

2040 MTP – Final Plan

Compilation of Public Comments

Background

This document compiles all the comments that have been received from the public during the public input process for final 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) report. All comments received by email and letters up to May 3, 2013 have been included.

From: Lisa Brach
Sent: Friday, March 01, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Subject: Re: Long-Range Transportation Plan review

Do you purposely schedule these hearings when those of us who work normal hours in order to pay our taxes are unable to attend????? It is beginning to look that way when the Public Hearings are scheduled on a weekday at 9:00am!!!!

From: sylvester williams
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2013 12:02 AM
To: Henry, Andrew
Cc: denise hester;
Subject: East End Connector

This email is to reiterate our stand on the East End Connector. The Durham Committee On The Affairs Of Black People and the Hayestown Community (of which I am President) are on record as being opposed to the building of the East End Connector.

I was a member of the ad-hoc committee and none of the concerns I expressed were part of the final proposal. I am also President of Hayestown, the area being directly affected by construction of EEC. The community is a predominantly elderly African American community. Many in the community, though poor, own their homes. Not only will construction impair their health but could force many of them to move.

Previous reports done by NCDOT did not include comments by UNC graduate students on environmental justice. The graduate students' report highlighted once again, that a predominantly

African American community (Urban Renewal and Hayti) was being impacted by a major road project with no concerns for the people in the community.

The EEC project along with the widening of Holloway Street and Highway 55 are taking place within a short period of time of each other within miles of each other. Even though they minimize the effect of the number of homes being taken, what happens to the people living in their homes when pollutants from the construction is released into the air. The road building will destroy businesses and the value of homes in this area and the quality of life.

As the letter from NCDOT stated, there is no economic benefit to our community. This supposedly, was the top criterion, for new road projects. Once again a predominantly African American community is being asked to bear the brunt of growth for the city, county and state without any real benefit.

There are three reasons why we are opposed to the building of the East End Connector.

Health Concerns

Section 4.1.8 on air quality states that MSATs or Mobile Source Air Toxic would be increased due to increased traffic on the East End Connector. The document does not take into account how the elderly residents of Hayestown health will be negatively impacted by the emission of MSATs. The EA document emphasized that MSAT caused cancer in animals and that there currently in not a way to measure levels of these toxins. "The localized levels of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) emissions for the preferred alternative could be higher relative to the No-Build Alternative". Why would the state of North Carolina want to build a road that could impair the health of local taxpaying citizens. There is mitigation for wildlife, but there is nothing in place to protect the health of residents in the EEC area.

Economic Development

The proposed road will not significantly add to traffic being driven to local businesses along Holloway Street and Highway 98. While minority communities in Durham continue to have double digit unemployment rates, why are roads being built that will not address this economic malaise. EEC should provide better access to these businesses in order to spur economic growth in a predominantly minority community. If given the opportunity we can make the economic base in NECD much stronger, but not with onerous zoning laws and threats of eminent domain which result from the building of the EEC.

Lack of Funding

The state of North Carolina nor the city of Durham currently have enough funds to complete the construction of the East End Connector. With the state showing a budget deficit of over \$2 billion, eliminating the construction of the EEC could either save on budget dollars or allow funds to be directed to areas of the state where it is most needed.

In the service of Christ Jesus, the Son of the Living God,

Pastor Sylvester Williams
President Hayestown Community
Economic Co-Chair Durham Business and Professional Chain

David Laudicina
Hillsborough, NC
March 13, 2013
DCC-MPO public hearing

I am here to relay my thoughts in support of the Triangle Transit Authority (TTA) plans for providing infrastructure to satisfy the Triangle's transportation needs for the future.

The TTA transit plan calls for the creation of a light rail transit segment (LRT) between Chapel Hill and Durham. It also calls for a light rail segment from Cary to downtown Raleigh and further to north Raleigh. If you look at the maps you can also see that the segment between Durham and Cary not built initially but planned for a future phase will run on existing right of way making the expansion to complete the light rail line from Chapel Hill to North Raleigh via downtown Raleigh easily and inexpensively. This would allow a light rail infrastructure that connects all 4 major population centers in a contiguous infrastructure. This means with proper scheduling a rider could commute anywhere in between Chapel Hill and Raleigh easily without the need to make a transfer.

