

CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/14/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Email Return of Questionnaire, Debra Campbell

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview?

RESPONSE: In terms of land use and growth management, the City updated the Centers Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework in August 2010. The "Centers and Corridors" development framework was originally introduced in 1994 and is the City of Charlotte's adopted overarching policy for organizing and guiding growth and development. The updated framework broadens the original transportation oriented focus to include other aspects of planning and development, such as public facility needs and environmental concerns. The update also provides more specific definitions and guidance for Centers and Corridors and expands the concept to provide recommendations for Wedges, as well. Visit our website for more information on the policy

at <http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/planning/AreaPlanning/CentersCorridorsWedges/Pages/Home.aspx>

2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census?

RESPONSE: The Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) is working to expand its planning area boundary in response to the 2010 Census data. The Census Bureau released its 2010 urban area information in March 2012, and the impacts on MUMPO were significant. The Charlotte urbanized area (UZA) increased in population from 758,927 in 2000, to 1,249,442 in 2010, and its land area increased from 435 square miles to 741 square miles. The significance of this expansion is that UZAs are the minimum area for which an MPO is required to implement the metropolitan planning process. For more information, visit <http://www.mumpo.org/>.

3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.

RESPONSE: Links to policy updates and documents are provided in the table below.

4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how?

RESPONSE: Water Quality Buffer Guidelines were revised in October 2011 and the Floodplain Regulations were updated in June 2012. For additional information, please contact Rusty Rozzelle with the Storm Water Services Department at 704.336-5449.

5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects?

RESPONSE: Below is a summary table of the development activity within the Southeast Corridor Area. More specific data can be found on our website at www.planning.org or contacting Evan Lowry for the GIS data at 704.336-8323.



Acrobat Document

Summary of Development Data

6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?

RESPONSE: No significant growth changes are expected for this area.

7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
- a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector?

RESPONSE: Long-term land use and transportation growth projections within the MUMPO Long-Range Transportation Plan include the Monroe Connector.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community?

- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis?

RESPONSE: No.

9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations?

RESPONSE: No changes to long-term growth expectations other than growth in the shorter term is expected to be slower than originally anticipated. Please contact Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utilities at 704-399-2221 for more detailed information about utility infrastructure capacity.

10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox?
- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances?

- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans?

RESPONSE: Many of the principles within the “Green Growth Toolbox” are incorporated into The Environment Chapter of the General Development Policies ([click here GDPs](#)) which are used to develop our land use plans and other development regulations.

Our department is currently in the process of assessing and reorganizing our current Zoning Ordinance to respond to the rapid growth in our community and to provide for more sustainable development. This process is an opportunity to consider “Green Growth Toolbox” principles.

Table 1. List of Local Plans and Policies Collected for ICE Reports

Jurisdiction	Document	Year
Goose Creek Watershed	Site Specific Water Quality Management Plan for the Goose Creek Watershed	2009
City of Charlotte	Zoning Ordinance (City of Charlotte)	2009
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	Tree Ordinance (Update)	2010
	Independence Boulevard Area Plan	2011
	Centers Corridors and Wedges Growth Framework	2010
	Zoning Ordinance	Updated 2008
	East District Future Land Use Map	Adopted 2007
	Adopted Area Plan Infrastructure Implementation Recommendations	2007
City of Monroe	Land Development Plan	Last Modified
	Stormwater Management Ordinance	Modified 2007
	Zoning Code (Floodplain Permits)	Modified 2008
	City of Monroe Code of Ordinances	1994
	City of Monroe, Downtown Master Plan	2008
Town of Indian Trail	Unified Development Ordinance	2008
	The Villages of Indian Trail – A Plan for Managed Growth and Livability	2005
	Downtown Master Plan	2006
	Post Construction Storm Water Ordinance	2007
Town of Unionville	Zoning Ordinance	Adopted
	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2006
Town of Fairview	Land Development Plan	Adopted 2005
	Flood Plain Ordinance	Modified 2009
	Land Use Ordinance	Adopted 2005
Town of Stallings	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2009
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2008
Town of Mint Hill	Zoning Ordinance	Minor
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2007
	Comprehensive Transportation Plan	2008
Town of Marshville	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2007
	Land Use Plan	2004

Jurisdiction	Document	Year
Town of Wingate	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2008
Towns of Marshville and Wingate	Strategic Plan for Economic Development, Town of Marshville, Town of Wingate	2008
Town of Weddington	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2006
	Temporary Development Ordinance	Adopted 2008
Village of Wesley Chapel	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2003
	Floodplain and Stormwater Ordinance	Adopted 2005
	Village of Wesley Chapel Land Use Plan	2003
City of Matthews	Zoning Code	Modified 2008
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2007
Union County	Land Use Plan Map	Updated 2006
	Zoning Map	Updated 2007
	Comprehensive Plan Update: Transportation Analysis and Strategies	2008a
	Land Use Ordinance	2008b
	2009 Draft Comprehensive Plan	2009
Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO)	2030 Long Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination	2007
	2035 Draft Long Range Transportation Plan	2009
NCDENR	Site Specific Water Quality Management Plan for the Goose Creek Watershed	2009
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Division of Water Quality (NCDENR-DWQ)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit System Permit Number NCS000395 (Mecklenburg County and the Towns of Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville, Matthews, Mint Hill, and Pineville Jurisdictional Areas)	2005
NCDOT	Marshville Comprehensive Transportation Plan Study	2009a
Town of Matthews	Downtown Matthews Master Plan and Design Guidelines	1997
	Subdivision Ordinance	2003
	Zoning and Post Construction Ordinances	Undated
Villages of Marvin and Wesley Chapel, Towns of Waxhaw and Weddington, and Centralina Council of Governments	Western Union County Local Area Regional Transportation Plan	2009

TOWN OF FAIRVIEW PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/11/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Date, Type, & Contact Person: 9/11/2012, Phone Interview with Ed Humphries, Land Use Administrator

Baker Attendees: Kristi Suggs & Heath Caldwell

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? _____
Updates/amendments have been made to the Land Use Ordinance see web link listed in Question # 3.
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? No it wasn't available when changes were made.
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
1.) Land Use Ordinance amendment link: <http://fairviewnc.gov/land%20use.htm> 2.) Land Use Revised Map (2010) see link: <http://fairviewnc.gov/LandUse/FutureLandUseMap.pdf>
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? No developments have been approved or proposed since 2008. Most likely due to lack of utilities (water/sewer). However, Union County is proposing to implement sewer at the NC601 and NC218 intersection and the Town has initiated the planning phase for a downtown business plan.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
Amendments only see Question #3.
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? Changes do not reflect bypass.
8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? Growth is anticipated to continue to be slow. The Town feels that the bypass will impact their future growth, but are unsure at this time of how it will affect them. Currently Hwy 218 is often used to bypass the traffic congestion along Hwy 74 in Union County. The implementation of the bypass would provide another alternative around the Hwy 74 municipal corridors. Its

implementation may divert travelers along Hwy 218 to use the bypass; however, the toll on the bypass may deter some from its use and opt for Hwy 218. Also,

- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? Yes
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Union County is proposing to add a sewer treatment plant in the downtown area of Fairview to provide sewer to the intersection of NC601 and NC218 for limited commercial development. See Union Cnty Comprehensive Water and Wastewater Master Plan.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
 - a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No, but would use it if needed.
 - b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Have incorporated clustering for areas where higher density residential is allowed; however, the subdivision would need to provide sewer, otherwise lots must be at least one acre for septic.
 - c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Would favor this type of development if it would be feasible.

