



Monday, December 20, 2010, 5:30-7:15pm
Raleigh Municipal Building, Room 305
222 W. Hargett St., Raleigh, NC 27602

AGENDA

I. Introductions – 5:35pm – 5 minutes

II. Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2010 Meeting – 5:40pm – 5 minutes

III. Public Comments – 5:45pm – 10 minutes

This is an opportunity for public comment on items or issues that are otherwise not on the agenda. Please limit comments to three minutes per speaker.

IV. Staff Report – 5:55pm – 15 minutes

- **Project Updates** – Review of all bicycle and pedestrian related projects (Eric Lamb) *
- **Last Leg Street Networks** – Methods of prioritizing, and specific streets
- **BPAC Email List** – Staff email updates on press releases, major committee events, etc.
- **Public Email List** – Inclusion of BPAC and all staff
- **Social Media** – Proposed Facebook profile photo, and inclusion of agenda in invitations *
- **BPAC Bylaws** – Availability of Council-approved, electronic version
- **Education Committee** – Consider establishing to develop LCI certification program and bike/ped media campaign to educate the public about rules of the road

V. Committee & Member Reports – 6:10pm – 10 minutes

- **Bike Rack Design Competition Committee** – Charlotte Mitchell
- **Law Enforcement Liaison Committee** – Brian McCrodden

VI. Old Business – 6:20pm – 10 minutes

- **Triangle Bicycle & Pedestrian Workshop** – Discussion of meeting materials and presentations for the half-day workshop the morning of Friday, January 28, 2011 (Jennifer Baldwin)*

VII. New Business – 6:30pm – 40 minutes

- **Sidewalk Assessment** – Discussion of current and future funding for sidewalk construction and maintenance*
- **Bike to Work Week: May 16-20, 2011** – Discussion of organizing effort (Jennifer Baldwin)

VIII. Announcements – 7:10pm – 5 minutes

- **StreetSmart Presentation to CAMPO TCC** – On agenda for January 6, 2010
- **Upcoming Events** – Please announce any events of which you are aware here
- **Confirmation of Next BPAC meeting** – Monday, January 10, 2010 at 5:30pm

IX. Adjournment – 7:15pm

* There is an attachment related to this item.

Follow us:  [Facebook](#)  [@RaleighBPAC](#)

Listen in to the meeting at (919) 857-4311 (please mute your phone)



DRAFT- Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2010

The City of Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission met on Monday, November 15, 2010 at 5:30 pm in Room 305 at the Raleigh Municipal Building, 222 W. Hargett Street, Raleigh, NC, with the following members present:

Commission Members

Steven Waters, Chair
Alan Wiggs, Vice-Chair
Corey Bates
Sig Hutchinson
Brian McCrodden
Michael Dayton
Charlotte Mitchell

Staff

Eric Lamb, Transportation Services Manager
Fleming El-Amin, Transportation Planner
Jennifer Baldwin, Bike/Ped Coordinator
Mike Kennon, Transportation Operations Mgr
Jed Niffenegger, Transportation Engineer
April Webb, Administrative Support

1) Introductions

Mr. Waters called the meeting to order at 5:35pm and asked that guests introduce themselves.

2) Approval of Minutes

Mr. McCrodden moved for approval of the October 18, 2010 minutes, which was properly seconded by Mr. Bates and approved by unanimous voice vote.

3) Public Comments

Mr. Timur Ender stated his opposition to the proposed bike lanes on Faircloth Road but endorsed sharrows. He also stated that in order to facilitate more cycling on Hillsborough Street and the surrounding area as well as to increase the legitimacy of cycling as a form of transportation, the city should consider on street bicycle parking facilities. In reference to the pedestrian crossing on Western Boulevard at Boylan Avenue, traffic turning left from Western onto Boylan is notorious for not stopping at the red light. Mr. Ender recommends that the city put a “stop here on red” sign on the left side of Western Blvd for eastbound traffic. NC State’s North Hall Drive is hard to exit onto Hillsborough Street. Mr. Ender recommends two parking spaces to the east of the entrance be removed to improve sight distance.

Mr. Roger Vale would like to see bicycles receive adequate consideration during traffic calming projects. He would also like to promote education for the police force on bicycle and pedestrian safety and laws.

Staff Updates

4) Project Updates

Mr. Lamb gave status updates on current projects.

5) Bicycle Project Field Trips

Mr. Lamb gave a brief summary of the bicycle scoping rides and referred people to the detailed summary in the agenda packet.

Mr. Wiggs requested a separate scoping ride for Lassiter Mill Road and St. Mary’s Street.

6) Triangle Bike/Ped Meeting

Ms. Baldwin stated that there would be a conference call on November 19, 2010 at CAMPO to confirm meeting date and location. Mr. Waters requested the Commission to consider topics to be discussed during the Triangle workshop.

7) Pedestrian Plan

Mr. Lamb informed the Commission that staff will be presenting their consultant choice to City Council during the November 16 meeting. Staff has ranked Toole Design as their preferred choice. The Plan will kick off in January 2011.

Ms. Mitchell shared her concerns with the lack of sidewalks on Hillsborough Street west of Blue Ridge Road. Pedestrian volume in the area is high due to the NC State Fairground events. Mr. Lamb stated that it was identified in the approved Streetscape Plan and will also be addressed in the upcoming Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan.

8) Trail with Southeast High Speed Rail

Mr. Lamb informed the Commission that Public Works and Parks and Recreation staff has met to discuss the opportunity for bicycle accommodations from the Neuse River greenway at Capital Boulevard to the I-440 Beltline. Staff is evaluating whether the rail corridor can be utilized.

9) Recent Pedestrian Fatalities

Mr. Kennon gave a summary of how the City of Raleigh reviews all crash-related fatalities, to include bicycle and pedestrian crashes. Mr. Waters stated he was concerned with the number of recent bicycle and pedestrian crashes in Raleigh. Mr. Lamb said that a goal of the Pedestrian Plan is to analyze pedestrian crash data and identify recurring crash locations and to recommend improvements.

Committee & Member Reports

10) Bike Rack Design Competition Committee

Mr. Bates stated that the committee met twice to further discuss the logistics of a bike rack design competition. Ms. Baldwin has been in contact with the City of Louisville, Kentucky to discuss their annual competition.

11) Law Enforcement Liaison Committee

Mr. McCrodden gave an update on the status of RPD officer training course that the committee with the help of Steven Goodridge is creating. The sub-committee plans to present the training course materials to the Commission in early 2011. The goal is to have the course available to the officers by April 2011.

12) Traffic Control Center Tour

Mr. Waters gave highlights of the tour that he and Mr. Ender took of the City's Traffic Control Center.

New Business

13) Joint Meeting with Parks, Recreation & Greenway Advisory Board

Mr. Waters proposed a joint meeting with the PRGAB and BPAC to discuss common projects and goals. After a brief discussion of the idea, it was determined that such a meeting was not necessary at this time and should be reconsidered at a later date.

14) Announcements

- Mr. Mike Rogers, a League of American Bicyclists Certified Instructor, stated his willingness to partner with the City of Raleigh and BPAC to develop a bicycle safety program to educate the general public on the rules of the road. Mr. Lamb suggested that the Commission may wish to form a standing education committee; Mr. McCrodden suggested that this item be added to the next meeting agenda.
- Mr. Waters will confirm next meeting date via email.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:16pm.

