

**US 64 - NC 49 CORRIDOR STUDY
CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT TEAM (CDT) MEETING #3 SUMMARY**

**November 10, 2004
10:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Davie County Public Library**

Prepared by: PBS&J

The following attended the meeting:

US 64 – NC 49 Study Team

David Wasserman	NCDOT – Transportation Planning
John Adams	PBS&J
Kim Bereis	PBS&J
Jill Gurak	PBS&J
Joel Leisch	PBS&J
Heidi Stamm	HS Public Affairs
Meg Connolly	Land Design
Padam Singh	Land Design
Lewis Grimm	Cambridge Systematics
Don Vary	Cambridge Systematics

Corridor Development Team (CDT) Members

Brenda Moore	NCDOT – Roadway Design
Thad Duncan	NCDOT – Roadway Design
Lynnise Hawes	NCDOT – Roadway Design
Derrick Lewis	NCDOT – Feasibility Studies
Terry Bralley	Davie County
Jack Meadows	Siler City
Mayor Calvin Gaddy	Rocky River RPO (New London)
David Monroe	Town of Pittsboro
Pat Strong	Triangle COG/Triangle RPO
Diane Khin	Town of Apex
Tim Clark	Wake County
Ed Johnson	Capital Area MPO

David Wasserman began the meeting at approximately 10:30 a.m. and asked attendees to introduce themselves. The meeting agenda is attached for reference.

The Study Team covered the following topics in a formal presentation:

- Problem Statement (Gurak)
- Definition of Alternatives (Leisch)
- Evaluation of Alternatives (Leisch)
- Corridor Vision (Leisch)
- Land Use Development Patterns/Models and Precedents (Connolly and Singh)
- Closing Comments (Wasserman)

CDT members offered comments and/or asked questions following each topic listed above. CDT questions and comments are provided below.

Problem Statement

No questions/comments.

Definition and Evaluation of Alternatives

Q. Would the E+C Enhanced Alternative incorporate signals and median openings? Do you have an idea of how many signals there would be with the E+C Enhanced system versus Expressway Alternative?

A. Ideally, the E+C Enhanced would eliminate all signals and eliminate the placement of new signalized intersections. Existing signalized intersections would be looked at (i.e. with respect to accidents, etc.). However, the E+C Enhanced would include bypasses around the existing signalized urban areas. Potential median openings would be evaluated at specific areas through a collaborative process involving the NCDOT and effected local communities.

Q. Did you account for intersections delays in the traffic modeling?

A. The modeling was not at that level of detail for such a geographically large corridor study area (over 200-mile corridor). It was assumed that realistically a few signals would not affect mobility.

Q. Will the evaluation become more geographically specific?

A. That level of detail for the overall corridor(s) has not been conceptualized at this time, nor has how to phase implement the improvements and identify priority areas.

Q. For your costs criterion, what is included in those figures?

A. These figures include cost of construction and right-of-way in 2004 \$.

Corridor Vision

Q. Does the vision in which we are trying to reach consensus on include a freeway by 2040? Has that changed?

A. What is presented is to establish the Freeway alternative as a long-range vision with no specified completion year (recognizing funding priorities) and to step-by-step address remaining segments that are not freeway. It is possible that the long-range freeway vision may not be realized. One of the goals is to reach consensus on the overall “type” and look of the corridor (specific picture examples were provided in the “Corridor Vision” portion of the presentation) with the understanding that coordination and the course of local decisions are necessary in reaching the desired outcome.

Q. Something separate from this vision still needs to be done for the section between I-540 and US-1 and perhaps should be discussed with the resource agencies before entering the formal NEPA Merger 01 Process.

A. Reconfiguring the US 64/US 1 interchange to utilize 540 would solve the traffic problem. The footprint (clover leaf) is sufficient to develop a range of alternatives where a US 64 to I-540 movement can be facilitated.

Q. In the long-term, could US 64 be routed along I-540 to the south of Raleigh?

A. That is a possibility.

Q. Please explain what would happen to existing 5-lane sections with the E+C Enhanced Alternative.

A. The existing 5-lane urban sections would remain and be bypassed with a new alignment.

Q. Where would the Asheboro Bypass project connect on the east side? Wasn't there discussion at some point about a continuous bypass around Ramseur and Siler City? What's the status of the Asheboro Bypass project?

A. The bypass would miss the large shopping center on the east end. Evaluating an extension of the bypass around Ramseur and Siler City is a possibility, but the implications of this are not covered in this study. (There was a discussion about the status of the Asheboro Bypass project, TIP R-2536. It was noted that the segment from US 64 to NC 49 is scheduled last.)