SEE UNION COUNTY FOR GIS INFORMATION.

TOWN OF MARSHVILLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/12/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Amanda Reid, Town Manager & Diane Dil, Centralina COG Planner

Meeting Place: Town of Marshville, NC: Town Hall

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? Sidewalk Implementation along Hwy. 74 corridor – approved in 2012. Infrastructure Development Plan for implementation by FY2014 (Attached map shows current system. Upgrades in capacity and connection would move toward surround areas and Bypass, see #9 for additional information.)
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? _____
MUMPO Urbanized Area Plan now includes Marshville based on 2010 Census. See link: [http://www.mumpo.org/PDFs/Resources/MUMPO Urbanized Area.pdf](http://www.mumpo.org/PDFs/Resources/MUMPO_Urbanized_Area.pdf)
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
Updates to zoning plan (see attached GIS shapefiles) otherwise no updates applicable to planning, natural resources, etc.
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No.

5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? Subdivision – Gulf Bay Estates (E. Union & Brewer St.)

6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No.

7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
No.

- a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? Current Land Use Plan does not include the Bypass; however, when

revised it is anticipated that the Bypass will be reviewed and it is possible that a Bypass Corridor Plan may be proposed.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? MUMPO is revising the Urbanized Area Map to include Marshville. See link [http://www.mumpo.org/PDFs/Resources/MUMPO Urbanized Area.pdf](http://www.mumpo.org/PDFs/Resources/MUMPO%20Urbanized%20Area.pdf) and <http://www.mumpo.org/mpo-planning-area-boundary-expansion>
- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? It is foreseen that the implementation of the Bypass will not affect the implementation of Marshville into the MPO. However, future growth in Marshville is dependent upon the implementation of the Bypass. The Bypass would provide a more direct route that would offer residents the ability to commute to Charlotte and surrounding towns for work. Also it would open up the possibility of industrial/commercial/business development because of the increased accessibility that is currently restricted due to congestion along Hwy 74.
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Marshville is currently working to assess and update their long term infrastructure plan. Marshville currently purchases its water from Anson County and its sewer capacity from both Anson and Union Counties. Marshville is hoping to increase capacity through upgrades and additional infrastructure, as well as address aging infrastructure. The implementation of the Bypass would create a priority for the Town to increase their capacity requirements. However, if it was not implemented, it is foreseen that the upgrades and capacity increases would still be needed, but would not be a priority. Addressing aging infrastructure would then become the priority.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No, but interested.
- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? No.
- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? It is possible, but would be dependent on cost/benefit/ and priorities of the Town.

TOWN OF MATTHEWS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/10/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Kathi Ingrish, Planning Director

Meeting Place: Town of Matthews, NC: Town Hall – Planning Department

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? Matthews developed an Economic Development Program and approved an Economic Development Incentive Grants Policy in 2012. - <http://www.matthewsnc.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=0ys-IUU48Us%3d&tabid=290>. A draft Downtown Master Plan has been proposed and should go to Council in 2013 for approval. The draft document is located at <http://www.matthewsnc.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=T9I7O9MFCXo%3d&tabid=106>. The Zoning Ordinance is being revised into a Unified Development Ordinance. The draft chapters are located: <http://www.matthewsnc.com/Departments/PlanningandDevelopment.aspx>
A draft land use plan has been proposed and should go to council for approval in 2013. The draft document is located <http://www.matthewsnc.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=MXdR6YzUJL0%3d&tabid=106>

2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? _____
The Draft Land Use Plan references the 2010 Census information.

3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
PCCO – Redevelopment of existing built upon area established prior to 1979 was exempt from the implementation of stormwater detention; however, this has been amended to include existing built upon area established prior to 1990.

- CATS/Lynx Line: In 2011, the Southeast Transit Corridor along Independence Blvd to I-485 in Matthews was revised (see the Independence Boulevard Area Plan <http://www.charmeck.org/Planning/Land%20Use%20Planning/IndependenceBlvd/Adopted Plan.pdf>). As result the center rapid transit lane will no longer continue east past Crownpoint Executive Dr. into Matthews to I-485. Currently CharMeck, NCDOT and Matthews are in discussion of how to best provide alternative transit to ease congestion along Independence. Currently the rapid transit outlook for implementation into Matthews is undecided.

4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? Mecklenburg County is in the process of updating the FEMA maps (anticipated for implementation in 2013). Currently, the Town of Matthews is waiting to see how the County plans to implement the updates in the revised Floodplain Ordinance. Mecklenburg County hosted an Open House for municipalities on Sept. 19th and is hosting a one for the general public on Sept. 26th.

5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? 1. Economic Development Program has been approved to implement an Incentive Grant Policy to encourage business relocation and/or expansion (See <http://matthewsnc.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=0ys-IUU48Us%3d&tabid=290>) 2. Crestdale Neighborhood Project (See attached Power Point) 3. Zoning Ordinance revisions see website link <http://matthewsnc.gov/Departments/PlanningandDevelopment/CurrentItems.aspx>, <http://matthewsnc.gov/Departments/PlanningandDevelopment/PendingZoningActions.aspx>, & <http://matthewsnc.gov/Departments/PlanningandDevelopment/PendingZoningActions/CompletedZoningActions.aspx> 4. Liberty Health Senior Retirement Community at I-485 & Hwy 74. 5. JCPenney at Windsor Sq. on Independence (Fall 2012) 6. Proposed Harris Teeter Corp. Center on 15 acres between Matthews and Mint Hill. 7. Sports Plex will (http://matthewsnc.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QTrV-4S_00A%3d&tabid=222). Additional Projects see <http://matthewsnc.gov/TownGovernment/OngoingProjects.aspx>
-
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No.
-
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
Yes, see above.
-
- a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? Plans reflect the implementation of the Monroe Bypass but are likely to still be incorporated even if the Bypass is not built.
-
8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? _____
Focus on denser growth along Independence, the implementation of roadway connectivity to provide alternative routes to ease congestion on Ind. Blvd. and to reduce emergency vehicle response times, and provide rapid transit alternatives within community and into CharMeck.
- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? These changes are currently needed and are to be implemented with or without the Bypass; however, if the Bypass is built the connection at I-485 will cut off Independence Commerce Drive and connectivity to Steven's Mill Rd for EMS. The connection cut off will increase the priority level for implementation of connectivity in this area.
-
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Implementation of a pump station on the north side of Independence to provide services for the proposed Retirement Community at I-485 & Hwy 74. The health care facility is paying to implement the facility to serve their community and the surrounding area of Crooked Creek. The facility is to be adopted and maintained by CharMeck Utilities.
-
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)

- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No.
-
- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Not formally, but authorized the implementation of alternative pavement to be implemented at fire station. See Meck County for PCCO provisions and SWIM buffers
-
- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? See Meck County. Would like to implement and adopt some standards into the Zoning Ordinance.
-

TOWN OF MINT HILL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/14/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with John Hoard, Planner

Meeting Place: Town of Mint Hill, NC: Town Hall – Planning Department

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? No.
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? No
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
1.) Consolidated land use, zoning, PCCO, ESC, etc into a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) in 2011 (see link: [http://nc-minthill2.civicplus.com/documents/9/Mint%20Hill%20UDO%20\(Pre-Formatted%20version%20\)%20revised%2010-28-2011.PDF](http://nc-minthill2.civicplus.com/documents/9/Mint%20Hill%20UDO%20(Pre-Formatted%20version%20)%20revised%2010-28-2011.PDF)) 2.) Lawyers Road and I-485 Small Area Plan was adopted by Board in 2011. (See link: <http://www.minthill.com/index.aspx?NID=329>) 3.) Pedestrian Master Plan adopted in 2011 (see link: http://www.minthill.com/documents/53/Mint%20Hill%20Pedestrian%20Plan_Final%20Adopted.PDF)
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? Mecklenburg County now administers the Goose Creek Management Plan.
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? 1.) Proposed mall complex to be implemented in 2014. See Small Area Plan (Question #3) for Mall location 2.) Small scale Corporate Center (See Small Area Plan for concept) east of I-485 along Allen Black Road – currently no sewer or water in area and without them it is not feasible.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
1.) No, See Question #3
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? The existing land use plan does not consider the implementation of the bypass and its implementation would not have any effect on the plan either.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? _____

Implementation of the mall in the Small Area Plan could increase growth in the area.

- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? No.

9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Mecklenburg County is proposing to add water and sewer (see Mecklenburg County's Master Plan) in areas of the proposed small scale corp center as well as other areas, within the next 10 yrs. The proposed mall (See small area plan) is going to implement its own utilities.

10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)

- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? Yes, has reviewed it.

- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? LID policies are incorporated through the Meck Co. PCCO

- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? N/A

CITY OF MONROE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/11/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Doug Britt, Senior Planner

Meeting Place: City of Monroe, NC: Town Hall – Planning Department

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? 1.) Lake Twitty Buffer rules (See Question #4) 2.) US 74 Corridor Revitalization Plans (see Question #3)
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? Not at this point. The City is currently looking at development and settlement patterns based on the 2010 Census Data, but the analysis has not been completed.
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
1.) Stormwater Mgmt – Updates to NPDES Phase II Permit 2.) Zoning Ordinance Revisions (2010) (see link: <http://wwwnew.monroenc.org/services.php?cat=269>) 3. Updates to Flood Damage Prevention in Zoning Ordinance – (2009) 3.) US 74 Corridor Revitalization Plan is in planning stage and likely to be adopted by Monroe in 2013. Plan was initiated because of the proposed implementation of the Bypass. The City does not think that the Plan would be applicable without the implementation of the Bypass. (see link: <http://www.us74corridor.com/>)
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? Lake Twitty Buffer is currently being reevaluated for possible revisions. A study committee has been established to look at other sources of water contamination besides waterfront property. Current buffer requirement is 35-LF from high water mark.
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? No major residential developments have been approved. Conditional District developments are attached. The ones that are highlighted are new commercial developments or major expansions.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how? Probably slower than expected in 2009; however, growth forecasts and pattern studies have not been completed. Census data from 2000 and 2010 show higher growth rates in the western part of the County than in Monroe.
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009? No. City is completing the US-74 Corridor Revitalization Plan
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? It assumes that the Monroe Connector will be built.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? _____

The City anticipates fewer subdivisions. The City is now requiring a Conditional District rezoning approval for all new subdivisions.

- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? No difference because the requirement is independent of the bypass' implementation.
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? No changes. Planning staff anticipates that growth patterns will be similar with low-density residential and commercial properties at intersections. Key growth determinants are the availability of water and sewer, not the bypass.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? Not at this point.
- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Not at this point.
- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Would like to incorporate but have not looked into it yet.

TOWN OF STALLINGS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/14/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Brian Matthews, Town Manager and Lynne Hair, Town Planner

Meeting Place: Town of Stallings, NC: Town Hall

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? No

2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? UDO see Question #3.

3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.

Unified Development Ordinance was adopted in 2012 and zoning classifications have been updated to reflect the UDO.

http://www.stallingsnc.org/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC={EAFB9747-6826-4F31-A906-A92106F4A745}) PCCO was updated in 2010. (See link: <http://www.stallingsnc.org/vertical/Sites/%7B052C66EC-317E-4C0C-8034-D2D91E376211%7D/uploads/%7B8FB70B1A-5CF9-431E-AE96-CC7046981817%7D.PDF>)

4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No. But the Goose creek Water Quality Recovery Program Plan for fecal coliform TMDL was revised in 2010 (see link: <http://www.stallingsnc.org/vertical/Sites/%7B052C66EC-317E-4C0C-8034-D2D91E376211%7D/uploads/%7BDDCE5BCD-6CE2-4165-8630-F985790B9AE6%7D.PDF>)

5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? Two residential developments and a small scale commercial development are proposed: the 2nd Phase of Fairhaven to begin soon with a new developer at Stevens Mill Rd., 2nd Phase of Chestnut Place Subdivision, and 2nd phase of Shops at Chestnut Place on Matthews Weddington Rd. <http://gis2.stallingsnc.org/ZoningCases/>

6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?

