

## 2035 LRTP COMMENTS

Comment	Response
<p>I saw one sentence that requires correction, in reference to Power Bill Funds on page 95:</p> <p><b>10.1.7 Powell Bill Funds</b>  <i>Powell Bill funds are funds that are annually provided to municipalities that maintain NCDOT roads within their jurisdictions.</i></p> <p>In accordance with DOT guidance literature (<a href="http://www.ncdot.org/programs/Powell%20Bill/">http://www.ncdot.org/programs/Powell Bill/</a>), Powell Bill funds cannot be used for the "construction, maintenance or repair on State Primary Highways, State Secondary Roads or Private Streets."</p> <p>For a simple fix, it may be more correct to substitute "local" roads for "NCDOT" roads.</p>	<p>The recommended changes/corrections will be made.</p>
<p><a href="#">Click here to see attached CMP Comments</a></p>	<p>Most of the CMP comments from Mr. Loyd represent corrections to be made in the text. Other issues may need more discussion which can occur as MUMPO continues to refine the CMP portion of the Plan.</p>
<p>I've been pondering the NC 115 descriptions in the LRTP for several weeks. I could swear that as NC 115 came up during the half-day LRTP meetings for N Meck last year, I made it pretty clear that 115 should not be widened north of our boundary with Cornelius//Potts Street. The Town has always advocated that the highway should remain 2 lanes with bike lanes where feasible. However, the description shows 4 lanes all the way to the Iredell Co line.</p> <p>I am not sure how to handle the situation going forward. I am pretty certain that the Town would not want the LRTP to include this description, in the strange event the state finds the funding and it falls into the TIP as currently described. However, we know we will require all (and more) of the funding currently allocated to NC 115 to effectively manage congestion and safety allong the corridor. We had discussed the concept of using two parallel, 2-lane roads to proxy for a 4-lane NC 115.</p> <p>I'd like to propose that we amend the current draft LRTP to describe the section of NC 115 north of Potts Street as "two parallel roads, marked, undivided two-lanes, bike lanes", and maintain the existing level of funding (\$41 million). I am not proposing that we change any of the maps until the LRTP is revisited again next year.</p> <p>I feel that it is my responsibility to do everything I can to correct this description as soon as possible.</p>	<p>NC 115 was modeled as a two-lane roadway in the area noted in the comment. The LRTP will be corrected.</p>
<p>The following comments pertain to Potter Road:</p> <p>The document lists US 74 as project starting point. This is Stallings Rd not Potter Rd. Potter Rd does not start until Old Monroe Rd. Is US 74 the starting point or Old Monroe Rd?</p> <p>Town of Stallings does not support left turn restrictions on Stallings Rd and/or Potter Rd. The Town does not want medians to limit left turns.</p> <p>The left turn restriction and medians conflicts with the current Downtown Overlay (in the Land Usage Ordinance) and the new Downtown Master Plan concept along Potter Rd between Old Monroe Rd and Pleasant Plains Rd.</p>	<p>The comments are specifically in reference to the Congestion Management portion of the LRTP.</p> <p>The starting point is 74. The the matrix will be corrected to state "Stallings Road/Potter Road."</p> <p>The CMP doesn't mandate construction of any particular tool, and in this case, it wouldn't do so for the entire length of the corridor</p> <p>The CMP doesn't mandate construction of any particular tool, and in this case, it wouldn't do so for the entire length of the corridor</p>