Respectfully submitted,

April Webb

Name	Description	Status
Major City Capital Improvement Projects		
Perry Creek Road Widening	Widen street to five lanes with curb & gutter, sidewalks, and wide outside lanes from US 1 to US 401 (1.7 miles)	68% construction complete; estimated close date in Spring 2011
Jones Sausage Road Widening	Widen street to five lanes with curb & gutter and sidewalks from Sunnybrook Road to New Hope Road (1.4 miles)	Design complete, currently out for bid and scheduled for construction to begin in Spring 2011
Rock Quarry Road Widening, Part B	Widen street to four lanes with curb & gutter, sidewalks, wide outside lanes, and median refuges from I-40 to Rock Quarry Road (0.9 miles)	Design complete, currently out for bid and scheduled for construction to begin in Spring 2011
Falls of Neuse Road Widening & Realignment	Widen street to four lanes and construct new four-lane street with curb & gutter, sidewalks, wide outside lanes, and median refuges from Raven Ridge Road to New Falls of Neuse Road (2.1 miles)	26% construction complete; estimated close date in December 2012
Wade Avenue Improvement Project	Adding curb & gutter, sidewalks, wide outside lanes, and median refuges from Ridge Road to Faircloth Street	80% design complete; awarded STP-DA Funding from CAMPO. Scheduled to be let for construction in late 2010
Mitchell Mill Road Widening	Widen street to four lanes with curb & gutter, sidewalks, striped bike lanes, and median refuges from US 401 to Watkins Road (1.4 miles)	50% design complete; Public Meeting held 9/23/10. Scope reduced to US 401 to Forestville Road.
Buck Jones Road Widening	Widen street to four lanes with curb & gutter, sidewalks, striped bike lanes, and median refuges from Farmgate Road to Xebec Way (1.4 miles)	25% design complete; Public meeting held on 11/29/10
Leesville Road Widening	Widen street to four lanes with curb & gutter, sidewalks, striped bike lanes, and median refuges from I-540 to New Leesville Boulevard	30% design complete; Public Meeting to be held on 1/20/11
Peace Street Streetscape	Roadway improvements, sidewalk repairs/replacement; street trees, utility cleanup	74% design complete; schedule pending release of construction funds
Transportation Planning & Programs		
Crabtree Valley Transportation Study	Long range multimodal transportation study for Crabtree Valley	On 11/16/10 Council referred the Comprehensive Planning Committee for review; Date to be determined
Capital Boulevard Corridor Study	Long range multimodal transportation study from downtown to I-440	2nd public meeting held 10/30/10
New Bern Avenue Corridor Study	Long range multimodal transportation study from Poole Road to Crabtree Creek	Project scoping underway; public meeting held on 12/2/10 and bike/ped accommodations were given a high priority by the general public
Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan	Conduct a pedestrian need and assessment inventory	Council selected Toole Design Group, LLC on 11/16/10; staff finalizing scope of work and contract agreement;
Neighborhood Traffic Mngmt Program	Management of traffic volumes and speeds on residential streets	Tom Fiorello new coordinator for COR
	Anderson Dr (Glenwood Ave to Six Forks Rd)-Add Bike Lanes, realign intersection at Six Forks Rd	83% design complete; to be added to 2009 Annual paving contract
Bicycle Projects		
City Bicycle Markings & Signage Program	Implementation of Bicycle Plan priority projects	
	STP-DA Grant Projects - FFY11 (Recommended Projects)	\$138,139 in funding to be obligated by October 2011; Priority list adopted by Council on 11/2/10
	Hargett Street (S. West St to Tarboro Rd)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/23/10
	State Street (Bunchie Dr to MLK Blvd)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/23/10
	Clark Avenue (Faircloth St to St. Mary's St)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/31/10
	Faircloth Street (Hillsborough St to Wade Ave)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/31/10

Name	Description	Status
	Oberlin Road (Hillsborough St to Glenwood Ave)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/31/10
	Lassiter Mill Rd (Glenwood Ave to Camelot Dr)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/31/10
	City Capital Improvement Projects - FY11 (Recommended Projects)	\$500,000 available for implementation July 2010
	Cabarrus Street (Boylan Ave to Chavis Way)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/23/10
	Durant Rd (Falls of Neuse Rd to Capital Blvd)	Preliminary planning
	Spring Forest Road (Sandy Forks Rd to Atlantic Ave)	Preliminary planning
	Creedmoor Road (Lynn Rd to I-540)	Preliminary planning
	E. Millbrook Road (Falls of Neuse to Capital Blvd)	Preliminary planning
	Wakefield Plantation Drive (Falls of Neuse to NC 98 Bypass)	Preliminary planning
	Edwards Mill Rd/Creedmoor Rd (Blue Ridge Rd to Glenwood Ave)	Preliminary planning
	Glen Eden Drive (Glenwood Ave to Edwards Mill Rd)	Preliminary planning
	Wilmington Street/Salisbury Street (Peace St to MLK Blvd)	Preliminary planning; Scoping ride held 10/23/10
	CMAQ Grant Projects	
	Bicycle Plan Prioritization List (3 year disbursement)	Projects to be determined
City Resurfacing Program	Resurface City streets and restripe per the Bike Plan	
	Change Orders to install bike symbols on NCDOT projects	
	Hillsborough Street Bike Lanes (Oberlin Rd to Gardner St)	Awaiting project closing for budget analysis; Staff developing bike lane striping plans
	Spring Forest Rd (Capital Blvd to Fox Rd), Avent Ferry Rd (Gorman St to Athens Dr)	Markings to be installed end of 12/10
NCDOT Resurfacing Program	Resurface NCDOT streets and restripe per the Bike Plan	
	Millbrook Rd (Glenwood Ave to Six Forks Rd): Bike Lanes	Wide outside lanes complete from Creedmoor to Six Forks; Remaining construction to be complete by end of November
City Bicycle Parking Program	Purchase and install 70 new bicycle racks around Downtown	Municipal agreement approved by Council on 12/7/10; assembling documents & permits to prepare for public bid in late January
City of Spokes Bike Share Program	Private concessionaire to manage a bike share program Downtown	Agreement in negotiations with City of Spokes
SEHSR Greenway Options	Assess possible parallel greenway and bicycle corridors along High Speed Rail project corridor from Neuse River Greenway to Downtown Raleigh	PWD staff to work with Parks & Rec staff to identify potential alternatives; NC ECG to organize special committee to discuss route from VA border to Fayetteville
Sidewalk Projects		
City Sidewalk Program	Sidewalk projects on streets with existing curb & gutter	Updated Project Priority List adopted by Council on 5/3/10
	2008 Contracts	
	Capital Blvd (Calvary Dr to Spring Forest Rd)	95% Construction complete
	New Bern Avenue (Trawick Rd to New Hope Rd)	95% Construction complete