Expect long term growth to continue but at a slower pace due to slow economy not bypass dependent. However, commercial property owners along 74 in the area of the proposed bypass seem to be in a holding phase while awaiting the outcome of the bypass and possible easement buyouts. Multiple owners are holding tax payments.

7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?

UDO see Question #3.

- a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? UDO assumes that the bypass will be built.
8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? 1.) US-74 Corridor Revitalization Study is underway and is a joint effort among the municipalities and County agencies. Study is along US-74 from I-485 through Monroe. 2.) Economic conditions have slowed growth.
- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? The proposed implementation of the bypass prompted the study. It is foreseen that the revitalization effort for Hwy 74 is not dependent upon the bypass; however, the implementation of the bypass would most likely make the need for the revitalization of US-74 a more significant priority.
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Town is to release an RFP for the preparation and mapping their stormwater inventory in the next couple of months. No new roads are proposed or being built; however, improvements are proposed for the intersection of Potter Rd and Old Monroe Rd to ease traffic congestion. Funding is in place.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No.
 - b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Not outside of what has been implemented in the revised PCCO.
 - c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Possible, but implementation would be in the future.

UNION COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Dates: 9/12/2012 & 9/19/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

- Meeting Date, Type, & Contact Person: 9/12/2012, Personal Interview with Amy Helms, Water and Land Resources Division Manager & Scott Huneycutt, Engineering Division Mgr.

Meeting Place: Union County Government Center, NC

- Meeting Date, Type, & Contact Person: 9/19/2012, Personal Interview Dick Black, Planning Director

Meeting Place: Union County Planning Dept., NC

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? 1.) Revised Floodplain Ordinance (2010) for Union County (see Land Use Ordinance sections 389 and 400A at http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/Planning/Documents/UC_LAND_USE_ORD.pdf) 2.) Water and Sewer Ordinance (2012) – (see http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/Ordinances/Volume4/Vol4_137-160.pdf) 3.) 2025 Comprehensive Plan (2010) <http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/Planning/Documents/2025CompPlan.pdf> 4.) US – 74 Revitalization Study (see link http://www.us74corridor.com/#!_page-0) 5.) Draft Carolina Thread Trail Master Plan for Union County and Participating Municipalities (2011) (See link: <http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/Planning/plans/CarolinaThreadTrail-UnionCountyDraftPlan.pdf>) 6.) In the process of rewriting the Zoning Ordinance and it is anticipated to be adopted in Dec. 2013.
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? Yes, the Water and Wastewater Comprehensive Master Plan
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
See Question #1. Additionally Union County Thoroughfare plan was not included, but was revised in 2004. <http://maps.co.union.nc.us/gis/standardmaps/thoroughfares.pdf>
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? Floodplain Ordinance revisions: see Question #1
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? 1.) No new subdivisions or non-residential developments except for a rezoning to implement an Asphalt Plant between Hwy 601 & Hwy 200, close to Rollins Rd. 2.) County is working with local towns to perform a joint planning initiative at the Bypass interchanges; however, there are no definite plans available at this time.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?

Water & Wastewater Master Plan used an approx. 2.5% growth projection. The updated Comprehensive Plan expectation was to slow growth so its outlook is most likely similar to what is currently expected if incorporating the current economic conditions.

7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
Yes. See #1. Legacy Park was not included in the Union County Master Plan. Its implementation is most likely dependent upon the implementation of the Bypass.

a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? The implementation of the Bypass was assumed. The County feels that its implementation will have a more direct effect on the surrounding towns due to its location within the municipalities' jurisdiction. However, they also feel that if the bypass is not implemented the area at interchange node #8 (in Union Co. jurisdiction) would be affected and would reduce growth in this area.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? 1.) Growth within the County and its municipalities is dependent on the availability to water and sewer. On Sept. 17, 2012, the County Commission lifted the requirements of the WW Allocation Plan from 2009 that limited infrastructure capacity. See <http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/publicinformation/News/2012/water%20policiy.pdf> and <http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/publicinformation/News/2012/sewer%20policiy.pdf> 2.) Municipalities along Hwy 74 are more interested in development and growth where the more rural towns to the West of the County, except for Waxhaw, seemed to be more focused on slowing/managing growth.

a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? Growth in the eastern part of the County, Wingate & Marshville, will definitely be limited without the implementation of the Bypass. Without the Bypass these areas will be less accessible and less attractive to growth and development. For the rest of the County, future growth would likely slow without the implementation of the bypass, but would be more dependent upon the availability of water and sewer.

9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Comprehensive Water and Wastewater Master Plan (2011) (See link: <http://www.co.union.nc.us/Portals/0/PublicWorks/Documents/UCComprehensiveWWMasterPlan.pdf>) See Question 8 also.

10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)

a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No.

b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Cluster development

- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Since currently in the process of rewriting the Zoning Ordinance it is likely that these principles will be incorporated.
-

SEE LINK FOR GIS UPDATES.

<http://www.co.union.nc.us/Departments/GISMaps/DownloadableData.aspx>

Table 1. List of Local Plans and Policies Collected for ICE Reports

Jurisdiction	Document	Year
Goose Creek Watershed	Site Specific Water Quality Management Plan for the Goose Creek Watershed	2009
City of Charlotte	Zoning Ordinance (City of Charlotte)	2009
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	Zoning Ordinance	Updated 2008
	East District Future Land Use Map	Adopted 2007
	Adopted Area Plan Infrastructure Implementation Recommendations	2007
City of Monroe	Land Development Plan	Last Modified
	Stormwater Management Ordinance	Modified 2007
	Zoning Code (Floodplain Permits)	Modified 2008
	City of Monroe Code of Ordinances	1994
	City of Monroe, Downtown Master Plan	2008
Town of Indian Trail	Unified Development Ordinance	2008
	The Villages of Indian Trail – A Plan for Managed Growth and Livability	2005
	Downtown Master Plan	2006
	Post Construction Storm Water Ordinance	2007
Town of Unionville	Zoning Ordinance	Adopted
	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2006
Town of Fairview	Land Development Plan	Adopted 2005
	Flood Plain Ordinance	Modified 2009
	Land Use Ordinance	Adopted 2005
Town of Stallings	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2009
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2008
Town of Mint Hill	Zoning Ordinance	Minor
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2007
	Comprehensive Transportation Plan	2008
Town of Marshville	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2007
	Land Use Plan	2004
Town of Wingate	Land Use Ordinance	Updated 2008
Towns of Marshville and Wingate	Strategic Plan for Economic Development, Town of Marshville, Town of Wingate	2008
Town of Weddington	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2006
	Temporary Development Ordinance	Adopted 2008

