

**Durham-Chapel Hill Carrboro**  
**Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO)**  
***Goals and Objectives Summary (as of September 12, 2007)***

---

## **Background**

The MPO has published a draft set of Goals and Objectives for a public comment period that runs from August 1 through September 12, 2007. The Goals and Objectives will guide the overall development of the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (2035 LRTP) and the specific tasks such as the selection of transportation projects and policies. The MPO staff has received feedback from several sources, including:

- A Web-based online survey;
- Completed comment forms that were mailed to citizens and also distributed at two public workshops; and,
- Documents in which citizens edited copies of the Goals and Objectives.

The remainder of this document provides a summary of the feedback from the comment forms and the survey.

## **Full Documentation Available**

A compilation of all the completed comment forms and a summary of the online survey are available for review on the MPO's Web site – [www.dchcmpo.org](http://www.dchcmpo.org).

## **Summary of Comment Forms**

The MPO received thirty-two comment forms. Overall, the respondents support the existing Goals and Objectives, especially those related to the Bicycle and Pedestrian transportation, Natural Resources and Environment, Public Transportation, and Land Use integration. Some respondents believed the list of Goals and Objectives could be consolidated to reduce redundancy. Several contemporary issues were often identified as the motive for supporting a certain Goal or Objective; these issues include global warming, fossil fuel depletion, sustainability and health and exercise.

The remainder of this section provides an additional summary of the major (i.e., often identified) and minor themes (i.e., identified enough to merit mentioning).

### **Major Themes**

Bicycle and Pedestrian – This transportation mode received the most frequent support among respondents, and some people believed that new development should be required to connect to a planned bicycle and pedestrian system. Others

identified this transportation mode as essential to a multimodal transportation system and a necessary alternative for low-income people.

Public Transportation – This transportation mode received strong support, and was frequently identified as essential to a sustainable and equitable transportation system, and a healthy environment.

Natural Environment and Social Systems – This goal received strong support, and was often identified as a product of a balanced, multimodal transportation system.

Integration of Land Use and Transportation – This goal received strong support, and was often identified as a necessary condition to support public transportation, a multimodal transportation system, the natural environment and other Goals.

Overall Transportation System – A balanced, multimodal transportation system received fairly strong support, and a few respondents identified this Goal as one that would lead to the accomplishment of the other Goals.

Opportunity for Input Appreciated – Many respondents commented that they appreciated the opportunity to provide input to the transportation planning process.

Good Set of Goals – Many respondents believed the set of Goals and Objectives were very comprehensive and specific enough for planning purposes.

Reduce and Clarify – Some respondents believed there were too many Goals and Objectives. They believed that the redundant, “self-evident,” and overly generalized Goals and Objectives could be eliminated. A few respondents wanted them to be more specific or attached to a measurement.

### **Minor Themes**

Implementation – Some respondents believed the Goals and Objectives were good but that implementation was lacking.

Money and funding – The need for additional transportation funding was identified several times.

Seniors, Children, Low-Income and Good Health – The need to support non-automobile transportation modes, such as transit, and bicycle and pedestrian transportation, was identified as essential for the seniors, children and low-income population, and for good health.

## Summary of Survey

The MPO developed an online survey to capture the public's level of support for the various Goals and Objectives. The survey Web link was distributed to citizens by mail and electronic mail (approximately 1,000 citizens are on the mailing address list), and was often redistributed by a neighborhood or interest group to its members. At this point, there have been 191 survey respondents. This section summarizes the two main survey parts. A copy of the original survey summary, which includes a few additional questions and general socioeconomic data on the respondents, is available on the MPO's Web site – [www.dchcmpto.org](http://www.dchcmpto.org), and as Attachment 8C in the September 12, 2007 TAC meeting packet. Please note that the survey incorporated two draft Goals based on the requirements of the most recent federal transportation legislation, i.e., SAFETEA-LU. These two draft Goals are Safety and Security, and Freight Transportation.

### Support for Goals

The survey asked respondents to award points to Goals based on their level of support. They could award a total of 100 points among the nine Goals, but no more than 20 points to any single Goal. The results in the table below list the Goals in their order of overall support, and provide response data to indicate the relative strength of support. Support appears to be strong for all Goals except Public Involvement, Safety and Security and Freight, shown below the solid black line in the table below.

No.	Goal	Total Points	Mean
1	Public Transportation System	180	15.2
2	Overall Transportation System	176	16.2
3	Pedestrian and Bicycle System	176	16.0
4	Protection of the Natural Environment and Social Systems	175	14.8
5/6	Multimodal Street and Highway	172	16.2
5/6	Integration of Land Use and Transportation	170	12.3
7	Public Involvement	148	8.9
8	Safety and Security	133	9.5
9	Freight Transportation	122	5.4

### Support for Objectives

The survey asked respondents to award points to clusters of similar Objectives based on their level of support. They could award a total of 100 points among the twenty groups of Objectives, but no more than 10 points to any single Goal. The results in the table below lists the groups of Objectives in their order of overall support, and provides response data to indicate the relative strength of support. Support appears strongest among non-automobile transportation modes, preservation of the environment and community assets, and reduced resource consumption, shown above the solid black line in the table on the next page.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Group of Objectives</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1	Clean air and clean water	181	8.8
2	Bicycle transportation	174	8.3
3	Public transportation	173	8.4
4	Reduce gas and electrical consumption	172	8.1
5	Preserve historic and valued sites, natural areas and plants and animals	170	7.8
6	Land use to support bicycling and walking	169	8.2
7	Pedestrian transportation	167	7.8
8	Agency coordination	162	6.9
9	Educate public on safety and multimodal use	146	5.8
10	Transportation projects that are beautiful and functional	143	6.1
11	Cost efficient transportation projects	136	6.6
12	Low-income and minorities in decision-making process	130	5.2
13	Seek innovative funding mechanisms	128	5.8
14	Reduce congestion on roads	125	5.8
15	Projects should reflect local community values	125	5.2
16	Adopt uniform performance standards	122	5.6
17	Accommodate freight	120	4.9
18	Monitor and communicate progress	119	4.8
19	Make transportation system safer	110	4.6
20	Greater security	97	3.3