Name	Description	Status
	Creedmoor (Lynn Rd to Mapleton Lane)	95% Construction complete
	2010 Contracts	
	Merwin Dr (Swift Dr to Liles Dr)	In design, 79% completed; construction on west side authorized by City Council
	STP-DA Grant Projects - FFY11 (Recommended Projects - REVISED 9/10)	
	Falls of Neuse Rd/Wake Forest Rd (Hardimont Rd to Balnd Rd/Pacific Dr)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	Lake Boone Trail (I-440 to Dixie Trail)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	Poole Rd (Sunnybrook Rd to Old Poole Rd)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	Calvary Dr (Green Rd to Capital Blvd)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	Wade Ave (Dogwood Ln to Hymettus Ct)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	Fox Rd (Werrabee Dr to I-540 Bridge)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	New Hope Church Rd (Green Rd to Ingram Dr)	Scheduled to be let for construction by September 2011
	CMAQ Grant Projects	
	Overpass Pedestrian Accessibility Retrofit Project - (Avent Ferry Rd, Lake Dam Rd, Trailwood Dr, Rock Quarry Rd, Trenton Rd and Blue Ridge Rd)	Scheduled to be let for construction by Sept 2012
	Six Forks Rd Sidewalk Project (Coleridge Dr to Wake Forest Rd)	Scheduled to be let for construction by Sept 2012



Invite People to Join

Information

Category:

[Organizations - Advocacy Organizations](#)

Description:

The Raleigh Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) is an all-volunteer advisory body, appointed by the City Council to provide guidance and leadership on all matters concerning bicycle and pedestrian activities and accommodation in Raleigh. Commissioners are responsible for making recommendations on the implementation of relevant programs, policies, regulations, and funding priorities regarding walking and cycling in the City of Raleigh.

Privacy Type:

Open: All content is public.

Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

Wall

Info

Discussions

Photos

Video

Events

Share:  Post  Question  Photo  Link  Video



Steven Waters The next BPAC meeting will be Monday, December 20, 2010 from 5:30-7:30pm. <http://www.raleighbpac.org/>

November 29 at 11:52am · Like · Comment



Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission attended the event BPAC Meeting.



BPAC Meeting

Monday, November 15, 2010 at 5:30pm
Raleigh Municipal Building Room 305, Raleigh, NC

 November 8 at 1:03pm · Like · Comment · Share



Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission attended the event Bicycle Project Scoping Ride #2.



Bicycle Project Scoping Ride #2

Sunday, October 31, 2010 at 9:00am
West Raleigh - Meet at Cameron Village

 October 19 at 12:10pm · Like · Comment · Share



Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission attended the event Bicycle Project Scoping Ride #1.



Bicycle Project Scoping Ride #1

Saturday, October 23, 2010 at 9:00am
Downtown Raleigh Area - Meet at Chavis Park

Triangle Bicycle and Pedestrian Workshop – Planning Meeting Notes – 12/10/2010

In attendance: Kenneth Withrow, CAMPO; Jeff Brubaker, Carrboro; Dale McKeel, Durham/DCHC; Jennifer Baldwin, Raleigh; Steve Waters, BPAC; Shelly Epps, Triangle Transit

Anticipated attendance: About 75

Location: RDU Airport Authority (Confirmed)

Confirmed Date/Time: 8:30 am to Noon on Jan 28th, 2011

Draft Agenda:

8:30 – *Welcome (Durham Representative)*

8:35 – *Commission Presentations*

CAMPO BPSG

Durham

Raleigh BPAC

Chapel Hill

Carrboro

9:45 – *Break*

Joe Davis Presentation

TJCOG Center of the Region

10:00 – *Special Presentations*

NCDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian Division (25mins)

SRTS Program Update

TE Program Update

NCDOT Complete Streets (30mins)

Highway Safety Research Center (15mins)

Legislative Update (10mins)

Peloton Project & LAB certifications (25mins)

11:55 – *Final Remarks (Raleigh Representative)*

Next Planning Meeting: Conference call on Friday, Jan 7 at 9am (919-857-4311)

Assignments before next Conference Call:

- Develop commission presentations (All)
- Workshop flyer and final agenda (Jennifer & Shelly)
- Save the date email (Jennifer to develop for everyone to utilize)
 - RSVP online form (Shelly)
- Confirm speakers for special presentations
 - NCDOT Updates (Kenneth)
 - Highway Safety Research Center (Steve)
 - Julie White (Steve)
 - Joe Davis (Shelly)
 - TJCOG (Shelly)



City of Raleigh North Carolina

December 16, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

FROM: Eric J. Lamb, PE
Manager, Transportation Services Division

SUBJECT: Sidewalk Assessments

Per the request of the City Council, the Raleigh Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) has been asked to review the City's policies and practices relative to sidewalk assessments. Our staff has compiled information from a variety of sources relative to sidewalk assessments, both for new construction and for sidewalk repairs.

The contents of this packet include:

Assessment Policy

- Assessments FAQ (City Attorney's Office)
- Assessment Processes & Calculations
- City of Raleigh Petition Flier
- Raleigh City Code References
- NC State Law References

Sidewalk Construction and Assessment Data

- Sidewalk Assessment Study – Major NC Cities
- CIP Projects – Sidewalks with Major Street Improvements
- CIP Projects – Standalone sidewalk projects
- Sidewalk Fund Revenues
- Sidewalk Assessment History
- Sidewalk Repair Data
- Sidewalk Construction by Private Development

If you have additional questions about this item, please advise.

Cc: Carl R. Dawson, Jr., PE – Public Works Director
Dean Fox, PE – Design/Construction Division Manager

FREQUENTLY ASKED LEGAL QUESTIONS ABOUT SPECIAL BENEFIT ASSESSMENTS

Q: What is the source of the City's authority to assess for certain projects?

A: *The City is authorized to assess by Chapter 160A of the North Carolina General Statutes and by various special City Charter provisions unique to Raleigh.*

Q: Is a petition from property owners required before the City may assess?

A: *No. The City is authorized by its charter to assess without a petition in most cases.*

Q: Is the City required to assess for public projects?

A: *No. The assessment process is just one possible funding source for providing public improvements. The City is never required to assess.*

Q: What is the basis upon which assessments can be made and calculated?

A: *Assessments may be calculated by the following methods;*

1. *per front foot for the footage abutting the project*
2. *the area of land served*
3. *the value added to the land*
4. *per lot*
5. *any combination of the above methods*

Q: Must every lot involved in a project be assessed?

A: *No. The city council has almost unlimited discretion to determine which lots actually receive a benefit from the assessment. The assessment process is predicated on the notion that the charge is appropriate because the lots are receiving a special benefit.*

Q: May assessments be levied against property owned by the United States?

A: *No, these properties are always exempt.*

Q: May assessments be levied against property owned by the State of North Carolina?

A: *Yes, but only on the condition that the State is notified in advance and consents to the assessment.*

Q: May a property owner being assessed challenge that assessment in a legal proceeding?

A: *Yes. The general statutes establish a procedure that allows a legal challenge to the validity of an assessment.*

Q: How are assessments paid?

A: *Assessments may be paid in cash as a one time payment or they may be financed over a ten year period at an interest rate established by the city council but not to exceed eight percent. In addition, a law is currently in place, expiration July 1, 2013, which would allow some assessments to be financed over a thirty year period.*

Q: What happens if a property owner fails to pay an assessment?