The initial TTA plan also calls for a commuter rail system between West Durham and East Raleigh on the same right of way the LRT and Amtrak utilize. Look at a map and see where the Amtrak lines run. They run right through Hillsborough, Burlington, Greensboro and High Point where marvelous new train stations have been either renovated or built (Hillsborough station will be built as a part of the initial TTA plan). Amtrak has committed to a future stop at the Hillsborough station. Commuter service could easily be extended in the future from West Durham to Hillsborough, Burlington, Greensboro and High Point. This allows potential for commuting anywhere between High Point and Raleigh on a daily basis and potential for feeding

these commuter stops with commuters living in rural areas. Take another look at a map the right of way goes right through downtown Mebane and Haw River. The addition of new train stations and commuter service in Mebane and Haw River would stimulate much needed economic growth in the Mebane and Haw River areas. With an easy transfer in Durham, commuters could also transfer to the LRT system and commute to Chapel Hill and North Raleigh.

Future US growth will be centered in innovation centers and jobs will be centered in these clusters of knowledge and ideas. It's estimated that 1 new innovation job creates 5 new non innovation jobs (lawyers, doctors, service industry jobs, etc.). This has proven to be true in places like Seattle and Silicon Valley. Raleigh is one of the leading clusters of innovation (Research Triangle, IBM, SAS etc.) right up there with Seattle, Silicon Valley, and Austin. As much as we would like, The US will not be able to rely on manufacturing to create jobs as in the past. Manufacturing jobs will continue to go to China and similar countries. Our best investment is in infrastructure that encourages growth in an innovation based economy built around ideas and the new technology resulting from these ideas in the US. An example of this is the Apple Corporation new ecosystem technology originates in the US while Apple manufactures in China. We can already see the stimulus for innovation industry growth related to TTA planned infrastructure. Citrix is building a huge facility right next to the proposed new Raleigh station. Citrix is doing this mainly to be close to this infrastructure. With the knowledge spillover and clustering of innovation jobs, downtown Raleigh will become an innovation cluster in itself.

Recently the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) released a new master plan mapping out the future growth of the Research Triangle Park (RTP). The plan calls for an expansion of job capacity from 45,000 to 150,000 innovation jobs. Currently the RTP employs 39,000 innovation jobs. You can calculate roughly using a multiplier of 5 non-innovation jobs to 1 innovation job applied to the 110,000 potential new innovation jobs created could result in over 600,000 new jobs in the Triangle. The master plan also calls for RTP development to be multi-use clustered around commuter rail and light rail stations.

The RTI strategic plan combined with the TTA transit plan potentially creates an ecosystem that would compete with any other innovation center in the US.

Thx for the opportunity to comment.

Thx Dave L

2040 MTP Comments from J. Bollinger, NCDOT DCHC MPO Coordinator

MAPS-All

DCHC area:

1. The NC 86 diamond looks like it is on I-40 in Orange County.
2. The US 15-501 shield is missing "501" in Chatham County.

MAPS- Highway

In General:

1. The "CTP" lines, general road lines, and "Completed 2020 Projects" lines seem like they could be easily confused.

Franklin County:

1. The US 1 Corridor Study Ph. 2 recommendations appear to be in the map, but Ph. 1 new facility and realignment recommendations do not appear to be.
2. Not all Franklin County CTP recommendations are shown (such as Airport Dr. Ext., Flat Rock Church Rd. Ext., etc.). Are the US 1 Corridor Study Ph. 2 recommendations to be incorporated into the Franklin County/CAMPO CTP, thus the same grey line "CTP" symbology?
3. In Youngsville, the grade separations appear to be misplaced. One should be at the intersection of Main St./NC 96 and the railroad and the other should be at the intersection of the NC 96 Bypass and the railroad.

DCHC area:

1. In Inset C, the East End Connector improvements could be cleaned up to make it look neater since all the proposed roadway details aren't shown anyway.

MAPS (& Project List)- Transit

DCHC area:

1. Why are no CTP projects shown on transit maps, when they are shown on the highway maps?

Franklin County:

1. In Bunn, from what I recall from the CTP study, railroad tracks have been removed and at least part of the land has been given back to land owners in the area.
2. In the Transit project list, DCHC and CAMPO both list "Rail LRT D-O 1".

MAPS- Bicycle

DCHC area:

1. On the Off-Road Bicycle map, local facilities near the Wake County/Brier Creek area are very spotty and look to be new from 2035 MTP. Are these errors that can be cleaned-up (maybe deleted) or are they new projects?
 2. Why does the ATT look different on the Off-Road and On-Road Bicycle maps, especially the extent of it being "statewide"?
-

From Julie Bollinger, 3/27/13

CTP Projects within the 2040 MTP

4. CTP language corrections in MTP report.
 - a. CTP projects are needs based; projections are to horizon year 2040+
 - b. Projects beyond what can be afforded in the MTP are those expected to be in the CTPs, which are underway.

