around shopping centers and other places where people are likely to be traveling on foot.

RB responded that the Cates Farm work is emerging, and she thinks about how to build connections, such as a safe crossing for Mill Creek residents.

CS replied the timing is not right for a Mill Creek-Cates Farm connection, suggesting the NCDOT would not grant an encroachment agreement across NC-119 until the Bypass is complete.

AL asked for a time frame.

CS responded Spring/Summer 2021.

SS asked if a traffic light is planned at the entrance of Mill Creek.

CS began searching for revised plans.

AD provided an update on trail construction at Cates Farm. About 4,000 linear feet of trails is complete in the wooded areas only. At the last visit, the trails had not crossed the power line easement but AD imagines that has been completed. AD shared recent news that Duke Energy will be putting in a temporary gravel road to help a contractor fix power line towers, which may impact the timeline of the trails. The contractor is planning to begin work the first of November. AD suggested the BPAC schedule time to explore the trails at an upcoming meeting.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

RB asked AD to provide a window as to when that might be a possibility and suggested a field trip outside of the regular BPAC time.

AD is unsure the entire trail system will be finished by the end of November given Duke Energy's work.

RB added that connecting to Cates Farm Trails does not seem to be a good way to spend the improvement funds.

AD agreed and commented NCDOT does not appear interested in negotiations until the Bypass work is completed.

SS asked CS if he had found the plans and supported RB's point of getting Mill Creek residents safely to the other side. She added that future growth of a greenway would make the connection more important.

RB suggested returning to the idea later.

CM asked if the \$10,000 had to be allocated before budget approval or if the conversation is related to the items associated with resurfacing.

CS replied two matters exist. Anything associated with the repaving schedule is a recommendation that Mark Reich is happy to include, even as a change order if needed. The \$10,000 is immediately available to the BPAC for this fiscal year ending June 30, 2021. CS commented that last year the BPAC used the funds for bike boulevards, which totaled just under \$5,000. CS added if the BPAC wishes to pursue a bike lane, the striping is more difficult and expensive. Bike boulevard stencils have already been purchased. CS replied to the earlier inquiry by SS, noting he did not see indication of traffic signals at the Mill Creek entrance. He suggested he may need to follow up with an engineer to confirm.

RB asked if the BPAC was limited in how the funds could be used. She provided the example of t-shirts and asked if the funds were designated for infrastructure only or could be used for outreach.

CS responded he believed the funds were allocated to the BPAC as discretionary.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

RB added she was not advocating for any use beyond infrastructure but wanted to clarify.

RB asked if the BPAC was limited to simple projects like striping and signs or if other things could be considered.

CS responded the use of the funds should serve the mission of the BPAC.

RB asked if the BPAC needed to decide tonight. She summarized that if the BPAC wishes to stick with the five crosswalks already proposed, they need to prioritize the remaining balance.

SE stated she needed more guidance on the category of things to consider and the costs. She suggested narrowing down the list to items the BPAC has discussed in the past.

CS responded he has prepared that information in the budget for bike boulevards. He suggested another project to consider would be extension of the Jackson Street improvements, which involves extending the sidewalk down to the park and includes striping for a bike lane. He referenced discussion in the Zoom chat.

In reference to the Zoom chat, RB discussed outreach opportunities to help bring attention to bike boulevards. She asked when the BPAC should produce a list and asked for more cost information.

CS replied the information could be prepared for the next meeting.

RB asked when a priority list is needed.

CS responded no timeline exists. If the BPAC desires to update Council in February with budget recommendations, a list is needed by then. If the BPAC wants the projects on the ground by Council budget decisions in March, a



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

decision is needed at the next meeting or December.

SE remarked the timeline sounds feasible if more structure is provided in the review of options.

RB asked for the BPAC to be provided with cost information for infrastructure projects.

CS responded staff could send information for projects recommended for inclusion in the City's Capital Improvement Plan, which includes low-cost projects the BPAC could consider.

RB asked for enough information to get a ballpark idea of costs per linear foot to avoid an unrealistic recommendation.

AL agreed with RB, adding it is difficult to decide without knowledge of project costs and the size and scale of possibilities.

RB added that last year was easy because of the greenway and priorities for bike projects. A generic price list would be helpful for the BPAC. She suggested moving in tandem with earlier comments by ME and avoid recommending Downtown bike boulevard projects. RB asked for the BPAC to use the Google Map, forthcoming price information, and Bike/Ped Plan to consider priorities.

