DOLRT DEIS - NO BUILD - 672 Citizen online petition

NC54 Transit Impact [nc54.transit.impact@gmail.com]

Sent: 10/13/2015 10:14 AM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Submitted for the record, the following 672 citizens signed this online petition against the current proposed DOLRT plan (http://bit.ly/noDOLRT)

https://www.gopetition.com/petitions/stop-durham-orange-light-rail-train.html

Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train
Petition published by Smart Transit Future on Jun 05, 2015
672 Signatures
Target: City, County, State and Federal officials, DCHC MPO and GoTriangle
Region: United States of America

Petition Background (Preamble):
With the final recommendations being unveiled by GoTriangle, many in the community are now actively seeking to stop this project.

Upon deeper investigation, many of the GoTriangle planning assumptions are either highly questionable or so erroneous that making an informed decision on the options is impossible.

We urge local, county, state and Federal decision-makers to require an independent review by external parties that have no role in the development of the PLAN and do not stand to benefit from decisions regarding the PLAN.

Petition:
We, the undersigned, call on you to **REJECT** the current proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region.

Attachments: NO_BUILD_PETITION.xlsx

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	CLARE	ABRAHAMSON			CHAPEL HILL	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	I REJECT THE CURRENT PROPOSED DURHAM ORANGE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT AND AM PURSUING MORE COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES THAT WILL MEET THE LONG TERM NEEDS OF THE REGION.
Ms	Marilyn	Agney		C	Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27515	10-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Dona	Aguayo			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	No Depot on Farrington Rd.
N/G	Barbara	Ailsworth			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Kimberly	Aitken			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	I do not want this noisy place so close to my nice housing community and am worried it will lower my house value. Please find a non-residential location.
N/G	Benjamin	Aitken			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Kimberly	Aitken			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Jul-15	This area is all residential with nice communities of school children, retirees, and hard working people who have worked their lives to be able to live in these homes. An industrial facility like this has no place in this area and should find a more business oriented industrial location.
Mrs.	Alyssa	Alegre			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Louis	Almekinders			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	11-Oct-15	N/G
ms	jennifer	anderson			chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Thomas	Anderson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	14-Sep-15	Terrible waste of my tax dollars. Please don't build this expensive piece of junk.
Ms	Elizabeth	Andrews			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Dave	Anna			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27515	1-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Mark	Anna			Chapel hill	Durham	USA	27517	1-Oct-15	Commuter populations don't travel these routes as is. The general population doesn't travel to either downtown chapel hill or Durham on a regular basis. A major waste of money that couldn't be diverted towards usable infrastructure.
Mr.	Michael	Anna			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	1-Oct-15	I am strongly opposed to the current plan for this light rail system.
N/G	Kathrynne	Anna			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	1-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Nancie	Archin			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	4-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	N. J.	B.			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517-942	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Bok	Baek			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	N/G
Dr	Ann	Bailey			chapel hill	nc	N/G	27514	25-Jun-15	The purpose of this very expensive project is questionable, since much of the growth in the RTP area is in Raleigh. There is not sufficient traffic between durham and orange counties to warrant this massive endeavor
Mrs	ross	baker			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	If this route must happen, it should be built above grade level. At ground level, people south of the railway will be trapped in case of an emmergency such as needing to get someone to the hospital.
N/G	Jeff	Baldino			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Christopher	Baldino			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Deborah	Barab			Durham,	NC	USA	27705	30-Sep-15	The financial numbers need to be re-crunched. The cost vs. need/use does not seem realistic or feasible. I think that the companies associated with the building of this project are pushing to hard and not using reasonable arguments for the need. It's like the apples to apples argument. You've got apples to squash. (not even fruit) As a Durham resident, I ask you to review the need vs cost. Would make more sense to connect Raleigh to Durham before Chapel Hill. (and I love Chapel Hill)
N/G	Natalie	Barbare			Durham	Durham	USA	27705	8-Aug-15	N/G
Ms	Marcia	Barfield			Chapel hill	Nc	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	William T. Toby	Barfield			Chapel hill	Nc	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Kaye	Barker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27516	8-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Ted	Barrow			CHAPEL HILL	North Caro	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	Cutting off proper vehicle access to and from the areas south of the light rail grade level crossings will only create congestion, especially during rush hour for communities such as Chapelwood and Downing Creek. Meadowmont was designed to allow for this access and has a very small vehicle load as compared to the area affected by C2/C2A.
N/G	Alice	Barrow			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	I do not agree with the light rail project crossing the intersection of Barbee Chapel Road nor the other 3 intersections near it. This will cause too much congestion and create safety issues for the many people who already commute using Barbee Chapel to access route 54. This would only be safe and sane if a bridge was built for the light rail to go over these intersections. In addition, the original plan of the rail going through Meadowmont should not now be changed to the detriment of those living south of 54.