Jurisdiction	Document	Year
Village of Wesley Chapel	Land Use Plan	Adopted 2003
	Floodplain and Stormwater Ordinance	Adopted 2005
	Village of Wesley Chapel Land Use Plan	2003
City of Matthews	Zoning Code	Modified 2008
	Post Construction Ordinance	Adopted 2007
Union County	Land Use Plan Map	Updated 2006
	Zoning Map	Updated 2007
	Comprehensive Plan Update: Transportation Analysis and Strategies	2008a
	Land Use Ordinance	2008b
	2009 Draft Comprehensive Plan	2009
Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO)	2030 Long Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination	2007
	2035 Draft Long Range Transportation Plan	2009
NCDENR	Site Specific Water Quality Management Plan for the Goose Creek Watershed	2009
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Division of Water Quality (NCDENR-DWQ)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit System Permit Number NCS000395 (Mecklenburg County and the Towns of Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville, Matthews, Mint Hill, and Pineville Jurisdictional Areas)	2005
NCDOT	Marshville Comprehensive Transportation Plan Study	2009a
Town of Matthews	Downtown Matthews Master Plan and Design Guidelines	1997
	Subdivision Ordinance	2003
	Zoning and Post Construction Ordinances	Undated
Villages of Marvin and Wesley Chapel, Towns of Waxhaw and Weddington, and Centralina Council of Governments	Western Union County Local Area Regional Transportation Plan	2009

TOWN OF UNIONVILLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/11/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Sonya Gaddy, Land Use Administrator

Meeting Place: Town of Unionville, NC: Town Hall

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? No
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? No
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.

Land use Ordinance has been amended. A listing of the amendments is located: http://www.unionvillenc.com/Unionville_LUO_EXCEPT_Table_of_Uses_2012.pdf. They are listed in chronological order. Revised Table of Uses is located: http://www.unionvillenc.com/Unionville_Table_of_Uses_2012.pdf

4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No.
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? Only a few minor subdivisions of large parcels into 1 to 3 lots.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
Land Use Ordinance has been revised see #3. Future Land Use Map has been revised to expand future commercial area at major town intersections and a downtown area. Both commercial and downtown areas will be zoned as B2 and B4. See attached maps.
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? These areas of growth are not dependent on the Connector nor do they reflect future conditions with the Monroe Connector.
8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? No

- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? No difference.

9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? Unionville does not supply water or sewer to its residents. This is done by the County.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No
 - Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? The Town is focused on keeping growth within its jurisdiction on a more rural / low density residential scale. Therefore there may be low impact policies that mirror their growth model in place however, if was not specifically done to implement low impact design.
 - How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Doubtful unless it is already being implemented.

VILLAGE OF WESLEY CHAPEL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/12/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Josh Langen, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Meeting Place: Village of Wesley Chapel, NC: Town Hall

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? No.
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? No.
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.
1.) Currently updating the land use regulations, should go into effect in 2013. 2.) Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance – Sept 2009 (see link: <http://ci.wesley-chapel.nc.us/vertical/sites/%7B1AD59A02-0FFA-4E56-AC61-69E74B4BE4D0%7D/uploads/%7B513CED6E-9189-4B42-939E-87BE2C4C2F54%7D.PDF>) 3.) Zoning Ordinance – Jan 2012 (see link: http://ci.wesley-chapel.nc.us/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC={BF55F5F6-009B-41A5-B267-1B80CD83B572}&DE={59F8B1C6-D960-4A28-A7C9-72B74B83CCF4}) 4.) Subdivision Ordinance – Nov 2011 (see link: http://ci.wesley-chapel.nc.us/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC={603B4986-6A11-4DB6-8F14-DF82F1E52684}&DE={EE63CE8B-C29F-4716-AC1D-FA5BDA5A784F}) 4.) Transportation Plan – Nov 2009 (see ftp site link)
4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No.
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? None in the Monroe Bypass study area.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
See Question #3.
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? Current Land Use Plan does not include the Bypass; however, it is unknown at this time whether or not the revised plan will include it.
8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? No.
 - a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? N/A

9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? No. (See Union County Plan)
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No
 - b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? No
 - c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Very high

TOWN OF WINGATE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Date: 9/6/2012

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis Update

Meeting Type & Contact Person: Personal Interview with Patrick Niland, Town Manager

Meeting Place: Town of Wingate, NC: Town Hall

Questions for Monroe Connector Planning Agencies:

1. The August 2009 interview covered land use and economic development trends, growth management and natural resource protection – in general, have any of these dynamics affecting future land use changed since the previous interview? No
2. Have any changes to future land use plans, transportation plans or other plans, policies or projections been made that incorporate information from the 2010 Census? No;
3. Have new or amended land use regulations been developed since August of 2009? Please see the list we have provided of documents we collected and reviewed during the previous environmental documentation effort. Are there any updates to those plans or regulations? If there have been any changes, please provide specific web link or a copy of the document.

The Town of Wingate is currently in the process of updating the existing land use plan with suggestions outlined in the “Wingate 2020 Plan: Comprehensive Plan and Concept Plan” that was finalized in 2010. http://wingate.govoffice.com/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC={5B007DF2-4E4D-417C-8EF6-B350DC723896}

4. Has the local regulation of natural resources (including stream buffers) changed since August 2009? If so, how? No
5. What can you tell us about any proposed or approved developments that have come to light since the August 2009 interviews? What information is available about any of these planned or approved developments that are not built yet? Can you provide any details and locations for these projects? The Wingate Mixed Used Center has been proposed and would be located on the southern side of the Monroe Connector at Interchange #7. The project is currently in the planning stage. A copy of the concept plan is attached. This project would likely not be implemented if the Connector was not constructed or the off-ramp at interchange #7 was not implemented.
6. Have long-term growth expectations changed since the previous interview and if so how?
No
7. Has the city/town/county updated its Comprehensive Plan or Land Use plan since August 2009?
The Comprehensive Plan was updated in 2010 and includes projections through 2020. See the following link <http://wingate.govoffice.com/vertical/sites/%7B97E181A6-5F3F-4B46-B6D8-5965A146C00C%7D/uploads/%7B0DB1E1AF-A103-4DCC-9B69-2E50719CFC1D%7D.PDF>
 - a. If so, does this updated plan reflect conditions in the future with or without the Monroe Connector? This Plan acknowledges that the Monroe Connector has been proposed and anticipates that it will be implemented. However, the plan highlights land use updates for the downtown area of Wingate, park and recreation facilities, and a commercial highway area. These updates are very likely to be implemented even if the connector is not.