5. Concerns about having CTP projects listed and shown on maps in the MTP.
 - a. Refer to comments on maps and list submitted on 3/26/13.
 - b. For the Highway map, what does CTP mean?
 - i. DCHC and CAMPO do not have CTPs. They are currently in progress, but are incomplete. There are only CTPs for the individual CAMPO collar counties.
 - c. For the Highway map or any other map or list, where are the justifications for these CTP projects?
 - i. NCDOT requires Problem Statements that state a need for improvement.
 - d. TPB and DCHC staff had discussed and agreed to separate the CTP and MTP back in January this year.

→ Since the MTP is federally required and the CTP is incomplete, remove CTP projects from the MTP and move forward with the MTP.

6. Having the CTP projects (as currently shown) on the MTP maps and as a part of the same lists does not give a clear delineation/distinction of what is fiscally constrained (MTP) and what is not (CTP).
 - a. This confuses the public.

 7. DCHC MPO TCC: MTP recommended for approval subject to clearer distinction between MTP projects and CTP/projects beyond the MTP. The question to answer:
 - a. **How do we create a clear delineation/distinction between the fiscally constrained projects (MTP) and the non-fiscally constrained projects (CTP/projects beyond the MTP) on the maps, lists and report?**
 - i. Current suggestions:
 1. Define CTP projects as “candidate projects for the CTP” or “proposed CTP projects.”
 2. Illustrate the projects as dashed lines.
-

Andy,

Looking over the DCHC plan, the MTP/LTRP looks fine.

I found two discrepancies between the DCHC CTP and the Cary CTP, both in the top northwest corner of Cary/northeast corner of Chatham County.

- 1) We have O’Kelly Chapel Road from the American Tobacco Trail to the Wake County line as a 4-lane divided facility. The first segments west of the County line are already widened as part of the Del Webb development. We would require the widening as development comes along O’Kelly Chapel Rd. near Pittard Sears Rd and Chatham Glen Rd.
- 2) Our CTP also has a 4-lane, median divided extension of Yates Store Rd to the north to Grandale Dr./Wake Rd.

Thanks for considering these. For ease of finalizing the plan, both can be left in the CTP horizon and both can be shown as private/developer-funded.

Also, just to note, we may have a very minor issue arising where the Yates Store Rd (formerly County Line Rd) alignment may have to move into Chatham County slightly based on the ATT and Ferrell Rd crossings. The road is in the model though a 4-lanes nonetheless, in the appropriate horizon year (though I forgot what it is). Just thought I would at least let you know about the issue. If we have to do a Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the alignment, I will give you a heads up when it starts to move forward.

Call me with any questions.

Thanks, Todd

Todd B. Delk, P.E.

Transportation Planning Engineer

Town of Cary Engineering Dept.

316 N. Academy Street

PO Box 8005, Cary NC 27512

919.462.3834 (919.460.4935 fax)

todd.delk@townofcary.org

From: Lewis, Ed F <elewis@ncdot.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 2:23 PM

To: Henry, Andrew

Cc: Wilson, Patrick D

Subject: 2040 MTP Process Review

Andy,

Good afternoon. Pat Wilson forwarded the subject item to me. I took the opportunity to briefly review the plan and offer the following comments that are tied to the process and also the plan:

1. Consider list/link to other MPO and RPO groups that border DCHC and CAMPO. I understand the link between these two MPO's (DCHC AND CAMPO), and folks may want to review those other "border" areas. This was in section 3.1.
2. Section 2.3, the discussion about preserving R/W for future projects is ok, but this MTP can only id possible R/W's needed in the future. Are you saying the local governments will protect these R/W's by zoning and permit restrictions? Those are different tools using data from the MTP.
3. Page 25 the 2040 plan mentions NCTA as a member of the TCC, and there is no mention of the representation from NCDOT (Division).
4. Section 5.2 Stakeholder and PI Process. It would be enlightening to see the raw numbers of people attending the workshops (and a geo-referenced map showing the general area where folks lived for EJ/Title VI issues). The total number of comment received would be good as well from workshops. Times and location of these workshops would be helpful.
5. Section 9.2 EJ. The third bullet of EJ pertaining to no denial of benefits may have been left out.
6. Maybe mention BikeWalkNC or WalkBikeNC initiative.
7. I did not see any LEP provision in the process as it relates to translation and interpretations services during outreach...did I miss it?.

The plan is well researched and well written.