A: *Upon confirmation an assessment becomes a lien against the property. That lien is second in priority only to existing state, federal and local tax liens. The city can and has foreclosed on property and sold the property at judicial sale pursuant to the foreclosure statutes. Assessments are in rem in nature which means that the land is the only asset which the city can look to for recovery. There is no personal liability to the owner for any deficiency resulting from a foreclosure.*

Q: May assessments be held in abeyance?

A: *Yes. Water and sewer assessments may be held in abeyance for up to ten years or until the owner of the assessed property actually hooks up the service. Other types of assessment are not subject to being held in abeyance.*

Q: May property outside the city be assessed?

A: *Yes. The city has special charter authority to make certain assessments outside the city limits. However, no lien attaches to the property until such time as the owner hooks on to the service or the property is annexed. Therefore, there is no encumbrance on the property until that later time.*



Assessment Processes & Calculations

Project Initiation

Preliminary Resolution of Intent

When the plans for an assessable project are nearing completion, or upon receipt of a valid petition request for improvements, an agenda item is submitted regarding the City's intent to undertake/construct the project with assessments to apply against the abutting properties.

In this agenda item adoption of a Resolution of Intent by the Council is recommended to schedule a public hearing to allow public input on the proposed project and assessments.

Public Notification

Once a Resolution of Intent has been adopted, staff reviews the limits of the project and generates a property owner notification list from the Wake County tax records.

This property owner list is provided to the City Clerk who sends a copy of the adopted Resolution of Intent and a public hearing notice by mail.

If a notification is returned by the postal service, staff searches for an updated address and forwards the notice.

Public Hearing / Directing Resolution

During the public hearing, citizens are given the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. At the conclusion, of the hearing, the City Council may adopt a Directing Resolution, refer the project for further consideration or vote not to approve the project.

Upon adoption, the Directing Resolution authorizes the proposed improvements and directs that the costs be assessed to the abutting properties. The resolution provides a brief description of the project, states the assessment method(s) to be used and sets the interest rate.

Additionally, the base assessment rate for the project is set at the prevailing rate at the time the Directing Resolution is adopted.

Assessment Records:

New Records

Once staff receives a copy of the Directing Resolution from the City Clerk's office, the properties on the notification list are entered as "pending" assessments in the Assessment Database (IRIS).

After all the records have been entered into the Assessment Database, the Revenue Division runs a process that automatically pulls the pending assessment records to the Assessment Billing System (ABS). This process is typically completed within 2 - 3 weeks of the adoption of the directing resolution.

It is from the ABS system that the "lien list" is compiled and posted to the City's web site.

Availability of Assessment Records

The Revenue Division compiles and maintains a list of "active" and "pending" assessments from the Assessment Billing System and is available on the City's web site. The list is sorted and posted (3) different ways.

- street address
- real estate tax ID number
- owner name

The Revenue Division updates the web site list daily.

Citizens may also check to see if there are assessments on a property by calling the Revenue Division.

"Pending" assessments are parcels that have been flagged in the database because they are within a projects limits and potentially will have special assessments confirmed upon completion of construction.

"Pending" assessment records do not contain dollar values while they are in a pending status but are entered into the database and included on the "lien list" to alert citizens who inquire of the upcoming special assessment that will be placed on the property upon completion of the project.

"Active" assessments are final dollar values that have been adopted and confirmed by City Council as special assessments against a parcel respectively.

Record Maintenance

Updates are periodically run to assure that property and current owner information in both the Assessment Database and the Assessment Billing System is accurate.

If there is a subdivision or recombination involving a property that has pending or active assessments, staff makes the necessary adjustments to the records.

Estimated Assessments and Advanced Payments

After a project has been directed, staff uses easement plats, preliminary construction plans and in the case of utility projects, estimated/projected easement acquisition costs to calculate "estimated" assessment values for the project.

These "estimates" are provided to interested parties upon request. Since estimates are based on preliminary information, they are subject to change due to changes in construction plans, changes in property configuration and changes in easement acquisition costs.

When estimates are provided, citizens are informed that the final assessment will likely be different from the estimate. Advanced payments for "pending" assessments are accepted with the understanding that the property owner at the time the final assessment costs are confirmed by City Council will receive any refunds, or be responsible for any additional payments that may be due.

Finalization of Assessment Costs

Once staff receives a copy of the as-built construction plans, final payment information and, on utility projects, the actual easement costs, calculation of the final assessment costs begins.

This process can be delayed when condemnation cases or liquidated damages negotiations prevent easement acquisition costs or final contract costs from being finalized.

Property Research

Staff researches each property along the assessment project to determine the current owner as listed in county tax records, the footage abutting the improvement, excluded footage allowed per the city’s exemption policies, excluded footage associated with existing improvements, previous assessments, and fee-in-lieu payments associated with private development. When necessary, zoning, lot size and area of the lot served by the improvement is also determined.

Exemptions

If a property is already served by existing improvements, or improvements are simultaneously completed on two or more sides of a corner lot, the property may be subject to an exemption from assessments.

Depending on the circumstances, these exemptions can range from 150 feet to a complete exemption from the assessment.

In general, the exemption policies tend to favor small to moderate sized residential properties.

Calculation of Street & Sidewalk Assessments:

All street and sidewalk assessments are calculated on a per foot basis.

The assessment value for a parcel is calculated by multiplying the abutting footage along the improvement less any excluded footage allowed per the city’s exemption policies by the appropriate assessment rate.

Current Paving & Sidewalk Assessment Rates (per side):

Paving & Construction of Curbs, Gutters & Storm Drains

- Residential - \$32.00 / ft
- Non-residential - \$64.00 / ft

Resurfacing/Repaving of a street that does not have curbs & gutters

- Residential - \$8.50 / ft
- Non-Residential – Not eligible for resurfacing

Strip Paving – paving of a dirt/gravel road without the construction of curbs & gutters

- Residential \$16.00 / ft (1/2 the residential paving assessment rate)
- Non-Residential – Not eligible for strip paving

Sidewalk

- Residential & Non-Residential \$6.00 / ft

Calculation of Utility Assessments

Water and sewer assessments are calculated using one of three methods; Per foot, per lot, or area served (*acreage*)

The method used for a project depends on several factors and may be varied to distribute the assessment costs in a fair and equitable manner. On projects where there are subdivision lots of similar or equal size and other lots of varying sizes abutting an improvement, it may be necessary to use multiple assessment methods to equitably distribute the assessment costs. Staff review the assessment costs using all of the available assessment methods to determine which method(s) provide the most equitable distribution to assessed owners prior to finalizing for Council consideration.

Changing the assessment method does not change the total dollars assessed for a project, it merely changes the way in which the assessments are distributed among the individual properties.

Current Utility Assessment Rates:

Utility assessment rates are reviewed and adjusted annually based on special legislation approved for the City of Raleigh.

This legislation allows utility assessment rates to be calculated from the preceding five years average project costs and average rate of increase/decrease.

New utility assessment rates are adopted each fiscal year by the City Council and are in effect for all utility projects that are directed during the year.

Sewer - \$50.08 / ft + adjustment for easement acquisition costs

Water - \$33.79 / ft + adjustment for easement acquisition costs

Adjustment for Easement Acquisition Costs

State statutes allow the City to include easement acquisition costs when determining the assessment costs for utility projects.

