

Durham
Chapel Hill
Carrboro



metropolitan
Planning Organization

APPENDIX G

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES



APPENDIX G -- PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The draft 2030 LRTP was released on June 23, 2004, and the public comment period continued through September 22, 2004 – this is a 91-day comment period. The Public Involvement process for the 2030 LRTP included many sources to receive public comments, including e-mail, Web site feedback links, voicemail, and written and oral comments at public workshops and hearings. The table below lists all public comments and briefly discusses how the comment is addressed in the plan, or the response. Note that the comments are grouped into five categories, including General, Highway, Transit, Fixed Guideway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Financial.

No.	Comment	Response
General		
1	Devise public outreach to make public more knowledgeable on the Plan	Plan development used workshops, hearings and public notices. Final plan will be available on Web site.
2	Establish Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) for Long Range Transportation Plan	CAC involved in 2025 LRTP. 2030 LRTP update does not change major projects and assumptions, thus CAC not convened.
3	Pursue opportunities to use bio-diesel in public-owned fleet of vehicles	Assessment of bio-diesel use will part of MPO's upcoming Greenhouse Gas report. The Town of Chapel Hill and Duke University have alternative-fueled vehicles (AFV). Area governments, transit operators, and school transportation systems are increasingly implementing AFV vehicles.
4	Land use/transportation integration is not addressed in the Plan	Plan projects designed to meet travel needs of projected residential and employment growth – this growth is based on currently adopted land use plans.
5	Synchronize traffic signals	City of Durham traffic signals to be synchronized by December 2005. Chapel Hill has some synchronized subsystems, and plans to upgrade when funding available.
6	Emphasis on safety	
7	Use 2030 LRTP to inform public on road improvements (especially to avoid new construction in future corridors)	Local governments receive copy of 2030 LRTP to inform their building permit review process.
8	Public needs single source telephone number, similar to "311" non-emergency number, to report needed highway repairs	The NCDOT has a "511" traveler information telephone service – this comment will be forwarded the appropriate official.
9	Provide more training and education for vehicle drivers, especially new drivers	Driver training has traditionally been the purview of the NCDOT and local school systems.
Highway		
10	Keep East End Connector as priority	This project remains the top priority in the 2030 LRTP
11	Keep US 70 freeway upgrade as priority	This project remains among the top priorities in the 2030 LRTP

No.	Comment	Response
12	Set aside resources to build cost-effective geometric capacity/safety improvements as intersection and interchanges	2030 LRTP identifies ~\$57 million for Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Transportation System Management (TSM) that would include these improvements
13	Improve I-85 in Orange County before I-40 in Orange County	In Orange County, I-85 improvements planned by 2020, and I-40 improvements by 2030.
14	Widen I-85 in Orange County before it gets worse (advance implementation)	In Orange County, I-85 improvements planned by 2020. Shift in resources or funding required to advance this project.
15	Work with UNC to build Estes Drive improvements quickly	Timing and design of these improvements depends on final agreement between UNC-CH and Town of Chapel Hill.
16	Remove “north-south” road on Horace Williams property from LRTP (stream beds and mature woods)	Required environmental planning phase of this project will address these issues.
17	Widen US 15-501 & Fordham Blvd to six lanes	Most traveled segments of Fordham Blvd. and 15-501 are to be widened to six lanes.
18	Add Cornwallis/Riddle Rd. Connector in the 2030 LRTP	Neighborhood and elected official opposition to project deleted it from 2025 LRTP.
19	Add 3-lane improvement of Hillandale Road from I-85 to Club Blvd in LRTP	Community has requested that this project not be included.
20	Widen Horton Road from Duke St. to Guess Rd. to a 3-lane facility	Project has been added to 2030 LRTP.
21	Thoroughfare Plan is outdated	Thoroughfare Plan will be updated after approval of 2030 LRTP.
22	Include medians and landscaping in highway projects	All multi-lane improvements include medians.
23	Measuring and analyzing People Miles Traveled (PMT) would be more useful than Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	PMT can be derived from model data and its use can be explored in the next long range plan update.
24	Durham highway engineers should adjust designs “on-site” to improve safety	The specific contents of this comment were forwarded to the City of Durham Engineering Division.
25	Speeding is a safety problem in Durham, especially in construction zones	Specific speeding complaints are addressed by Transportation Division (e.g., signage, speed humps), or Police Department or Highway Patrol (e.g., enforcement).
26	Directional information signs are misleading	Local highway planners are reviewing suggestions to change signage and seeking funds to replace some signs.
27	Consider “no build” as option for Elizabeth Brady Rd.	The selected alternative will result from the current scoping, environmental assessment and public involvement process.
	Transit	
28	LRTP should include improved transit and express services to RDU	Plan has bus shuttle service between airport and TTA light rail station. Other transit connections will be studied.
29	Improve Peak headway to 5 minutes	At this point, the demand and funding are inadequate for 5-minute headways.