Also, is there a way to call in to tomorrow's meeting? I am partially double-booked. Thanks and let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks
Ed

From: Zach Ferguson
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 3:23 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Subject: Public Comment for Long-Range Transportation Plan

Hello!

My name is Zach Ferguson and I am a resident of Chapel Hill, NC in Orange County. I am a law student and president of the Carolina Bicycle Coalition. I wanted to submit a comment for the DCHC Long-Range Transportation Plan.

I strongly believe that all levels of the government need to aggressively invest in bicycling infrastructure, specifically protected bike lanes (also known as cycle tracks).

These lanes are much safer for bicyclists, and correspondingly, attract much more bike riders.

The Triangle has excellent potential for being a bike-friendly area. Smart investments in bicycling infrastructure brings about a myriad of benefits. It reduces air pollution, cuts traffic congestion, lowers the need for expensive and high maintenance infrastructure like parking lots, allows people to more physically active, brings economic benefits (higher property values, greater sales for businesses), and overall makes communities more sustainable and livable.

Biking should not be an alternative to main forms of transportation, it should be one of the main forms of transportation. It is not an unstable or unproven new technology, nor unsustainable, nor a dying fad. Biking infrastructure is critical to creating livable, healthy, safe, and clean communities.

I hope the Long-Range Transportation Plan gives an appropriate emphasis and commitment to bicycling infrastructure.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Zach Ferguson
Carolina Bicycle Coalition

--

Zach Ferguson
UNC School of Law
J.D. Candidate, 2014

ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING & INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT

Craig N. Benedict, AICP, Director

Current Planning
(919) 245-2575
(919) 644-3002 (FAX)
www.orangecountync.gov



131 West Margaret Lane
P O Box 8181
Hillsborough,
North Carolina, 27278

April 4, 2013

Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Technical Advisory Committee
c/o Andy Henry, Transportation Planner
City of Durham, Transportation Dept.
101 City Hall Plaza
Durham, NC 27701

Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Technical Advisory Committee:

On behalf of Orange County Planning Staff and consistent with County plans, the following comments/requests are offered on bicycle facilities included in the draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Specifically, these comments pertain to the "On-Road Bicycle Facilities Map" as provided on the DCHC MPO website:

<http://www.dchcmo.org/dmdocuments/2040MTPOffRoad.pdf>

1. Old NC 86 segment between New Hope Church and Davis is identified as a Regional Bicycle Facility. Consistent with the County's Comprehensive Transportation Plan (March 2013), we are requesting that this designation be removed. New NC 86 provides the preferred alternate connection to Hillsborough from points south (*If needed, the section of New Hope Church Road, connecting Old NC 86 to New NC 86 and beyond to Old NC 10, could be identified as a Regional Bicycle Facility rather than a Local Bicycle Facility*).
2. St. Mary's Road segment between US 70 Bypass and Durham County line is identified as a Regional Bicycle Facility. Consistent with the County's existing bicycle route system (2010 NCDOT bicycling brochure), we are requesting that this designation be removed. The preferred alternate to Hillsborough from the Durham County line is via Guess Rd., New Sharon Church Rd., Walker Rd., Miller Rd., to Saint Mary's Rd.
3. NC 86 North segment between the intersections with Coleman Loop Road is identified as a Local Bicycle Facility. Consistent with the County's Comprehensive Transportation Plan (March 2013), we are requesting that this designation be removed and Coleman Loop Road be used as the preferred alternate.
4. Orange Grove Road and Dodsons Crossroads Road segments within MPO boundaries could be shown as Regional Bicycle Facilities rather than Local and may provide more of a regional connection south to Chatham County. The Orange County Comprehensive Transportation Plan includes the connections that complete the route.

A sketch map is attached as a reference and key to the above comments.

Orange County Staff will be in attendance at the April 10th TAC Meeting to address any questions it may have.

Thank you,



Tom Altieri, AICP
Orange County Comprehensive Planning Supervisor

Cc:

Craig Benedict, Orange County Planning Director

Frank W. Clifton, Orange County Manager

Donna Baker, Clerk to the BOCC

Orange County BOCC, including DCHC MPO TAC member, Alice Gordon

Paul Guthrie, Chair, Orange County Unified Transportation Board

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan

February 28, 2013

On-Road Facilities

- State Bicycle Facilities
- Regional Bicycle Facilities
- Local Bicycle Facilities

*DCHC MPO State and Regional routes are shown on the On-Road Facilities map. Appendix 4 provides a listing of the routes.



This map was compiled using the best available data, however, the Capital Area MPO is not responsible for errors, omissions, and/or misuse. Subject to change.