## 2035 LRTP COMMENTS

Comment	Response
<p>The Public Transportation section needs to be modified to include two changes:</p> <p><b>The following should be placed in Section 11.2.2 as a separate paragraph after the paragraph devoted to the Countywide Transit Services Plan Enhanced Bus Service</b>, similar to the current Sprinter service on Wilkinson Blvd., will be studied and considered along various high volume transit corridors such as Route 9 (Central Ave.), Route 7 (Beatties Ford Rd.) and others. These services are best suited for routes in corridors with high existing ridership, significant potential to attract new choice riders and multiple and/or significant origin/destination nodes.</p> <p><b>The following should be placed in Section 11.2.1 as a separate bullet point after the section regarding Fixed-Route Service Enhanced Bus Service</b></p> <p>Enhanced Bus Service In September 2009, CATS introduced Sprinter, an enhanced bus service that provides a direct connection from Center City Charlotte to the Charlotte Douglas International Airport. Enhanced bus service includes several passenger amenities such as frequent service (20 minutes on weekdays, 30 minutes nights and weekends), efficient stop locations and signature shelters. The service uses specially-designed hybrid fueled buses and is branded as a specialized service with a different logo and paint scheme.</p> <p><b>Enhanced Bus Service</b>, similar to the current Sprinter service on Wilkinson Blvd., will be studied and considered along various high volume transit corridors such as Route 9 (Central Ave.), Route 7 (Beatties Ford Rd.) and others. These services are best suited for routes in corridors with high existing ridership, significant potential to attract new choice riders and multiple and/or significant origin/destination nodes.</p>	<p>The transit related corrections will be made.</p>
<p>Attached is a memo prepared by NCTA that outlines the updated design concept and scope for the Gaston East-West Connector that should be incorporated into the 2035 LRTP.</p> <p><a href="#">Click here to see attached Memo</a></p>	<p>The description reflect the NCTA's comments.</p>
<p>In looking through the LRTP, I came across the Congested Hot Spots list, but I don't understand several of the entries. I have attached and marked them.</p> <p>With regard to Weddington Rd- a better entry might say S. Trade Street from Weddington Rd to Sadie (well John St. really).</p> <p>On the Sam Newell entry- Sam Newell at the present does not connect to Krefeld or Arequipa. If there's a Congestion Hot spot, it's at Sam Newell and Independence Blvd.</p> <p><a href="#">Click here to see Congested Hot Spots List</a></p>	<p>The corrections will be made.</p> <p>The corrections will be made.</p>
<p><b>Verhoeff Drive Grade Separation at NS RR (Coxe)</b> A suggestion was made to add the project as a safety improvement.</p>	<p>This project does not have to be added to the LRTP because it is a safety project.</p>
<p><b>NC115 in Davidson: Potts Road to the County Line (Blackburn)</b> There is a discrepancy in the LRTP's description of the project (#3191).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table A-1 describes the project as a 2-lane facility</li> <li>Table 11-4 describes the project as a 4-lane facility</li> </ul> <p>What is in the network, 2-lane or 4-lane? Davidson would like the project shown as a 2-lane facility.</p>	<p>See NC 115 comment above.</p>
<p><b>NC 115 Two-Way Pair (Coxe)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project removed from project list at November MPO meeting; Huntersville may want it placed back on the list.</li> <li>Project not modeled.</li> </ul>	<p>This project cannot be added to the project list without delaying the adoption of the plan and making a conformity determination.</p>
<p><b>Exit 28 interchange (I-4733) (Shah)</b></p>	

## 2035 LRTP COMMENTS

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cornelius may want to pursue stimulus funding for the project.</li> <li>• Possibly switch TIP funds from ROW to Construction.</li> <li>• Project in 2025 HY; would it have to be in 2015 HY in order to receive stimulus funding?</li> <li>• Is the project regionally significant? Confirm with Loretta.</li> </ul>	Pending
<b>Transit Map (Steinman)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map submitted by CATS is wrong.</li> <li>• Projects shown to be done in wrong horizon year.</li> <li>• Andy to work with Nick Map will be submitted to Keith.</li> </ul>	The map will be corrected.
<b>Chapter 7-CMP (Grzyski)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to produce figures 7-2 and 7-3 in color.</li> </ul>	Both figures will be in color in the final LRTP.
<b>Northcross Drive Extension (Coxe)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion: Change project description to “end of Northcross Drive to Westmoreland Road.”</li> </ul>	Based upon an email from Hemal Shah, Town of Cornelius transportation planner, the description will read: North Cross Extension, from end of Northcross Dr. to Westmoreland Rd..
<b>Introduction-Page 1-5; Section 1.2 Transportation Policy Boards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to add the following to the second to last sentence in the final paragraph of the section entitled “Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “and by integrating the land development pattern with the transportation system.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The recommended text will be added.
<b>Goals &amp; Objectives: Financial Objective-Page 2-4</b> Add the following text as a fourth objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster innovative financing and partnership opportunities for project development and implementation</li> </ul>	A fourth objective will be added.
<b>Security: Section 5.3-Planning Factors and Section 6.2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggestion was made to consider security in the design and location of facilities/projects?</li> </ul>	This will be considered in the next LRTP.
<b>Planning Factors 5.7-Safety Management System</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does CDOT compile crash data throughout Mecklenburg County or just Charlotte?</li> </ul>	Andy Grzyski will look into this and the text will be amended if necessary.
<b>Conclusion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was recommended that maintenance be discussed in the Conclusion</li> </ul>	Tim Gibbs prepare text that will address maintenance.
<b>Planning Factors 5.8-Preservation of the Existing System</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was recommended that access management be referenced.</li> </ul>	Bill Coxe will prepare the necessary text.
<b>CMP, Page 7-7, Hot Spots</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to drop the phrase “as a result of poor signal timing” from the third sentence of this section.</li> </ul>	The phrase will be removed.
<b>CMP, Page 7-11</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to place the paragraph entitled “Integration of CMP into LRTP . . .” in the “The 2012 Update to the MUMPO . . .” section immediately below.</li> </ul>	The paragraph’s location will be shifted and the necessary tense changes made.
<b>Section 8.5 Future Issues-Climate change</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to add “connectivity” as an option in the “Reduce growth in VMT” strategy.</li> </ul>	“Connectivity” will be added.
<b>Page 8-10: #3-Connectivity Policy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ replace “The City of Charlotte has established”, with</li> <li>○ “Many communities have established”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The change will be made.
<b>Section 8.5 Future Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to rephrase the sentence preceding “#1 Fast Lanes Study to read</li> </ul>	The change will be made.