This is done by dividing the easement costs by the centerline length of the project and then dividing that number by two to determine the easement cost per foot for each side of the utility line.

The resulting amount is added to the current utility assessment rate resulting in the adjusted assessment rate for the project.

Per Foot Method

Assessments are calculated by multiplying the assessable footage for each parcel by the adjusted assessment rate.

Per Lot Method

The per lot assessment method is used in situations where all/most parcels derive an equal benefit from the utility improvements, such as a residential subdivision with similar lot sizes.

This method is useful in situations where a parcel has limited footage abutting a utility extension that fully serves the property.

To calculate the per lot assessment, staff determines the total assessable dollars by multiplying the total assessable footage by the adjusted assessment rate. This amount is then divided by the number of lots to determine the per lot assessment rate. This per lot rate is then applied to each of the assessable parcels along the project.

Area Served Method (Acreage)

The area served method is used in situations where, because of varying parcel sizes and abutting footages, the per foot and per lot methods do not equitably distribute the assessment costs.

To calculate the per acre assessment, staff calculates the total assessable dollars by multiplying the total assessable footage by the adjusted assessment rate. This amount is then divided by the area (acres) served by the utility extension to determine a per acre rate.

The servable acres (*deeded parcel acreage less excluded acreage for low areas that cannot gravity serve, areas within riparian buffers, ponds/lakes, etc...*) for each parcel is then multiplied by the per acre rate to determine the assessment amount for each parcel.

Preliminary Assessment Roll

Once property research has been completed, and the final assessments calculated, staff prepares a preliminary assessment roll for City Council adoption that describes the project, declares the total assessment costs, lists the properties to be assessed and individual assessment values, states payment and interest terms, and schedules a public hearing for confirmation.

Notification of the public hearing is mailed to each property owner listed therein along with a copy of the adopted assessment roll.

In addition, copies of the assessment roll and assessment maps are posted to the City's web site.

Public Hearing / Confirming Resolution

At the public hearing, property owners are given the opportunity to address the Council regarding the project and associated final assessments.

Upon adoption of a Confirming Resolution;

For properties inside the city limits, the assessments become a lien against the property and are collected in the same manner as property taxes.

For properties outside the city limits, the assessments are not due and payable until annexation of the property into the city limits at which time they become a lien against the property and are collected in the same manner as property taxes.

All interest is calculated from the date the assessment lien is attached.

Billing/Collection

Assessment Notices

Once the assessment systems are updated with the confirming resolution information, assessment notices are sent by the Revenue Division to the owners of assessed properties that are located inside of the city limits.

This notice outlines their payment options, interest dates and respective due dates under the financing option.

Other than the information provided on the assessment roll at the time of the public hearing, owners of properties located outside of the city limits do not receive an assessment notice until their property has been annexed.

Subsequent Annual Notices

The Revenue Division sends annual installment notices to property owners paying on the installment option each August.

Under this option, annual installments are due September 1st.

Additional notices, warning property owners of possible collection action, are sent to property owners who fail to pay their annual installment in full by the September due date.

Payment Options

Prior to Confirmation – “advanced payments”:

Property owners may elect to make a payment prior to the final determination of the assessment cost. These “advanced payments” are paid based on estimates provided by staff.

When such payments are received, it is with the understanding that the property owner at the time of final assessment confirmation will be responsible for any underpayment of the assessment amount, or be entitled to any refund that may be due.

Properties Located Inside of the City Limits:

Assessments against properties located inside of the city limits are due upon confirmation of the assessment.

Property owners may pay the assessment without interest within 50 days of the assessment notice, or pay in ten annual installments with interest accruing from the confirmation date.

Properties Located Outside of the City Limits:

Assessments against properties located outside of the city limits are not due until the property is annexed, subdivided, or in the case of utility assessments, connected to the utility main.

These assessments may be paid without interest prior to annexation. Once the property has been annexed, notices are sent to the property owners explaining their payment options. Assessments may be paid interest free within 50 days of the assessment notice, or paid in ten annual installments with interest accruing from the annexation date.



Petitioning for Street and Sidewalk Improvements

Some streets in the City of Raleigh have never been paved to City standards. Why? Because at the time the subdivision or area was developed, it may have been outside the City limits, or even outside the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction, therefore, the streets were not required to be built to City of Raleigh standards. Over the years, many such non-standard streets have been brought into the Raleigh City limits.

Streets may be considered non-standard for several reasons. Three of the most common reasons are:

- The street is not wide enough
- The street does not have an acceptable pavement and/or base structure
- The street does not have curb, gutters and drains

Street Improvements may be initiated by City Council action or by petition of citizens. Either improvement process may include resurfacing a paved street that does not have existing curb and gutter, improving a non-standard street to a standard city street with curbs, gutters and drains or installing sidewalk along existing curbed and guttered streets.

Street improvements, resurfacing and sidewalk installation are all projects which require assessment to the abutting properties. Assessment indicates that property owners along the improvement will share in the cost of construction.

Current assessment rates are:

- Resurfacing \$8.50 per abutting foot/per side)
(non-standard streets only – applies each time the street is resurfaced)
- Sidewalk Installation \$6.00 per abutting foot/per side
(curb and gutter must already exist or be constructed with the sidewalk)
- Street Improvements \$32.00 per abutting foot/per side
(residential zoning)
\$64.00 per abutting foot/per side
(non-residential streets with non-residential zoning)

Streets improved to meet City standards allow the street to have full maintenance, including future resurfacing, at no additional expense to the abutting property owners.

City Council Initiative

The City Council may initiate street and/or sidewalk improvements as an assessable project. With City initiated projects, the City Council will adopt a resolution of intent for the proposed improvements and notify the abutting Property owners. Advertisements, public meetings within the community and letters by mail are normal methods of notifying property owners in the area about the intended project as well as postings to the City's website. The City Council will hold a formal public hearing to receive comments from property owners and other interested parties before deciding whether or not to continue with the project.

Citizen's Initiative By Petition

For public streets inside the city limits, citizens may petition the City Council for street and/or sidewalk improvements. In order to submit a petition for street and/or sidewalk improvement to the City Council for consideration, a sufficiency requirement must be met as required in Article 10 and section 160A-217 of the NC General Statutes. This sufficiency requirement being signatures from a majority in number of the owners of property to be assessed who represent at least a majority of all the lineal feet of frontage of the lands abutting on the street or portion thereof to be improved. When a valid petition is returned it will be submitted to the City Council for consideration. The City Council will adopt a resolution of intent for the proposed improvement and notify the abutting property owners by letter. A formal public hearing will be held to receive comments from the property owners affected by the request before deciding whether or not to continue with the project. For street improvement petitions, valid petitions that are returned will go through a prioritization process and will be ranked according to City Code/Policy criteria and availability of funds. These petitions, along with staff recommendations for approval, will be submitted semi-annually to the City Council through the City Manager's office.