8. We are reviewing and considering the predictions of future growth (2030 forecast year) included in the previous EIS. Are there any other factors that have changed since August 2009 that might affect the level of future growth and the location of that growth in your community? Wingate University has experienced increased growth and it is anticipated to continue with this trend. The increase in student enrollment and activity is currently putting increased pressures along US-74, since it is the main corridor for access to the University.
- a. Do these changes reflect the future with the Monroe Connector/Bypass, without the Monroe Connector/Bypass, or is there no difference on that basis? Without the Connector, congestion on US-74 will continue to increase within downtown area of Wingate.
9. Have there been any changes in capacity of utility infrastructure or expectations about the future capacity since the last round of interviews? Do any of those changes affect growth expectations? The implementation of utility infrastructure, including sewer, water, gas, and fiber optic has continued to increase. It is anticipated that the implementation of utility infrastructure will be focused to the north of the downtown area to the connector corridor. The implementation of infrastructure in this area is strategic for growth. However if the connector is not implemented, it is anticipated that growth and the implementation of infrastructure will still continue; however, it will decrease in scale and priority. Proposed sewer improvements / projects are outlined in the Water and Sewer Master. Mr. Niland will provide a copy of the plan.
10. Are you or other planners or development review staff familiar with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission "Green Growth Toolbox"? (<http://216.27.39.101/greengrowth/>)
- a. Have you attempted to implement any of the practices, ordinances or other policies recommended by the toolbox? No.
- b. Have you attempted to incorporate any other low-impact design type policies into zoning, subdivision or other land development ordinances? Yes, the existing Ordinance requires lower impacts to development through the implementation of cluster development and requirements for open space.
- c. How would you rate the likelihood of incorporating any low-impact design principles in future regulations or plans? Would likely increase the implementation as the Town's growth increases.

Mr. Niland stated that Wingate is currently in the planning process to implement a Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan. Also, GIS layers for the Comprehensive land use plan are available. Mr. Niland stated that he would have this information compiled onto a CD and mail it to the Charlotte Office.

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis

Meeting Date/Time: 6/19/2012, 2:30pm

Meeting Location: CDOT Offices, 7th Floor Small Conference Room

Attendees:

Anna Gallup – Program Manager, Metrolina Regional Model

Joe McLelland – Metrolina Regional Modeler

Martin Kinnamon – Metrolina Regional Modeler

Scudder Wagg - Baker Engineering

Lorna Parkins - Baker Engineering

Jamal Alavi – NCDOT, Transportation Planning Branch (by phone)

Meeting Notes:

Lorna began the meeting noting the unusual circumstances regarding the 4th Circuit Court ruling and that the focus of the meeting was to review in detail the process of developing the socioeconomic forecasts, in particular the travel time to employment factor, but also the general process and the level of involvement of the Expert Panel and others in determining the final forecasts. Lorna asked if the MUMPO staff were comfortable with how Baker staff had used the socioeconomic forecasts as a basis for the No Build Scenario given the inclusion of the Monroe Connector/Bypass project in the travel time to employment factor. Joe and Anna indicated that the effect of travel time on the allocation was negligible.

In discussing the overall process of developing the socioeconomic forecasts, Anna and Joe noted that they were the lead staff members at CDOT at the time the forecasts were developed and oversaw the contract that Paul Smith had to develop the bottom up forecasts. They were heavily involved in the review process of the forecasts and in reviewing the methodologies that Paul Smith was using.

Anna and Joe noted that the bottom up process went through multiple iterations of developing the land development factors, producing forecasts from them and then reviewing and adjusting those forecasts by the expert panels.

Anna and Joe noted as well that the land use modeling aspect of Paul Smith's work was intended to be a complete model that could be reused in future years to update and reassess bottom up forecasts as conditions changed, but the final model was never completed and the documentation of his process was never finalized due to schedule constraints and difficulties in automating many aspects of the process.

Additionally, they noted that the land use model was never calibrated to any historical data (such as 1990 to 2000 historical change at the census tract level).

The land use model used an ArcInfo GRID to develop the land development factors to provide a finer grain of detail than was possible at the TAZ polygon level. Parcel level data was used in Mecklenburg County and aerial imagery in Union County to populate some of the details for these GRIDs.

For the travel time to employment factor, Joe noted that the original intent was to use a gravity type model, where larger employment centers had a larger impact on the results. In the end, however, Paul Smith used an approach that only considered the nearest employment center, which meant that the travel time factor had a minimal impact on the overall results. Joe noted that the use of the nearest employment centers approach in calculating travel time meant that the effect of the Monroe Connector's inclusion in the roadway network would be very small, perhaps near zero for most TAZs, because the employment centers to which the travel times were calculated were all in or near Monroe, while the roadway project would bypass Monroe.

On the inputs to the travel time to employment factor, Joe noted that the input roadway network was based on a network that did not include the eastern portion of the Monroe Bypass. Paul Smith was responsible for travel time estimation beyond the border of the MUMPO travel demand model of the time period (2003-2004). MUMPO staff did provide speed values from their models which Mr. Smith applied to the roadway network he used to calculate the travel times. The 2010 forecast model was used to develop speeds for the 2010 and 2020 land use forecasting and the 2010 model did not include the Monroe Connector. The 2025 forecast model was used to develop speeds for the 2030 forecasts and this model did include the Monroe Connector.

Joe and Anna noted, however, that the geographic limits of their analysis at the time period limited any impact that the Monroe Connector would have had on the land use allocation to the east of NC 200. The MUMPO bottom up process was only applied to the MUMPO portions of the region and for Union County this only included areas around and to the west of Monroe. Therefore none of the bottom up process in question affected the population or employment allocations in the eastern areas of Union County under the Rocky River RPO jurisdiction. Furthermore, the allocation process within the MUMPO area was restricted by the control totals developed during the top down process. Therefore, the land development factors only affected how population and employment were allocated within the MUMPO portion of Union County.

Joe and Anna were not involved in the Rocky River RPO bottom up process, but their understanding was that they used an expert panel process to allocate population and employment across TAZs and they did not attempt any empirical process like MUMPO. They were also constrained by the control totals developed by the top down process.

Expert panels did play a significant role for the MUMPO process. These panels made determinations for some of the land development factor inputs (i.e. the growth areas) but they also reviewed the first iteration output of Paul Smith's land use model and made substantial adjustments to the TAZ population and employment totals. Furthermore, Joe and Anna noted that all the Non-Population Chasing Employment was hand set by staff and/or expert panel input. For Union County the expert panel included 3-4 persons and Dick Black was one participant they remember being involved but there is no documentation of any of the participants and neither Anna nor Joe could remember other participants.