No.	Comment	Response
30	Provide more cross-town transit routes	2030 LRTP has several existing and planned cross-town routes. Transit operations plans will continue to study and address need for these types of routes.
31	Provide more shuttle buses to connect RTP and major activity center	Plan has shuttle buses between RTP campuses and TTA light rail stations.
32	Provide seamless transit service in the Triangle Region	Raleigh (CATS), Durham (DATA) and Triangle Transit Authority (TTA) are to continue increasing service coordination.
33	LRTP does not address transit security and safety	Plan not designed to address operational details. Security and safety are operational details to be addressed by the transit operators.
Fixed Guideway		
34	Do not remove Phase I Duke Station from the 2030 LRTP	Duke Station remains in the Plan, but implementation year moved to 2015.
35	Add rail service to RDU in the Plan	Recent study concluded that travel demand was inadequate for RDU rail service. TTA will study issue in the future.
36	Advance implementation of Phase 2 rail from Duke to UNC	Implementation depends on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Start funding. Region unlikely to receive 2 nd New Start project while TTA Phase I is being implemented.
37	Study rail connection from Downtown Durham to Treyburn	This connection is likely to be studied once the rail corridor has been protected.
38	Develop Eubanks Park & Ride area with rail corridor	Intent is to build proposed park-n-ride adjacent to rail, and link rail with existing park-n-ride.
Bicycle and Pedestrian		
39	Add Leesville Rd/Shady Grove Rd to match bike project in Wake County	Project has been added.
40	Add Morreene Rd Bike project (to service Duke commute)	Project has been added.
41	Complete Airport Rd bike and pedestrian improvements from Estes to Homestead	Secured \$200,000 in STP-DA for project, and will continue to seek additional funding.
42	Complete bike improvements to Calvander along Old NC 86/Hillsborough Rd	Partially completed. Project is in 2030 LRTP.
43	Complete all sidewalk missing links	The policy and prioritization for fixing these links will be addressed in each local plan.
44	Give sidewalk connections to schools high priority	The policy and prioritization for schools will be addressed in each local plan – schools are commonly provided a high priority for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
45	Include sidewalks and bike facilities in all highway improvement projects	MPO policy is to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities in all highway projects, when practicable.
46	LRTP should include bike education	Long range plans include the capital, operating and maintenance projects for which there is a corresponding revenue source.
47	Greenways connectivity to parks	Planned greenways connect parks together.

No.	Comment	Response
48	Develop implementation plan for completing sidewalks, bike projects, and greenways by 2010	Several MPO member organizations, e.g., City of Durham and Town of Chapel Hill, have or are developing bicycle and pedestrian implementation plans.
49	Use widened travel lanes in place of striped bicycle lanes for safety advantages	Environmental and design processes determine ultimate design, not long-range plan. These comments have been forwarded to MPO bicycle planner for consideration in design plans.
50	Need to identify and consider pedestrian and bicycle networks that are disrupted by high vehicle congestion	Congestion is an important factor in the prioritization and design of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This factor can be explored in the long-range plan update.
	Financial	
52	Pursue dedicated funding for transit and non-motorized transportation	Area transit operators receive dedicated transit funding. MPO dedicates STP-DA funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects; otherwise, there are no dedicated sources for bicycle and pedestrian (i.e., only competitive grants).
39	Set aside minimum of 8% funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects	Bicycle and pedestrian projects receive 2% of available plan funding – this proportion is high compared to most MPO long-range plans.
53	Pursue high occupancy vehicle lanes and tolls on I-40	DCHC MPO, CAMPO and NCDOT are committed to initiating a funding study for I-40 HOV.
54	Express pay lanes should be considered for High Occupancy Vehicle lanes	DCHC MPO, CAMPO and NCDOT are committed to initiating a funding study for I-40 HOV.
55	Impact fees for transportation is low – need to increase the fees	The N.C. General Assembly and local elected officials control the rate and assessment guidelines for impact fees.
56	Use Certificates of Participation (COP) or State/local reimbursement agreements to finance needed highway projects	In a few cases, local governments in the MPO have advanced funding to the State to move up project construction.
57	Give priority to user fees when considering financing options	2030 LRTP identifies gas tax and vehicle registration fee, which are user fees to varying degrees.

Durham
Chapel Hill
Carrboro



metropolitan
Planning Organization