N/G	Taren	Basnight			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	27-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Anthony	Batton			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	I feel the light rail as presented is a waste of money. It falls short on providing parking and weather protection for riders if it has riders. This area's culture is drive solo first. Many do this to have transportation available in case of emergency be it a child or whatever. That is why carpooling and buses as ideas have failed or are seldom used. It will cause unprecedented traffic delays for Barbee Chapel Road which gets worse with every passing day. If you proceed with this project, please hear my resounding "I told you so" every 10-15 minutes when those empty cars go round and round.
Mrs.	Betsy	Batton			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	It's a waste of money and time and will cause lots of traffic problems on Barbee Chapel Road
Mrs	Tanja	Bauer			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Daniel	Bauer			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Kimberly	Bauer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Eugene	Bauer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Ginger	Bauer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jun-15	I vigorously OPPOSE the proposed light rail system.
N/G	Steven	Bearden			Chapel hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	26-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	bradford	becken			chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Oct-15	N/G
Mr	Larry	Beckler			Durham	North Caro	USA	27713	10-Oct-15	N/G
Dr.	Joanne	Beckman			Durham	NC	USA	27712	8-Oct-15	Trains may be good for long distances at high speed, but not short distances with multiple stops. If public transportation is needed, buses or vans are preferable, because routes can be changed to accomodate technology, population changes. and economical needs of the community as it develops. Light rail is not cost-effective for the future. Use the money to enhance bus service and fix the roads.
N/G	David	Bell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	I reject the current proposal, but I am in favor of a Durham-Orange Light Rail project.
Ms	Sharon	Bellmore			DURHAM	North Caro	USA	27707	1-Jul-15	Please reject the current proposed track down through Farrington Rd.
N/G	Dane	Berglund			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	The Lite Rail train system will potentially ruin our residential retirement community
Dr	Marcus	Berzofsky			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Anne	Billings			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	I oppose the current DO Light Rail Project and strongly urge that all facets of the plan be re-evaluated by an independent organization.
N/G	Timothy	Billings			chapel hill	nc	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	stop this
N/G	David	Biswell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mrs	Sue	Biswell			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	23-Jul-15	Where are car parking sites going to be located for those driving to a rider depot located? Not connecting to airport is a major flaw.
Ms.	Lori	Black			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Oct-15	The project as it is currently conceived is -based on fundamentally unsound ridership projections and will not result in any appreciable reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel Hill-Durham road corridor. -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not aligned with the higher density compact neighborhood developments in Orange and Chatham counties. -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small percentage of the annual operating costs. -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is necessary in order to support light rail transit. The Chapel Hill-Durham corridor has a population density less than 20% of that threshold. -The ridership projections for the D-O LRT are wildly optimistic, with estimated daily boardings of 23,000. -I support the NO BUILD OPTION. The projected growth in the Triangle is predominately weighted toward Wake County, and Wake County, with a much larger population than Orange or Durham Counties has rejected the Light Rail option.
N/G	Robin	Blackmon			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	25-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Tony	Blake			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27516	10-Jun-15	Ask yourself if LRT will make for a better transit experience and if it does, for whom. How it is rational people justify +1.8 Billion (much more, if other cities experiences are any guide) for an inflexible 17 mile system through a critical watershed that will be made mostly irrelevant by technology before it is completed?
N/G	Laura	Blank			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Edward	Blasius			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
mrs	pat	blasius			chapel hill	nc	N/G	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Jennifer	Blazing			Chapel Hill	NORTH CA	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Ms.	Margaret	Boccieri			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Christopher	Boehlke			Durham	N/G	USA	27707	1-Aug-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr	Kenneth	Bogue			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Oct-15	Light rail may cost $1,600,000,000 to construct (or more if there are cost overruns). Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens each workday. Some reasonable projections of ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. This is an investment of about $140,000 to $320,000 for each and every citizen who might benefit from a light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or federal level. The proposed light rail system should not be built because it costs too much and will serve too small a portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in Orange and Durham counties. There are other needs in our communities, especially building elementary and secondary schools and improving teachers’ salaries, which would be much better places to invest $1,600,000,000. Please do not waste this kind of money on a rail system that makes no sense.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Ms	Elizabeth	Bonnet			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Oct-15	Light rail may cost $1,600,000,000 to construct (or more if there are cost overruns). Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens each workday. Some reasonable projections of ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. This is an investment of about $140,000 to $320,000 for each and every citizen who might benefit from a light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or federal level. The proposed light rail system should not be built because it costs too much and will serve too small a portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in Orange and Durham counties. There are other needs in our communities, especially building elementary and secondary schools and improving teachers’ salaries, which would be much better places to invest $1,600,000,000. Please do not waste this kind of money on a rail system that makes no sense.
