



Section 6: PROJECT RECOMENDATIONS

6.1 Proposed Projects List

The Comprehensive Bicycle Plan contains both general recommendations for policy and infrastructure changes, as well as recommends specific bicycle facility projects. These facility projects include striped bicycle lanes, wide outside lanes, paved shoulders, off-road multi-purpose trails, bridge and tunnel crossing improvements, all associated facilities, and project segments that require only bicycle-related signage. Each of the projects is signified by project number on the **Proposed Routes & Facilities Map** found in **Section 7**. Many of the recommended projects are referenced in **Section 4.3: Focus Areas**, which describes their context in more detail.

The **Proposed Projects List** describes each of the individual projects in the following terms:

Location – including the street name or project name, project number, geographic starting and ending points

Improvements – describes the project’s purpose in terms of context or need served, the existing conditions and pavement width, the proposed facility type, specific actions required to create the facility, and a cross-sectional description of lane striping. The lanes are illustrated in terms of standard vehicular travel lanes (L) and center lanes (CL), parallel parking lanes (PP), and bicycle lanes (BL).

Costs – The length of each project segment is provided in units of feet and mileage. The unit cost of construction is listed and factored with the facility length to derive the project construction cost. An estimate of the annual project upkeep is also provided. All costs are based upon estimates current with publication of this plan.

Funding – Each project is designated according to its eligibility for funding for potential sources. If a project follows the adopted Carolina Thread Trail plan, it may make a good candidate for future Thread Trail grants. Projects that fall within the radius of eligibility of a Safe Routes to School qualifying school are indicated (only a small number of projects do not). Projects eligible for CMAQ and Powell Bill funds are also indicated.

Ranking – Project prioritization is an important component of this plan. The process of prioritization is described in **Section 6.2**. Projects are ranked as High, Medium or Low, according to the total points they received in the scoring process. Scoring is based upon the votes it received from the steering committee and the public, as well as how well the project satisfied publicly determined values including: safety, linking key destinations, scenic value, improving school commutes, and improved links across significant barriers or system gaps.

Each of the facility projects are recommended in this plan is described in detail in the **Proposed Projects List** and depicted on the **Proposed Routes and Facilities** map in **Section 7**. The ten highest ranked projects - based upon their total project scoring points - are listed below. Each of these projects received a total project score of greater than ten points.

| LOCATION | | IMPROVEMENTS | | COSTS | | | RANKING |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|-------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Street/Project Name | Proj. No. | Proposed Facility | Recommendations | Distance | | Construction \$ Estimate | Project Scoring |
| | | (Proposed Actions) | | feet | miles | | Total points |
| Battleground | W1 | WOL | Signage only | 1280 | 0.24 | \$500 | 11 |
| Battleground | W2 | WOL | Widening, grading | 2440 | 0.46 | \$231,061 | 11.5 |
| Beason Creek | T2 | Trail | Trail | 4600 | 0.87 | \$653,409 | 12 |
| Cleveland | L4 | BL | Restriping, median, trees | 3340 | 0.63 | \$474,432 | 14 |
| Kings Mountain | P12 | PS | Signage only | 9830 | 1.86 | \$1,862 | 11 |
| Mountain | L7 | BL | Restriping | 1950 | 0.37 | \$5,540 | 13 |
| N. Elementary | T9 | Trail, BL | Trail, Striping | 2300 | 0.44 | \$392,045 | 12 |
| Potts Creek 1 | T10 | Trail | Trail | 6000 | 1.14 | \$852,273 | 12 |
| Potts Creek 3 | T12 | Trail | Trail | 11,750 | 2.23 | \$1,669,034 | 13 |
| Potts Creek crossing | X4 | Bridge | Suspended bridge | 500 | 0.09 | \$142,045 | 13 |

TOP 10 PRIORITY PROJECTS

6.2 Proposed Bicycle Rack Locations

Approximate locations of recommended bicycle racks are indicated on the **Proposed Routes and Facilities** map in **Section 7**. Additional information regarding bicycle racks is located in **Section 5.13**. These locations include:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| West Elementary School | North Elementary School |
| Patriots Park | Citizens Service Center |
| Government Center | Country Club |
| Post Office | Westgate Plaza |
| Grover School | Kings Mountain Plaza |
| Art Center | Kings Mountain High School |
| Sims Park | Kings Mountain Intermediate School |
| Deal Park | Kings Mountain Middle School |
| East Elementary School | Ridgeline Trail head on York Road |

Additional information regarding bicycle racks is located in **Section 5.13**.