## 2035 LRTP COMMENTS

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "MUMPO and its partners have implemented a variety of actions that could reduce GHG emissions."</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Page 8-10 Greenhouse Gases</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to modify the phrasing of the first paragraph for clarity.</li> </ul>	<p>The text will be modified for clarity (it will not affect content).</p>
<p><b>Section 10.1.5-Financial Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to rephrase the fourth sentence because it suggests incorrectly that the Huntersville and Matthews bonds have been used largely on municipal streets.</li> </ul>	<p>Andy Grzynski will prepare alternate text.</p>
<p><b>Appendix C-2: CMP Hot Spots</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion was to review the Hot Spots list for accuracy.</li> </ul>	<p>Bob Cook will review and make any necessary changes.</p>
<p>It would have been helpful to include a note in the letter of transmittal that there was an error in the report. I refer to the widening of 115 to 4 lanes from Bailey Road to the county line.</p>	<p>The error was not discovered until after the draft was released.</p>
<p>Given the need for alternative routes to I-77, why is widening Hwy-21 to 4 lanes not a higher priority than widening 115? I have heard a reason, but the measurement methods are unknown.</p>	<p>US 21 did not score as high, and it does not provide for a continuous through movement as does NC 115.</p>
<p>The screening process does not show any details and I cannot tell if there is any weighting applied to the factors involved.</p>	<p>Appendix A-1 provides the complete ranking methodology. Weighting is not applied to any of the criteria.</p>
<p>Screening is usually the term applied to a first step. Is there another ranking step and is it available to the public?</p>	<p>A screening process takes place at the beginning of the process by virtue of nominated projects being limited to those roadways that are a part of MUMPO's Thoroughfare Plan</p>
<p>Each horizon year characterizes projects by "regionally significant" or not. How does that factor in the ranking? If a "Yes" is considered good, there is a problem (see below).</p>	<p>A project being classified as "regionally significant" is not a factor in project ranking.</p>
<p>The Westmoreland Road/I-77 interchange and four associated projects have a total cost of \$60 million. This proposal has been rejected by citizens, transportation experts, and MUMPO three times in the past 20 years. I understand the bias introduced by a developer stating that it will not cost taxpayers, even though that is not true. But I do not understand the logic of showing this project as funded by the state (taxpayers) since MUMPO is aware it will <u>negatively impact</u> a "regionally significant" roadway.</p>	<p>The projects referred to are all shown as being funded by "Local" sources.</p>
<p>Removal of the above projects would free the \$60 million to move many needed projects up to the 2015 horizon year.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Are the projects (Interchange improvements) to connect the ramps at Exits 23 and 25 to Hwy-21 on another list? If not, those projects need to be advanced.</p>	<p>Exit 25 modifications were nominated for inclusion in the Plan and were ranked but were not included in the financially constrained Plan; exit 23 modifications were not nominated and therefore were not ranked.</p>
<p>Gilead Road/Reames Road Extension/W T Harris Extension is not shown in any horizon. This road has been on the plans since 1985. It is needed now and will alleviate the heavy nonlocal traffic currently passing through the Hwy-73/I-77 interchange. Even with the current plans at Exit 25 (widening and no left turns), that interchange will fail. How is the proposed extension ranked completely off the chart?</p>	<p>The project was ranked in several sections for potential inclusion in the LRTP. None of the sections ranked high enough for the project, in whole or in part, to be included in the financially-constrained network.</p>
<p>The proposed two-way pair through Huntersville is costly and requires the taking of a significant amount of property for roundabouts. If built, the project will eventually be a two-way <u>6-lane</u> highway. With commercial development occurring along the corridor, each new business is expected to provide a left turn lane. At the limit, the left turn lane will extend the length of the road - therefore three lanes each way. The total cost will be even higher than the \$18 million shown in the plan. There is a better, less costly, and more effective way - a one-way pair. Existing 115 would be southbound and the new eastern path would be northbound. There would be no need for turn lanes in a one-way road. There would be no need for a roundabout and the associated condemnation of land. The opposition to a one-way pair has come from existing retail property owners who fear loss of business (doubtful since drivers can easily shop when driving in the direction most convenient for a stop). I know Bill Coxe leans toward the two-way pair, but I keep trying to change his mind.</p>	<p>The two-way pair proposal was removed from the project list at the request of Huntersville's MPO representative and with the assent of the full MPO. If the Town is agreeable, alternative concepts may be considered as a part of the next LRTP or as an amendment to this one.</p>

## 2035 LRTP COMMENTS

Comment	Response
Very pleased to see no tentative plan for a bridge, vehicular or pedestrian, that would connect Huntingtowne Farms Lane with Starmount subdivision. Neither Starmount nor Huntingtowne Farms desires such a plan, as it would split our neighborhoods in half.	No MUMPO or City of Charlotte plans indicate connecting the two neighborhoods referenced in the comment.