All requests for petitions should be made through the Assessment staff in the Design/Construction Division of the Public Works Department. Staff will provide a petition packet consisting of a copy of the City of Raleigh's Street and Sidewalk Policies, a map showing the location and typical street section of the proposed improvements in relation to the adjacent properties and street right-of-way, The property owner's contact information for all abutting properties as is on file with the Wake County Tax Office and the petition forms for owner signatures. The time required to put together the petition packet is typically 4 - 6 weeks depending on the length of the proposed improvement and number of properties involved. Once issued, the petition will remain active for a 6 month period to allow the petitioner to circulate the document for signatures.

If you are interested in additional information go the City's petition process for street and sidewalk improvements, **please contact the Public Works Department at (919) 996-3030 to speak with an Assessment Staff member.**

Raleigh City Code References for Sidewalk Construction and Assessments

Sec. 6-2016. - ASPHALT SIDEWALKS.

(a) Installation.

Installation of asphalt sidewalks shall be permitted by the City Council only where all of the following are present:

- (1) No curb or gutter exists on the street immediately parallel to the proposed sidewalk.
- (2) Prior to construction sufficient right-of-way, existing or dedicated, is available to place the sidewalk in a safe location.
- (3) There are no existing or projected stormwater deficiencies.
- (4) No part of the proposed sidewalk extends into or over a proposed street or utility improvement as shown on the amended five-year capital improvements program of any governmental authority.
- (5) The proposed sidewalk is either within an area that meets the linear distances established in §10-3051(a)(3) of this Code or the City Council finds that there is substantial pedestrian demand to make sidewalks beneficial.

Sec. 6-2022. - SIDEWALK ASSESSMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTING OR EXTENDING NEW SIDEWALKS.

- (a) The cost of new sidewalk construction or extensions shall be assessed at six dollars (\$6.00) per front foot against the property abutting on both sides of the street. If there already exists a sidewalk on the other side of the street, the total cost of which was assessed against the abutting property, the owner of the property requiring the new sidewalk shall pay an assessment of six dollars (\$6.00) per front foot, the remaining cost of the sidewalk to be borne by the City. If the City Council decides pursuant to §6-2014 that there is a public need for a sidewalk on both sides of the street, and no sidewalk assessment has been previously levied, the full cost of the second sidewalk shall be borne by the City.
- (b) Notwithstanding the charges established in §6-2022(a), the City shall make the following sidewalk improvements without assessment:
 - (1) If sidewalk improvements are made simultaneously to both streets on which a lot abuts, assessment of the costs of the installations shall be based upon the entire frontage of one street (short side) plus the frontage of the other street in excess of one hundred fifty (150) feet.
 - (2) If the lot is already served by a sidewalk which meets all City standards, any improvements to another abutting sidewalk shall be assessed against the lot owner to the extent that the frontage to be assessed exceeds one hundred fifty (150) feet in length.
 - (3) If a lot fronts on an existing sidewalk which meets City standards and abuts at the rear on another street to be built or improved, no assessment shall be made if it shall appear that no reasonable subdivision of the lot can be made by which the new arrangement of lots will benefit from the new or improved sidewalk.

- (4) If a lot abuts on a sidewalk to be built or improved but physical or topographic restrictions prevent reasonable access thereto from the lot, then no assessment shall be made. In the event that such a lot later gains access formerly though impossible to the sidewalk which was improved, no driveway permit shall be issued until the lot owner has paid a fee equivalent to the amount the lot would have been previously assessed.
- (5) Sidewalk improvements within redevelopment areas as delineated pursuant to G.S. 160A-500 et seq., provided the cost of such work is exclusively paid from community development funds.

Sec. 6-2023. - ASSESSMENT FOR REPAIRING, RECONSTRUCTING, AND OTHERWISE IMPROVING EXISTING SIDEWALKS, DRIVEWAYS, CURBS, GUTTERS, OR DRAINS.

The Council may, without petition of abutting property owners, require the reconstruction, alteration or repair of sidewalks, driveways, curbs, gutters or drains in conformity with the provisions of §6.44(a) of the Charter. If any of such improvements are required of a property owner and the property owner shall fail or refuse to make the same within thirty (30) days after notice thereof, the Council may cause such improvements to be made and assess the total cost thereof against the property abutting the improvement. In making and collecting assessments for such improvements, the procedure outlined in G.S. 160A-216 et seq. shall be followed to the extent that the same is not in conflict with §6.44 of the Charter. In the event of conflict in the provisions of the General Statutes and the Charter, the provisions of the Charter shall control. The total cost of the repairing, reconstructing or altering of driveways, curbs, gutters, drains, or sidewalks, including the cost of grading and the construction of retaining walls necessary to provide lateral support for abutting property, shall be assessed against the property abutting the improvement. The cost of relocation and construction of driveways, steps, or other means of access to his property from the street as he may deem necessary, shall be borne by the property owner.

Sec. 12-1037. - CLEANING SIDEWALKS AND GUTTERS.

It shall be the duty of all occupants or tenants of improved property and of the owners of all vacant property in the City to keep sidewalks, parkways and gutters clean, and to do such cutting, sweeping and scraping as may be necessary to keep such sidewalks clean and free from weeds, grass, snow, ice, dirt and trash, and to render the same passable, comfortable, and sightly, and the gutter next to and along each sidewalk open and free from obstruction, for the full width of their respective fronts.

Sec. 12-1037.1. - REPAIR OF SIDEWALKS AND DRIVEWAYS BY PROPERTY OWNERS.

It shall be the duty of every property owner in the City to maintain in good repair and safe condition, the sidewalk and driveway abutting his property for the safe passage of pedestrians over the same except as otherwise provided in §7-2008.

(note – this is an outdated reference as §7-2008 no longer exists)

North Carolina State Law References

§ 160A-216. Authority to make special assessments.

Any city is authorized to make special assessments against benefited property within its corporate limits for:

- (1) Constructing, reconstructing, paving, widening, installing curbs and gutters, and otherwise building and improving streets;
- (2) Constructing, reconstructing, paving, widening, and otherwise building or improving sidewalks in any public street;

§ 160A-217. Petition for street or sidewalk improvements.

- (a) A city shall have no power to levy special assessments for street or sidewalk improvements unless it receives a petition for the improvements signed by at least a majority in number of the owners of property to be assessed, who must represent at least a majority of all the lineal feet of frontage of the lands abutting on the street or portion thereof to be improved. Unless the petition specifies another percentage, not more than fifty percent (50%) of the cost of the improvement may be assessed (not including the cost of improvements made at street intersections).
- (b) Property owned by the United States shall not be included in determining the lineal feet of frontage on the improvement, nor shall the United States be included in determining the number of owners of property abutting the improvement. Property owned by the State of North Carolina shall be included in determining frontage and the number of owners only if the State has consented to assessment in the manner provided in G.S. 160A-221. Property owned by railroad companies shall be included in determining frontage and the number of owners to the extent that the property is subject to assessment under G.S. 160A-222. Property owned by railroad companies that is not subject to assessment shall not be included in determining frontage and the number of owners. If it is necessary to exclude property owned by the United States, the State of North Carolina, or a railroad company in order to obtain a valid petition under subsection (a), not more than fifty percent (50%) of the cost (not including the cost of improvement at street intersections) may be assessed unless all of the owners subject to assessment agree to a higher percentage.
- (c) No right of action or defense asserting the invalidity of street or sidewalk assessments on grounds that the city did not comply with this section in securing a valid petition shall be asserted except in an action or proceeding begun within 90 days after publication of the notice of adoption of the preliminary assessment resolution.