6.3 Project Prioritization

The Kings Mountain Comprehensive Bicycle Plan includes a total of 91 facility projects, where improvements (often multiple improvements) are proposed. Each of these projects is depicted on the **Proposed Routes and Facilities** map in **Section 7**. The total length of all of the proposed project segments is 66.9 miles. Of that total, 54.6 miles consist of proposed improvements to current road facilities, while the remaining 12.3 miles are proposed off-road facilities. The total projected cost to complete all of these improvements is estimated to be roughly \$16.7 million. Though different projects can be funded through different means, implementation costs requires that projects be taken on incrementally and as opportunities arise. With this in mind, projects are prioritized.

Prioritizing bicycle infrastructure projects is by nature a fluid process. Priorities depend upon a number of factors that are each subject to change; factors such as traffic demands, development trends, individual property parcel sales, and employment opportunities. The projects recommended by the Bicycle Plan were prioritized using the following method:

Prioritization of Bicycle Plan Goals

In order to establish criteria for determining which projects would be most needed and valued by the public, a list of goals was vetted with the steering committee, and then with the public at the first Open House and via the online survey. The various goals were rated using a goal scoring matrix. See **Section 6.1 Proposed Projects List** for results. Each of the goals was respected in the design of projects, but the highest rated goals were emphasized.

1. Public Prioritization of Projects

Once preliminary projects were developed for the Plan, each attendee of the second Open House meeting was asked to select and comment on their 24 most favored projects.

2. Steering Committee Project Prioritization

Committee members each selected 12 favored projects and indicated as well any projects they did not agree with.

3. Project Selection Criteria

Each of the projects was finally evaluated by how well it meets the priority goals. The final high priority criteria are defined below, along with the methodology used for evaluating each project by those criteria:

- **Key Linkages** - provide vital connections across substantial barriers such as highways, railroads and streams, or that otherwise form a singular link between significant networks of bicycle facilities (yes =1, no =0)
- **Destinations** - within one block or one parcel proximity. Qualifying destinations were selected by the project Steering Committee & by the public at the Open House meetings. Each destination linked = 1 point.



**Kings Mountain Bicycle Plan
Steering Committee Meeting**



- **School links** - within a one block or one parcel proximity. Schools are also counted under destinations, due to the fact that they serve multiple functions. Each school linked = 1 point.
- **Scenic** – having mountain or rural views, follow wooded trails, or include exceptionally attractive streetscapes (yes =1, no =0)
- **Safe conditions** – as per the Bicycling Suitability Analysis rating.
 - Least Suitable to Somewhat Suitable = 0
 - More Suitable = 1
 - Most Suitable = 2
 - All off-road routes = 3

The **Bicycle Suitability Analysis** map is located in **Section 7**. The bicycle suitability of each street is based upon a combination of factors, including traffic count, posted speed limit, functional classification, and the presence of bicycle facilities.

A total score for each project was derived using an even weight given to each of the five goals rated above, the Open House II project rating, and the Steering Committee project rating. Prioritization of projects was divided into High (H), Medium (M), and Low (L).

High = 10 points or greater
 Medium = between 9 points and 4 points
 Low = 3 points or fewer

This prioritization breakdown resulted in 17 High, 45 Medium and 28 Low priority projects. Project ratings are indicated in the Ranking column on the proposed Projects List in this section. Since these priority levels are based upon a variety of factors, it is important to use the resulting list as a guide, but not as an absolute rule. As noted previously, conditions change, and opportunities can arise that will make certain projects more favorable as the next to undertake.