MUMPO did begin an update process based on new Census estimates from 2005. The purpose of this update was to update the base year forecasts to 2005 and to update the future year forecasts based on pipeline growth and updated trends based on Census estimates of growth, input from the state demographer and other projections such as Woods and Poole forecasts. This update did not affect the data used in the ICE study, however, since this update was not fully completed and approved when the MUMPO forecasts were provided to Baker.

Regarding the top down forecasting process, Anna and Joe also noted that there was a Regional Reconciliation process to adjust those forecasts among the counties in the region. This reconciliation process resulted in some forecasted growth shifting away from Union County toward other counties to ensure more equity in the forecasted growth across all jurisdictions.

Follow Up Call

Meeting Date/Time: 6/21/2012, 9:30am

Meeting Location: Phone Call

Attendees:

Anna Gallup – Program Manager, Metrolina Regional Model
Scudder Wagg - Baker Engineering

Meeting Notes:

Scudder asked about the update to the forecasts that is underway. Anna mentioned that the Kenan Institute staff at UNC Chapel Hill will be doing the top down portion of the study this time and that UNC Charlotte GIS staff will likely be involved in the bottom up process again, at least for Mecklenburg County. The updated forecasts are not expected for at least 6 months, more likely 9 months.

Scudder asked to verify whether she and other MUMPO staff were comfortable with the manner in which Baker staff used the MUMPO socioeconomic forecasts to develop a No Build land use scenario for the Monroe Connector ICE study area. Anna said that she and her staff were comfortable with that use of their data as the basis for a No Build scenario because of the manner in which the forecasts were developed for Union county in the 2003 to 2004 time period. Specifically the shifting of growth during the regional reconciliation process and the assumptions used by the expert panel to develop the land development factors and to adjust the forecasts all pointed towards the reasonableness of using the forecasts as the basis for a No Build scenario. Further, as discussed in the June 19th meeting, the one technical element of the bottom-up forecasting process that included the Monroe Connector was carried out in such a way that the effect on TAZs in Union County would be at or close to zero.

Follow Up Communications

Communications Date/Time: 10/9/2013 to 10/24/2013

Via Email

Correspondents:

Anna Gallup – Program Manager, Metrolina Regional Model

Joe McLelland – Metrolina Regional Modeler

Scudder Wagg – Baker Engineering

Meeting Notes:

Scudder asked Anna and Joe to provide a succinct explanation for the reason the Travel Time to Core Employment Factor was originally included in the LUSAM model design but then was not used in any of the LUSAM model runs as it was given a weight of zero in all model runs. Joe explained that in designing LUSAM, travel time to core employment was anticipated to be a useful variable. In practice, it was difficult to implement without substantial additional programming effort. The travel time table in the various LUSAM versions was a test, hand-prepared version of travel time data using the old MUMPO model (the model that predates the 2035 MUMPO LRTP process). The TAZ did not always match the TAZ in the model used for the 2035 LRTP, nor did the table include TAZ in eastern Union County. The long-range plan schedule did not permit sufficient time to develop and test the travel time component. Therefore, in the interest of keeping the LRTP on schedule and conserving effort, CDOT staff and MUMPO chose to give the travel time coefficient a weight of zero in the LUSAM models. Thus, the travel time to core employment variable was never used in the LUSAM models to develop future projections.

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis, Legacy Park Development

Meeting Date/Time: 9/27/2012, 2:30pm

Meeting Location: Conference Call

Attendees:

Melanie O'Connell Underwood – Union County Partnership for Progress, Interim Director

Gretchen Carson – Union County Partnership for Progress

Scudder Wagg - Baker Engineering

Ken Gilland - Baker Engineering

Meeting Notes:

On Thursday, September 27, 2012, Gretchen Carson and Interim Director Melanie O'Connell Underwood of Union County Partnership for Progress (Partnership) spoke with Scudder Wagg and Ken Gilland of Michael Baker Engineering (Baker) with regards to the Legacy Park Project.

The discussion began with the Partnership asking what had prompted the call. Baker stated that the call was prompted by recent queries by parties associated with the Monroe Connector/Bypass legal case, environmental agencies, and the Charlotte Observer, all of which had asked if the project had been included in the past quantitative indirect and cumulative effects (ICE) study and if it would be included in any updates to the ICE study.

Ms. Carson answered that she and Director O'Connell had recently met with the past director (Maurice Ewing) to make sure that they had all available information about the Legacy Project. There is currently no work underway for the project due to the current economic conditions and the delay in construction of the Monroe Connector/Bypass. No offers have been made on any parcels in the area, and there are currently no plans to request land use plan changes or develop infrastructure plans to support Legacy Park. No financing plans have been developed for Legacy Park. Currently, the Partnership considers the project dead.

It is the case that the area proposed for Legacy Park appears to be suitable for development. Currently, there are no intensive housing developments in the area proposed for the park. CSX has noted to the Partnership that the long, straight railroad alignment in this area would accommodate sidings and the site offers potential benefits with the anticipated expansion of the Port of Wilmington. Anson County and the Town of Marshville have passed resolutions of support for the project. The Union County Planning Department is aware of the project but to date no changes in land use plans or zoning have been adopted or proposed to accommodate the full proposal. The current infrastructure is sufficient to support existing development and some future development but will not support the size or scale of the proposed Legacy Park.

Baker asked, what were the chances of Legacy Park being developed with or without the construction of the Connector. The Partnership answered that there was no chance of Legacy Park being constructed if the Monroe Connector/Bypass were not built. If the Connector/Bypass were built, the chances that some portion of the proposed Legacy Park might develop was about 25 percent in the next 5 to 10 years; however no phasing plan or feasibility study would be developed unless the bypass is constructed.

Baker asked about proposed project phasing if Legacy Park were built. The Partnership answered that of approximately 5,000 acres identified on the Partnership website as comprising Legacy Park, it was anticipated that the first phase of the project would cover approximately 300 acres, but that number was subject to change. The figure was based on preliminary discussions with CSX about one particular tract. The Partnership asked if they could go to the next phase of project development (an environmental study)

would CSX think this was a good idea and were informed that the railroad did not believe current conditions warranted advancing the project. Nothing was purchased and no landowners were directly contacted.

The Partnership stated that if Union County were approached by a developer or business, that they would be open to exploring future prospects. There had been one small rail project in the Legacy Park area in the past few years, but it was not associated with Legacy Park.

The Partnership stated that they were merging with the Monroe Economic Development Council and might cease to exist within a year.