CS clarified the Bike/Ped Plan is a 20-year plan and the 5-year plan refers to the Capital Improvements Plan. The Bike/Ped Plan was adopted in 2015 and the cost of materials has increased since project



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

costs were estimated in the plan. He suggested multiplying everything by four.

RB commented the item will be reviewed further in November and asked for additional discussion.

AO responded with information for a grant opportunity included with the agenda item. She reviewed that AmericaWalks is offering \$1,500 grants and the application is due November 9.

RB responded the MebaneWalks signs that show the urban trails are looking terrible. She recalled the signs costing around \$1,500 per sign and expressed a need to replace at least one of the signs. RB asked AD if the sign near the bell tower is the one that looks the worst.

AD responded that more than one of the signs need to be replaced, including one at the MACC.

RB asked if there was a date for when the funds had to be spent and suggested adding the greenway to the map.

AO responded the funds must be spent within the 2021 calendar year.

RB suggested the design of maps could certainly be considered. She asked if AO would write the grant.

AO replied she could draft the grant and send it to the BPAC for review. She added the guidelines ask for projects addressing racism, COVID-19, environmental justice, etc.

RB advised applying the money to digital design work for the urban trails maps, which would be an outreach campaign. She added the greenway is in an underserved part of the community and ways exist to discuss outreach and encouraging activity throughout the community. RB asked for any ideas from the BPAC.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

CM asked if the BPAC could use improvement funds to support the signs if costs exceeded \$1,500.

CS responded he did not think so. He added the City is engaged in a GIS services project to generate a Parks & Rec app and orient the Planning portal to be more user friendly. This could be another source of matching funds.

PDP mentioned the quick turnaround required for submitting the grant application.

RB offered support to AO in writing the grant application.

AO suggested she would work on the application in the coming week and inform the BPAC if the application was too much to complete by November 9.

RB asked for AO to update the whole BPAC so as to include anyone else that wants to contribute to the grant application.

AD shared he has \$1,500 to update the trails map at Lake Michael Park and added this could be another sum of money to assist with improvements.

RB suggested everyone is waiting for the greenway and this could be design and pre-work before actual signs are realized.

FINALIZE BPAC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESURFACING LIST

RB asked what discussion was needed for this item given discussion and follow up from the September meeting.

AO reviewed a memorandum she drafted with the resurfacing recommendations. The memo focuses on recommendations related to intersection improvements. AO mentioned a motion was needed to remove



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

the recommendation for a raised crosswalk across Ruffin to the elementary school. She also asked if the BPAC would like to include any recommendations regarding bike boulevards.

RB suggested reviewing the memo line by line and began with the raised crosswalk across Ruffin.

SS asked what was meant by raised.

RB and SE responded it was like a speed bump or table.

SS asked if the City would sign off on a raised crosswalk.

CS advised the BPAC would need to make a recommendation to Council who would then consider taking the action.

RB asked if CS was advising the BPAC to recommend a raised crosswalk.

CS clarified if the BPAC desires a raised crosswalk, a recommendation to Council is needed.

SE recalled discussion from the last meeting, noting the BPAC did not desire a raised crosswalk at the intersection of Fifth and Kit.

CS added the Fire Department feels strongly about raised crosswalks.

PDP agreed with CS reflecting the City has historically not pursued raised crosswalks.

RB asked if anyone on the call wanted this raised crosswalk.

AD concurred with CS.

RB asked if the BPAC could amend the recommendation from a raised crosswalk to a high-visibility crosswalk.

AO asked for a motion since the BPAC is recommending a change to what appears in the Bike/Ped Plan.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

SS made a motion to amend the recommendation from a raised crosswalk across Ruffin to E.M. Yoder Elementary School to a high-visibility crosswalk.

SE seconded the motion.

A unanimous vote supported the motion.

The BPAC did not edit the recommendation related to resurfacing Foust Road.

RB asked about the recommendation for Third & Fieldstone.

ME asked if this area was under construction.

CS replied the intersection is not complete.

ME suggested it may be too soon to say what improvements are needed at the intersection.

RB asked if the BPAC should remove the recommendation.

PDP advised leaving it as a recommendation.

RB asked ME to clarify his concerns.