N/G	Rebecca	Bostian			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517-249	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Michael	Bostian			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517-249	22-Jun-15	N/G
m	Robert	Bowerman			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Kathy	Bowerman			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
Dr	Laura	Bowers		t	Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Ellen	Boylan			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	26-Sep-15	Expanded bus service is much less expensive, more flexible, and less disruptive for our communities.
N/G	Richard C	Boylan Jr			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Sep-15	N/G
Ms	Lisa	Brach			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	Please do not waste my taxpayer money on a system that is doomed by its design and will ultimately have a negative impact on my neighborhood, our community and the whole City of Durham!
N/G	stephen	brackett			CHAPEL HILL	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Steve	Brackett			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Kathryn	Breen			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Walter	Brittle			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	@&%!&	22-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Rosemary	Brookman			chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Aug-15	Light rail is responsible for more deaths and accidents than any other form of transportation except motorcycles. This is a bad solution. Enchanced bus service would solve the problem with much less cost and much less environmental impact.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Daniel	Bruce			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	11-Jun-15	N/G
ms	mary	buchanan			Chapel Hill	nc	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	I grew up two miles from here and bought this house five years ago, as my forever home. Now there is a plan to make, literally, my backyard into the train line. I object and will continue to object until they drop the plan completely as there is not now and will never be a need for a light rail in the triangle of NC at all.
N/G	MEGAN	BUCKLEY			durham	nc	USA	27713	9-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Aaron	Buckley			Natthews	NC	USA	28105	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Thomas	Bulthuis			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Lauren	Burke			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Gary	Burke			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Brian	Burke			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Lauren	Burke			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Edith	Burns			CHAPELHILL	NC	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Julie	Burson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	Eric	Butler			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	2-Sep-15	Light rail is not the proper solution for our community. It cost too much money, will never reach sustainable ridership levels and will be a public burden. Further, it will certainly cause many fatalities which could have been avoided due to excessive at grade crossings. With regard to the local 54 corridor, it will increase congestion by usurping other more narrowly focused and thoughtful traffic solutions. With regard to Downing Creek, it will cut off access and impose a major safety risk to the hundreds of families in our neighborhood. All in all, the antiquated concept of light rail should be abandoned as outdated and intellectually dull and lazy. The area would be better served by doing nothing rather that making the elementary error of over building with an outdated technology. That type of error could not only cripple the area's economy but the progressive zeitgeist of Durham/Chapel Hill. It could have major repercussions the likes of which we here and now cannot fathom. As for Downing Creek residents, the mere existence of the train makes its far more likely that our neighbors and loved ones will come to an early preventable demise. It is just a very bad idea, indeed.
Ms.	Megan	Butler			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	2-Sep-15	N/G
Dr.	Steven	Buzinski			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Carol	Bylinski			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Freddy	Byrth			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Alex	Cabanes			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	As a resident of Downing Creek, myself and others in the neighboring communities have repeatedly expressed our concerns about the impact and safety of the proposed C2/C2A at-grade routing along the NC54 corridor. Despite repeated requests and outreach by the community, GoTriangle has to date failed to address these community concerns. These concerns have been discussed on numerous occasions directly with GoTriangle representatives in public and private forums, email, phone, letters, surveys, etc. Needless to say, this is extremely frustrating for the over 90% of local residents in opposition to the C2/C2A at-grade routing who believe their voices are not being heard or interests adequately represented. As our Durham elected representatives, I request that you either ask GoTriangle to directly address these safety issues with viable alternatives or REJECT the currently proposed Light Rail project.
Mrs	Pam	Calderwood			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	The costs benefit is just not there for light rail - just see the amount of people taking buses between the two medical groups. Safety is also an issue regarding a neighborhood which has prided itself on family activities with small children riding bikes everywhere!