Baker asked about other planned development. The Partnership answered that four communities in the area (Indian Trail, Stallings, Mint Hill, and Mathews) were looking into the possibility of pooling resources to encourage future developments in the form of a business park. A future meeting will determine anticipated next steps in this very preliminary effort.

The Partnership asked if Baker was aware of the Strategic Plan for Economic Development, Town of Marshville, Town of Wingate, and Baker answered that the plan had informed the potential build scenario for that portion of the ICE study area.

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis

Meeting Date/Time: Various (e-mail communications between 11/29/12 and 11/30/12)

Attendees:

Vance E. Bennett – CSX

Jim Van Derzee: CSX

Scudder Wagg - Baker Engineering

Communication Notes:

The purpose of this communication was to better understand the role of CSX in the Legacy Park development and gather information on the expectations of CSX staff regarding the potential for development of the site. Scudder began the discussion by asking:

Our staff spoke with Melanie Underwood and Gretchen Carson about the potential for development and one specific item they noted was that they had spoken recently to CSX staff about possibly conducting an environmental study of the site to advance project development but that CSX staff felt the current conditions did not warrant such action. Can you confirm this or provide any information as to why that decision was made? Also, if there is any additional information you can provide about the likelihood and possible timing of any development at Legacy Park we would greatly appreciate it. Specifically, we would want to know your assessment of whether and how much of the site might be developed by 2030 if the Monroe Connector/Bypass were built and if it were NOT built. Any specific reasons for your assessment would also be helpful.

Jim responded with the following:

This is very difficult to speculate. There are two separate, largely unrelated, development opportunities at Legacy Park for CSX.

- 1. **Rail-Served Industrial Development Projects** The property is adjacent to a CSX main line, which would enable sidetrack construction to serve new industries that locate to the property. Because we don't know what types of industries will locate there, we cannot determine the road access requirements and whether or not the Bypass would make a difference. As far as the timing, this could happen as soon as a project starts that is a suitable fit for Legacy Park, which is impossible to predict. I've offered Legacy Park to numerous industrial development projects, but none have pursued it yet. As CSX's Manager Industrial Development, this is my primary role with Legacy Park.*
- 2. **Construction of a new intermodal** facility that would transfer shipping containers between railcars and trucks. Because the local shipment would be made by truck, the road accessibility is critical to making this work. There are many other challenges that need to be overcome before I would recommend proceeding with an environmental study. As CSX's Director Intermodal Port Strategy, this is Vance's primary role with Legacy Park.*

I recommend that the environmental study be done after a need has been clearly determined.

Vance responded by noting the following regarding the possible new intermodal facility:

Jim's comments are correct and I would just like to add that CSX normally would conduct a market assessment before an environmental study is conducted to measure the current

and future if CSX was to build an Intermodal facility at any location. I would suggest that be considered if you have not done so already.

Later Vance further clarified regarding the need and process for doing a market assessment:
CSX would take the lead on such a study if it were a CSX planned facility. In this case, since it is a private terminal facility it would not be CSX's call on developing that research. If it were however, CSX would typically hire a consultant like RS&H, Moffat & Nichol or Tran-Systems to develop such a report.

Lastly, in response to a request to rate the quality of the Legacy Park site for rail-served industrial development and for the potential for the intermodal terminal development, Jim responded:
[O]verall, I rate the Legacy Site very high, with the potential to land some large industrial development projects. Its topography, rail access, and geographic location make this one of the best sites in the greater Charlotte area.

As for the other challenges with the intermodal opportunity, we do not currently have the necessary combination of shipment volume and distance to make rail work.

Project: R-3329/R2559 Monroe Connector

Subject: Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Quantitative Analysis, Legacy Park Development

Meeting Date/Time: 10/2/2013, 1:00pm

Meeting Location: Conference Call

Attendees:

R. Christopher Platé – Executive Director, Monroe-Union County Economic Development
Gretchen Carson – Project Manager, Monroe-Union County Economic Development
Scudder Wagg - Baker Engineering
Ken Gilland - Baker Engineering

Meeting Notes:

On Wednesday, October 2, 2013, Chris Platé and Gretchen Carson of Monroe-Union County Economic Development (MUCED) spoke with Scudder Wagg and Ken Gilland of Michael Baker Engineering (Baker) with regards to the Legacy Park Project.

The discussion began with the Baker staff explaining Baker's role in the overall environmental documentation process and discussing the need to consider all reasonably foreseeable development in the study area. Mr. Wagg began by asking about the current status of the Legacy Park proposal. Mr. Platé said the original proposal is dead but that the MUCED is working on plans for a smaller scale, rail-served industrial park with some manufacturing. The anticipated size at full build out would be between 200 and 400 acres with individual facilities of 50,000 to 200,000 square feet. The rough area in which this development would occur would be between the CSX railroad to the south, Stegall Road to the west and Gaddy Road to the east. Mr. Platé noted that this area already has some industrial activity and access to the rail line and the few large parcels in the area would make it a good fit for a small industrial park. He noted that there is the potential to add two additional parcels that would allow frontage on US 74.

He also noted that the proposal is very long term as there is insufficient utility infrastructure at the site currently. Sewer, water, fiber optic and gas utilities would all need to be provided and the cost and financing of such infrastructure has not been determined yet. MUCED is continuing to work on the project by securing options on the properties in the area and coordinating with localities such as Marshville to get utility infrastructure improvements including in local capital improvement plans.

In general, Mr. Platé noted that the focus of his agency and the county in general is more on economic development in the western portions of the county, in particular on box distribution facilities in and around Monroe and Indian Trail. If the bypass is built, Mr. Platé felt there would be some opportunities for industrial and distribution facility development along the corridor, particularly around Monroe at US 601 and Morgan Mill. Near the eastern end of the corridor, Mr. Platé felt that higher end residential was likely in the vicinity of Wingate. Wingate and Marshville currently lack the water and sewer capacity to allow for more intensive development.

As to the focus of the economic development team, Mr. Platé noted they are focusing equine industries in the area of Waxhaw, office development in Stallings along and near I-485, and more industrial development in Indian Trail and Monroe. In Fairview, Mr. Platé noted that the town had interest in seeing some small scale retail development around the US 601 and NC 218 intersection. He anticipated the development would be up to 4 to 5 small parcels focused on fast food, convenience store and related retail. He did note that the town had interest in very small scale industrial development that might have limited impacts, but Mr. Platé noted that any development faces serious hurdles in the Fairview area due to limitations from environmental issues and lack of sewer.

In the Marshville area, Mr. Platé felt that there would be limited growth in the short term with or without the bypass. Mr. Platé noted that the town had very old infrastructure with limited sewer capacity.