Sidewalk Budgets and Assessments in NC

Jurisdiction	Population (2009)*	Annual Budget for sidewalk projects	Assessment for new sidewalk construction (Capital)	Assessment for new sidewalk construction (Petitions)	Assessment for sidewalk repairs	Annual Sidewalk Budget per capita	Rank by per capita spending	Current Bond Funds
Charlotte	704,422	\$7,500,000	No	Yes/At-cost	No	\$10.65	1	Yes
Cary	136,637	\$500,000	No	No	No	\$3.66	2	No
High Point	103,368	\$150,000	No	No	No	\$1.45	3	Yes
Raleigh	405,612	\$500,000	\$6/linear foot	\$6/linear foot	Yes	\$1.23	4	No
Greensboro*	255,124	\$265,000	No	No	No	\$1.04	5	Yes
Winston-Salem	229,828	\$200,000	No	No	No	\$0.87	6	No
Fayetteville	198,071	\$150,000	No	\$10/linear foot	No	\$0.76	7	No
Asheville	76,636	\$50,000	No	No	No	\$0.65	8	No
Durham	229,171	\$100,000	No	\$5/linear foot	No	\$0.44	9	Yes
Wilmington	101,350	\$0	No	N/A	No	\$0.00	10	No

* Estimates provided US Census Bureau

Notes

The City of Wilmington does not budget annually for new sidewalk construction each but maintains an annual budget for sidewalk maintenance and repair. The annual budget for the City of Greensboro reflects a 20% match for STP-DA and CMAQ funds to construct 27 miles of sidewalk by 2015. Asheville, Fayetteville, and High Point do not have set annual budgets for the construction of new sidewalks, funding in these cities vary from year to year but some amount of funds are appropriated annually. The City of Durham and the City of Fayetteville only assesses for sidewalk petition projects. The information included in the spreadsheet reflects the amount most recently budgeted.

City of Raleigh
Public Sidewalk Construction Summary 2005-2010

Major and Minor Street Projects 2005-2010

Completion				Sidewalk Construction	Total Sidewalk Length (ft) *
Year	Project	From	To		
2005	Strickland Road Improvements	Six Forks Road	Creedmoor Road	Both Sides	19008
2005	Leadmine Road Improvements	Six Forks Road	Strickland Road	Both Sides	3610
2006	Newton Road Widening	Six Forks Road	Falls of Neuse Road	Both Sides	12144
2006	Wilmington Street Rehabilitation	Rush Street	Railroad Overpass	Both Sides	19008
2007	Tryon Road Widening, Part B	Gorman Street	Lake Wheeler Road	Both Sides	14392
2007	Leesville Road Widening, Part B	Lynn Road	Millbrook Road	Both Sides	10560
2007	Rogers Lane Extension	Robbins Drive	US 64 By-Pass	Both Sides	4618
2008	Laurelbook Street	Wicker Drive	Hodges Street	East Side	1426
2008	Lineberry Drive	Existing	Alder Ridge Lane	Both Sides	2746
2010	Summit Avenue	Water Works Street	Gilbert Avenue	West Side	578
2010	Blue Ridge Road	Existing	Arbor Drive	South Side	211
2010	Leesville Road Widening - Sycamore Creek	Norwood Road	I-540	West Side	2112
2010	Sunnybrook Road Widening	Poole Road	Holston Lane	Both Sides	8448
2010	Tryon Road Widening, Part D	Dillard Drive	Campbell Road	Both Sides	10980
2010	Edwards Mill Road Extension	Trinity Road	Chapel Hill Road	Both Sides	9820
2010	Fayetteville Street/Penmarc Drive Extension	Wilmington Street	Bridge over Rocky Branch Creek	One Side	3437
2010	Water Works Street Extension	Penmarc Drive	Fayetteville Street	North Side	1880
2010	Wake Forest Road Improvements	Six Forks Road	I-440	Both Sides	3600
2010	ACC Blvd Extension	ACC Blvd	TW Alexander Drive	Both Sides	1560
2010	TW Alexander Drive Extension	Glenwood Avenue	ACC Blvd	Both Sides	3908
				TOTAL (feet)	134,046

Note: Sidewalk costs for these projects are not associated with sidewalk fund revenues.

Sidewalk Projects (City Initiated & Petitions) 2005-2010

Completion				Sidewalk Construction	Total Sidewalk Length (ft) *
Year	Project	From	To		
2005	WADE AVENUE	DOGWOOD LANE	FAIRCLOTH STREET	North Side	675
2007	BLUE RIDGE ROAD	CRABTREE VALLEY DRIVE	CRABTREE CREEK BRIDGE	West Side	528
2007	BLUE RIDGE ROAD	REEDY CREEK ROAD	FAIRMEADOW LANE	West Side	1,267
2007	CREEDMOOR ROAD	MAPLETON LANE	SAWMILL ROAD	West Side	1,584
2007	HOLLENDEN DRIVE	NEW HOPE ROAD	SPRING FOREST ROAD	West Side	1,954
2007	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD	ROCK QUARRY ROAD	RALEIGH BLVD.	South Side	792
2007	MILLBROOK ROAD	OLD WAKE FOREST ROAD	ATLANTIC AVENUE	Both Sides	3,168
2007	S. PERSON STREET	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD	E. LENOIR STREET	West Side	1,214
2007	SPRING FOREST ROAD	CAPITAL BLVD	CASA DEL REY	South Side	1,056
2007	CURRITUCK DRIVE	LASSITER MILL ROAD	YADKIN DRIVE	South Side	3,062
2007	CURRITUCK DRIVE	YADKIN DRIVE	CHOWAN STREET	South Side	370
2008	HALIFAX STREET	CEDAR STREET	CITY PARK	West Side	2,640
2008	SIERRA DRIVE	LINEBERRY DRIVE	GOSHAWK LANE	North Side	370
2008	ATHENS DRIVE	KAPLAN DRIVE	SMITHDALE DRIVE	West Side	53
2008	TRAILWOOD HILLS DRIVE	ALDER RIDGE LANE	EXISTING SIDEWALK	East Side	528
2008	MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD	PEYTON STREET	POOLE ROAD	South Side	1,954
2008	QUAIL HOLLOW DRIVE	SOUTH OF COMPTON ROAD	240' SOUTHWARD TO EXISTING	West Side	240
2010	CAPITAL BLVD.	CALVARY DRIVE	SPRING FOREST ROAD	East Side	3,696
2010	SOUTH STREET	BLOUNT STREET	PERSON STREET	North Side	370
2010	BARRETT DRIVE	BARRETT DRIVE AT THE	SIX FORKS RD INTERSECTION	Both Sides	211
2010	NEW BERN AVENUE	TRAWICK ROAD	NEW HOPE ROAD	Both Sides	12,566
2010	MILLBROOK ROAD	IRONWOOD TRAIL GREENWAY	DIXON DRIVE	South Side	3,221
2010	CREEDMOOR ROAD	LYNN ROAD	MAPLETON LANE	East Side	1,901
2010	DANIELS STREET	SMALLWOOD DRIVE	EXISTING SIDEWALK	West Side	264
2010	DACIAN ROAD	GLENBROOK DRIVE	END	West Side	2,218
				TOTAL (feet)	45,901