ME agreed with PDP to leave the recommendation and keep planning efforts ahead.

CS added a stoplight requires a warrant analysis that is a yearlong process costing over a million dollars.

ME asked if the crosswalk recommendation should be kept and the stoplight removed. SE agreed.

CS clarified that he was not suggesting removing the recommendation, but the stoplight is well beyond the bounds of the BPAC's discretionary budget.

PDP added she would like to leave the recommendation and, if pursued, funds will come from elsewhere. She noted the



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

NCDOT will not allow a stoplight if not deemed necessary.

The BPAC agreed to leave the recommendation as is.

RB asked if a high-visibility crosswalk was desired for the recommended crossing at Fifth and Kit.

CS replied specification is needed if the BPAC wants to use the thermoplastic material.

RB suggested a high-visibility crossing was needed at the intersection. AO edited the recommendation.

The BPAC did not amend the recommendation for the intersection of Third and Crawford.

SE alerted the BPAC of a question from James Allen in the Zoom chat about thermoplastic.

CS responded that thermoplastic is a gooey plastic that functions like paint and is glued to the asphalt with an industrial dryer. A snowplow would likely pull it up. The thermoplastic pops at night and is less likely to wash away over time. He clarified the description James provided fits more with rubber bollards that are bolted into the pavement.

SS asked if snowplows look out for high-visibility crossings.

CS replied no and noted snowplowing is not done by City Public Works. He suggested the BPAC be thoughtful as to where thermoplastic is recommended.

CM responded Fifth Street is likely the first candidate for snowplowing. She asked if the recommendation should be for a painted crosswalk.

CS commented the thermoplastic would need to be replaced and would be more expensive to replace over time.

RB asked for the difference in cost.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

CS recalled from the last meeting Wayne Pore estimated \$1/square foot for paint with glass beads and \$10/square foot for thermoplastic.

AL commented a painted crosswalk could essentially be replaced ten times for the same cost.

RB added that it is different visibility.

AL suggested precedent exists for the use of thermoplastic and the BPAC may need more information before recommending a more expensive product. He advised first completing the crosswalk at a lower expense and then revisiting in the future.

PDP agreed with AL, recommending use of the less expensive product first and then evaluate.

SS asked if other products existed between the two.

CS replied that neither he nor AD could answer that question.

RB commented she did not have a problem going with a lower-cost item, recognizing it is hard to envision either and determine which would be more effective.

CM asked if a crosswalk was always accompanied by signage. She suggested the signs would provide greater visibility to a painted crosswalk.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

CS replied the signs are roughly \$75-\$100 with the pole and sign. Signs are not posted at every crosswalk.

CM suggested adding signage to the recommendation.

CS commented good planning practice is for signage at mid-block crossings. Signs are not as needed at intersections.

RB asked if the BPAC should make recommendations for signs at crosswalks or if best practice was used.

CS suggested it could save money over time, adding that intersections are natural locations for drivers to slow down. Stop conditions assist in making drivers aware of pedestrians. However, intersections remain dangerous, especially without stop conditions for turning vehicles. He suggested a traffic engineer could advise the BPAC better. CS commented a crosswalk sign may not be necessary for a four-way intersection with stop signs at two locations. Crosswalk signs would be highly necessary at an unsigned four-way intersection.

RB suggested a crosswalk sign does not appear to be a bad idea for this intersection given the speed at which vehicles travel down Fifth Street.

AO commented Mark Reich's recommendation at the last meeting was to include signage where the sidewalk changes sides.

SE agreed.

SS asked if temporary signage could be installed to alert everyone of new sidewalk.

AL suggested temporary lights that could be affixed to signage and asked if Mebane possesses any.

CS replied Mebane does not own any of those lights. He clarified this was not a reference to the hawk signals that alert someone of an upcoming intersection.

SS clarified she is referencing temporary signage to alert individuals of new rules and to pay attention.

CS stated Mebane does do that.

AL recommended this occur with the establishment of any new crosswalk signage.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

RB summarized what was decided for the Fifth and Kit intersection – a painted crosswalk with northbound signage.

The BPAC agreed.

The BPAC discussed including recommendations for a bike lane on Ruffin and a paved shoulder on Fieldstone, deciding to hold the Ruffin bike lane until the BPAC experiments with the Better Block Trailer.