Q. The median opening spacing of no less than 2,000 feet for non-freeway highway facilities with posted speeds greater than 45 mph would be a beneficial feature to include with your recommended Expressway and E+C Enhanced classifications. For the E+C Enhanced classification, the provision of signalized directional crossovers in urban fringe areas in accordance with this spacing distance would also preserve a high degree of functionality.

A. With regard to the median opening spacing, this is included in the NCDOT Facility Types Definitions, which was provided to the CDT at the last meeting. The E+C Enhanced concept is essentially a combination of a Type I and Type II Expressway. Therefore, the median opening spacing guidelines would be incorporated into the E+C Enhanced concept, which is also signal free.

Heidi Stamm facilitated an open dialogue between the CDT members and the Study Team. Specifically, CDT members were asked to share their views on the recommendation for the Freeway Alternative as the long-term vision with the E+C Enhanced as a staged improvement. The following summarizes specific suggestions and/or comments from CDT members who attended the meeting:

- *Have a hard time with the vision in that there will be a disruption to urban areas and rural areas that wish to stay that way.*
- *Like the vision because it provides a means to get goods between counties, and this will benefit the Charlotte and Raleigh areas, which are growing. People will continue to move outside of the urban areas and this vision is needed for this growth.*
- *It's a good vision, but the DOT needs to be cautious about setting this vision so far out that it is not reachable. The E+C Enhanced is reachable and good for connectivity.*
- *Like the Freeway for long-term and the E+C Enhanced is a good compromise for something less than a straight freeway.*
- *Like the E+C Enhanced concept because it discourages through-traffic from using 5-lane sections, but need guidance/worried about potential development around specific interchanges, such as problems that are arising around the Pittsboro Bypass interchanges. (Mayor Calvin Gaddy)*
- *Realize it's difficult to articulate the long-term vision, but as a long-term solution, the vision set forth makes sense. However, getting down to segment by segment will be helpful to tie things together for decision-making and for putting mechanisms in place at the local level. (Jack Meadows)*
- *Appears that the Enhanced E+C will meet the need best as can possibly can, and it's a good direction for starting to plan for long-term needs.*
- *Need to ultimately reach for the freeway solution, but E+C Enhanced projects should be in place.*
- *It's okay to look at the freeway as a long-term vision, but probably not realistic. Rather a combination of the Expressway and Freeway alternatives to address mobility. Has concern for heavily traveled and 2-lane sections.*
- *Freeway as ultimate solution is good. (Lynnise Hawes)*

- *Freeway is a good goal to shoot for, but hard pressed to get even the Enhanced E+C on the books. (Brenda Moore)*
- *Have a hard time buying in to the vision because it's not illustrated, but like the picture examples (i.e. the intent/effort to keep the corridor scenic). This means that coordination needs to begin with resources agencies now because of competing interests that emerge during the NEPA process. Education and coordination should begin now. (Ed Johnson)*
- *Likes the freeway concept as long-term. The I-540 and 64 interchange has little development, but inevitable pressures mean that now is the time to plan for that area. Also concerned with the I-540 to US 1 segment as a "superstreet". Agrees the E+C Enhanced is a good stepping stone, but not going to a freeway the "right way" is of a concern. It would be a mistake not to maintain the rural nature of the corridor with the long-term freeway alternative. (Diane Khin)*

Land Use (Development Patterns/Models and Precedents)

Q. Aren't these really local issues?

A. Yes. All of the examples provided would be local issues. In some cases, this may involve more than one community working together. There would be a partnership between the multiple jurisdictions and the NCDOT. Potential policies and/or guidelines will be presented at the next meeting.

Closing Comments

The next CDT meeting is tentatively scheduled for **Friday, January 14, 2005**, with the location to be determined (mostly likely in the Apex/Cary area). David Wasserman will follow up with the CDT members to determine an exact date, time and location.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.



**US 64 – NC 49 Corridor Study
Corridor Development Team (CDT) Meeting #3**

Davie County Public Library

**November 10, 2004
10:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.**

AGENDA

<u>Agenda Topic</u>	<u>Duration</u>
Welcome & Introductions	5 min.
Presentation	
Problem Statement	25 min.
Definition of Alternatives	10 min.
Evaluation of Alternatives	20 min.
Lunch	30 min.
Land Use	60 min.
Development Patterns	
Models and Precedents	
Closing Comments	30 min.