City of Raleigh Sidewalk Data 2005-2010

Sidewalk Repair Data

Fiscal Year	City Repaired (Assessed)		Owner Repaired		Tree Root Repairs		Total Annual Repairs	
	Length Repaired (LF)	Cost	Length Repaired (LF)	Cost	Length Repaired (LF)	Cost	Length Repaired (LF)	Cost
FY 05-06	211.6	\$ 6,752	357.2	\$ 20,139	1325	\$ 50,813	1893.8	\$ 77,704
FY 06-07	93.3	\$ 4,655	161.9	\$ 7,960	1283	\$ 57,092	1538.2	\$ 69,707
FY 07-08	461.6	\$ 23,110	908.1	\$ 52,405	1650	\$ 78,411	3019.7	\$ 153,926
FY 08-09	202.4	\$ 7,898	401.2	\$ 16,916	227	\$ 64,501	830.6	\$ 89,315
FY 09-10	223.0	\$ 8,874	241.3	\$ 10,097	3081	\$ 53,197	3545.3	\$ 72,168
FY 10-11	35.0	\$ 1,279	63.7	\$ 2,628	1347	\$ 25,196	1445.7	\$ 29,103
Totals	1226.9	\$ 52,568	2133.4	\$ 110,145	8913	\$ 329,210	12273.3	\$ 491,923

[Incomplete data for length]

Private Sidewalk Construction Data

Fiscal Year	Sidewalks Accepted (Private Development)	
	Length Accepted (LF)	Estimated Value
FY 05-06	153571	\$ 1,842,852
FY 06-07	109159	\$ 1,309,908
FY 07-08	111334	\$ 1,336,008
FY 08-09	64874	\$ 778,488
FY 09-10	18344	\$ 220,128
FY 10-11	19464	\$ 233,568
Totals	476746	\$ 5,720,952

Sidewalk Revenues

Fiscal Year	Sidewalk Revenues - CIP	
	Sidewalk Fund	Fund Reserves
FY 05-06	\$ 176,000	\$ 80,000
FY 06-07	\$ 179,000	\$ -
FY 07-08	\$ 190,000	\$ 200,000
FY 08-09	\$ 193,000	\$ 150,000
FY 09-10	\$ 93,000	\$ 100,000
FY 10-11	\$ 196,000	\$ -
Totals	\$ 1,027,000	\$ 530,000

Sidewalk Fund Revenue Sources

- Assessments
- Fund Interest Income
- Fee-in-lieu Payments (Private Development)
- Powell Bill Funds (State)

Sidewalk Fund Reserve Sources

- Unbudgeted income from prior year
- Unspent balances from previous allocations

Sidewalk Assessments Levied

Fiscal Year	Assessments	
	Construction	Repairs
FY 05-06	\$ 278,430.00	\$ 35,606.46
FY 06-07	\$ 146,531.00	\$ 11,378.74
FY 07-08	\$ 87,698.00	\$ 27,692.00
FY 08-09	\$ 88,548.00	\$ 12,048.96
FY 09-10	\$ 18,428.00	\$ 21,231.25
FY 10-11	\$ -	\$ -
Totals	\$ 619,635.00	\$ 107,957.41

Sidewalk Funding Allocations

Fiscal Year	Transportation - CIP	
	Sidewalk Program	Sidewalk Repairs
FY 05-06	\$ 100,000	\$ 25,000
FY 06-07	\$ 200,000	\$ 25,000
FY 07-08	\$ 500,000	\$ 25,000
FY 08-09	\$ 500,000	\$ 25,000
FY 09-10	\$ -	\$ 25,000
FY 10-11	\$ -	\$ -
Totals	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 125,000

Masthead

Published Tue, Dec 14, 2010 02:00 AM

Modified Tue, Dec 14, 2010 08:19 AM

Options considered for Blue Ridge Road intersection

Over or under?

That's the quandary for railroaders, traffic engineers and scads of drivers and pedestrians who yearn for a smart way to separate busy Blue Ridge Road from its clogged crossings at Hillsborough Street and twin train tracks in West Raleigh.

About 40,000 cars creep through this intersection on an average day - and at this hot spot, "average" is misleading. Weekend flea markets, the annual State Fair and frequent hockey, basketball and football games make this corner even more trafficacious (Read traffic and catastrophe).

Blue Ridge drivers have to stop for 22 freight and passenger trains every day, and the count is rising. The state plans to add more passenger trains in 2012. The N.C. Railroad is tinkering with a plan for a dozen or so daily commuter trains.

And so, given Raleigh's relentless crazy growth, state Department of Transportation engineers say the forecast is for gridlock by 2030 - unless we pick one of these options:

Lift Blue Ridge Road 33 feet over the twin tracks and the two streets that sandwich them, Hillsborough and Beryl Road, at an estimated cost of \$19 million.

That could work - if we don't mind hiding our beloved Dorton Arena and fairgrounds behind a long, tall bridge and retaining walls.

Another option:

Lift Blue Ridge only 17 feet, and lower the tracks and the two streets by 13 feet. Price: \$60 million.

That's easier on the eyes, but harder on the railroads. Trains don't like to climb a slope of more than 1 percent, so it could be expensive and disruptive to start lowering the tracks a few hundred yards away in each direction - work that would have to be done without stopping daily train traffic.

The new favorite choice is:

Lower Blue Ridge Road 29 feet under the street and tracks, for \$28 million. Three short bridges would keep Hillsborough, Beryl and the tracks where they are now - with room for a fourth bridge in the future, if Triangle Transit decides to roll into West Raleigh with its proposed electric light rail trains.

"This one seems to address all our problems," said Leza W. Mundt, a DOT planning engineer.

She aired the ideas Monday for a citizen committee advising the Raleigh City Council on a string of issues related to rail transit and passenger train plans.

Each option comes with fine print - and with provisions to avoid trampling the plans of railroads, nearby businesses and residents, and two big state institutions.

Drivers wanting to turn from Blue Ridge onto Hillsborough, or vice versa, would have to use a new connector road to be built on the northeast corner - land owned by the N.C. State University College of Veterinary Medicine. On the south side of the tracks, Pylon Drive would provide a similar connection between Blue Ridge and Beryl.

The new downward slope of Blue Ridge would start near State Fair Gate 11, but that doesn't look like a problem for fairgoers. Long-range fair plans call for closing that gate and building up the main fairgrounds entrance on Trinity Road.

Likewise, Mundt's team is trimming its ideas to fit NCSU's plans for expanding the veterinary college's campus.

People on foot and on bicycle can't be ignored, either. On an average State Fair day, 15,000 people walk across the intersection of Blue Ridge and Hillsborough.

A possible station for Triangle Transit or commuter trains - or both - would probably be built above the tracks. And it would have to be accessible to people walking on Blue Ridge Road below the tracks.

State engineers hope to make the over-or-under choice by next summer. Construction doesn't start until 2018.

Make contact: 919-829-4527 or bruce.siceloff@newsobserver.com. On the Web at twitter.com/Road_Worrier/ and blogs.newsobserver.com/crosstown/. Please include address and daytime phone.