AL commented he supports any improvement to Fieldstone.

RB noted sidewalk does exist.

ME added most people park along the street, leaving less real estate.

RB agreed, commenting people would likely park on any improvements.

RB asked about improvements to the entrance.

ME asked if a dedicated bike lane is needed given the existing sidewalk, which bicyclists could use.

RB agreed.

CS commented that when the Bike/Ped Plan was adopted, the ordinance to allow bicyclist on sidewalks was not in place.

The BPAC agreed to not pursue the paved shoulder proposal for Fieldstone.

CM asked about the crossing at Brown and N Ninth, which was discussed with Wayne Pore during the September meeting.

AO responded an encroachment agreement with NCDOT is needed.

CM asked if the recommendation should not be included until the encroachment agreement is submitted.

CS replied it is possible the agreement could be received in time, given the City has recently submitted other encroachment agreements.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

RB asked if the recommendation should be included in the memo.

CM voiced support, commenting she and her neighbors from Ashbury walk the route and she has also seen a lot of runners.

AO asked CS about the use of Powell Bill funds if an encroachment agreement with NCDOT is required.

CS responded the intersection requires an encroachment agreement, but Brown Street is a City-maintained street.

RB asked for clarification on whether the crossing at Brown and Ninth should be included as a BPAC recommendation.

CS recommended including it, noting it will be another six months before resurfacing work begins.

RB added the crossing could be included as a project for next year.

CS agreed and commented the BPAC could use discretionary funds next year.

RB commented the road is not likely to be paved and this is a hilly section. She clarified the crossing will go across Brown. RB noted a high-visibility crossing does not seem necessary given the topography. She commented signs east and west of the crosswalk appear to be needed and asked the BPAC.

The BPAC agreed to a painted crosswalk with signs to the east and west.

BPAC MEMBERSHIP & RECRUITMENT

RB reminded the BPAC of seats opening in February 2021.

PDP referenced the edit to the BPAC Ordinance to remove the City Council delegate as a voting member of the BPAC. She asked for the position to be added to the remaining seats on the BPAC and clarified with CS the amendment requires Council action.

CS replied the amendment would be on the November 2 City Council agenda and does not require a public hearing. He clarified the City Council delegate is



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary

October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

included as one of the five municipal members of the BPAC. CS suggested an opportunity to specify the areas represented by members.

PDP recalled discussion from the September meeting and suggested the position be broader and made available to include those living in the ETJ.

RB asked if the language should be edited to include four members residing within City limits, keep the ETJ membership as is (one member from Alamance ETJ and one from Orange ETJ), and add one at-large member.

PDP stated her favor for an at-large member still within the ETJ. She commented that in the past, qualified individuals applied to join the BPAC, but the City had narrow slots to fill.

RB asked for staff to update the BPAC Ordinance to reflect the discussion and confirmed Council would act on the amendment at its November meeting.

The BPAC reviewed a draft of a press release and graphic to advertise the open BPAC positions.

RB asked for the press release to reflect which three positions would be available – City, Alamance ETJ, and at-large. She requested AO send the press release to the BPAC for circulation within their networks and edit the graphic to include an application deadline.

BRAINSTORM – FORMAT & PREPARATION FOR BPAC DISCUSSIONS

RB asked BPAC members to reflect on how they can be prepared to address the agenda items and what might help with making decisions and recommendations.

CM shared she is a visual learner and requested maps be readily available, perhaps as a link in the agenda. Additionally, she reflected on difficulty remembering the sources of funding. She suggested a sheet that summarizes funding sources or including reference to funding sources with agenda items.



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

SS added that she too learns visually and favors being able to visit the areas discussed. She suggested providing notice of what areas/intersections will be discussed during a meeting to allow for a trip to the site before the meeting.

RB commented on the need to include more details and be more prescriptive with the agenda items, such as including information on what the BPAC should review in advance of a discussion and what actions may be taken by the BPAC during the meeting.

AL reflected on the September meeting and research he had to complete to better understand the intersections being discussed. He commented on his hesitancy to weigh in on some conversations, given the importance of the decisions and the information required to decide. AL presented the BPAC a sketch of how projects may be formatted and presented. He suggested the BPAC have a framework or rubric to evaluate projects and include project information related to location, issues, impact, timeframe, cost, etc. This would allow the BPAC to quickly consume information and talk about projects in a standardized way. AL commented on flattening the learning curve for new BPAC members.

RB suggested the format be used at certain times of the year, such as budget season.

AL commented on the September discussion and the improvements considered during the meeting.

CM added that the answer will be the same for certain questions, such as funding source. She added that if considering a bulk of similar projects, project-specific information may only be needed for photos. CM commented she liked the points presented by AL.

AL commented on the amount of information discussed during BPAC meetings. He added that standardizing project information will help BPAC members feel more confident in contributing to conversations. Additionally, he suggested a standardization of the information will help reduce time spent on information-



Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Meeting Summary
October 26, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

gathering during meetings. AL commented he could convert his sketch to Google Slides.

CS commented the BPAC is the only elected or advisory body not receiving an agenda packet. He reviewed an example of a summary sheet provided with items discussed during City Council and Planning Board meetings. Additionally, CS shared what Council receives during budget season. CS asked AV about the difficulty to create a template like what AL proposed.

AV responded it would not be too challenging and she could draft something by the next BPAC meeting.

RB remarked staff could not prepare all possibilities in advance of a meeting. She suggested RB and AL be mindful of the agendas being distributed and that expectations are communicated.

CS commented on Mebane's growth and the changing need for resources.

AL expressed his hope that a new format will streamline things for everyone. He asked how he should distribute the sketch.

CS asked for consensus from the BPAC by November 9.

RB suggested the BPAC respond to the sketch from AL by November 7.

CS thanked the BPAC for the constructive feedback to improve how Planning staff serves the BPAC.

NEW & ONGOING BUSINESS

AO shared information about an upcoming trail forum hosted by Carolina Thread Trail.

ME asked for more details.

Jason Smith shared additional information.

RB asked if the City would cover the cost of attendance for BPAC members.

CS confirmed the City would cover the costs.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Meeting summary by Ashley Ownbey, City of Mebane Planner



AGENDA ITEM #3

Better Block Trailer

Summary

The Better Block Trailer is a shared resource for communities in Alamance County to engage with tactical urbanism, which refers to low-cost, temporary changes to help reimagine the built environment. The BPAC will use materials from the trailer to experiment with designs that enhance the experiences of pedestrians and bicyclists in Downtown Mebane. At the October meeting, the BPAC specifically discussed exploring opportunities for bike lanes on Clay and Ruffin. The City of Mebane has reserved the Better Block Trailer through March 2021.

Get ideas and learn more about Better Block events through the following links:

<https://www.betterblock.org/>

<https://teambetterblock.com/>

Potential Discussion Points

- Explore ideas for demonstration projects
- Discuss coordinating with the City of Mebane and Downtown businesses
- Begin planning for outreach and engagement
- Consider assigning a point person for coordinating the logistics of hosting the events

Financial Cost

No cost is associated with use of the Better Block Trailer.

Suggested Action

Staff recommends the BPAC generally decide on the projects to be pursued. This will allow time to coordinate with other City departments and include City Council and Downtown businesses in future discussions.

Attachments

None



AGENDA ITEM #4

Discuss FY21 Funding

Summary

For Fiscal Year 2020-2021, the Mebane City Council allocated \$10,000 in improvement funds to be used at the discretion of the BPAC. In the past, the funds have been used to support development of bicycle boulevards. At the October meeting, the BPAC requested staff provide more information regarding cost estimates and potential projects. General agreement existed to use a portion of the \$10,000 to support previously discussed crosswalk projects.

Potential Discussion Points

- Prioritize improvement projects to fund for FY21

Financial Cost

See individual slides for cost estimates.

Suggested Action

Staff recommends the BPAC create a priority list. Staff can coordinate with other departments to evaluate the feasibility of the projects and confirm cost details.

Attachments

1. Project Evaluation Slides – click [here](#)
2. Mebane Bicycle & Pedestrian Map – click [here](#)



AGENDA ITEM #5

Review Project Evaluation Format

Summary

The BPAC is testing a new format for evaluating projects and is also receiving a more formal presentation of agenda items. This agenda item is designed to allow for an early debrief of these changes.

Potential Discussion Points

- Reflect on preparation for this meeting and consider ways to improve

Financial Cost

N/A

Suggested Action

Staff welcomes feedback from the BPAC.

Attachments

1. Project Evaluation Slides – click [here](#)