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Ms	Caroline	Cameron			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	My main concern is the safety of the rail, especially the C2A route. There will be 3 at-grade crossings, two of them are the entrances to Downing Creek and all are within a 1/2 miles stretch. This is a set-up for the worst-case scenario - the train hitting a car or a bus. The traffic on NC54 comes to a stop during peak times and there will be no traffic lights guaranteeing access to NC54 and there is a real potential a car will get stuck on the tracks and the gate will come down behind the car, trapping the car. The fact that there are going to be numerous stations without parking or any additional parking is also a boondoggle. The fact that technology has moved beyond light rail is also very short sighted especially for the billions of dollars this will cost to build and the hundreds of millions is will cost each year to run. The last fact is, it is basically the train to no-where. It basically runs to Duke and UNC and not to heavy shopping areas, the park, Raleigh , or the airport. That is what the people voted on when they approved the increase in the sales tax. Talk about a bait and switch. NO to the rail, get smart and do what Raleigh is doing.
Mr.	Keith	Cameron			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Please note that the vast majority of taxpayers affected by this project would not use it and DO NOT WANT IT!
N/G	Christina	Cameron			Durham	N/G	N/G	27704	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	John	Cameron			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	1-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Harriet	Cannon			Durham	NC	USA	27713	25-Aug-15	The planning commitee of Durham is being run by folks who have little interest in the thoughts or feelings of anyone they don't consider "progressive" I have lived in Durham all my life and love the fact that it has never felt or been urban. I am not a fan of light rail and what it will do to the hometown feel of Durham. It is going to ruin a lot of nice neighborhood. If urban is where these planners want to live, they should move to or back to a big urbanized city instead of trying to change ours.
N/G	John	Capell			Mount Gilead	NC	N/G	27306	6-Jul-15	I oppose the crossing planned at Downing Creek. I am an owner in 11 town homes at Bradford place.
N/G	Linda	Carmichael			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	24-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
ms	maureen	carroll			durham	nc	USA	27707	5-Sep-15	please think about how much good the money you folks have tossed down the drain for no good reason. money that could have been spent on the rapid transit or feeding and housing veterans, helping the homeless....a million ways to spend that cash. yes, we need better transportation here, but it is beginning to look like some kind of criminal mismanagement of funds is happening and pockets are get lined and nothing is getting accomplished. i think the whole matter should be thoroughly investigate by an independent group of knowledgeable citizens
N/G	maureen	carroll			durham	nc. durham	USA	27707	28-Sep-15	stop spending the money on a useless proposition. where is the money now? has it been used for anything?
N/G	Tami	Carter			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	David	Carter			Hillsborough	NC	USA	27278	16-Sep-15	This light rail fiasco was shoved down the voters throats. It's not feasible or sustainable without punishing the citizens further. Why not use existing rail lines with a LOT less money?
N/G	Mary	Carter			Hillsborough	NC	USA	27278	22-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	David	Carter			Hillsborough	NC	USA	27278	22-Sep-15	N/G
Mrs.	Jennifer	Cayless			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Hugh	Cayless			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Brian	Chacos			Chapel Hill	No	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Ryan	Chamberlain			Durham	NC	USA	27707	19-Aug-15	Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollution already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this train to areas where people NEED mass transit... who in Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to low-income? At-grade crossings are probably the worst part of all of this in this area. A huge reason trains on this entire coast are problematic is because of at-grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backups, low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disaster at these crossings especially.
N/G	Allison	Chandler			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Suzanne and Steve	Chaney			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	11-Oct-15	We have free buses in Chapel Hill and they run empty. Why does one think they will ride a train that they have to pay for. The low income individuals don't have the money to pay for a train ticket. The majority of people have their own cars and are not going to give up their time (the train transit time is long than it takes to drive from Chapel Hill to Durham) nor their freedom they enjoy with their car...they go and come on their own schedule not the train schedule. They have transportation when they get to Durham. They don't have to find a way to get from the Durham train station to their destination. If they drive their car, they can drive directly to their destination.
Mrs	Pal	Cheema			Chapel hill	Durham	N/G	27251	24-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Zibin	Chen			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Dawn	Chin-Quee			Durham	NC	USA	27707	26-Jul-15	I live in the area of Farrington and already have problems with traffic getting to I-40 and 54 from Farrington. Also, I don't want the value of my condo to be compromised by Light Rail project.
N/G	Kathleen	Christian			Durham	NC	USA	27707	17-Jul-15	This train is massively expensive to build and will drain funds from future transit needs with operation and maintenance costs over 16 million per year. It harms multiple neighborhoods that its tracks border, both by destroying air-cleaning, sound-buffering trees and by creating unsafe at-grade train-auto intersections. The results are higher air pollution, increased sound pollution from nearby highways such as Rt 54 and I-40, and dangerous, traffic bottlenecks at the car-train intersections. All this to decrease the need for bus service at Duke and UNC medical centers, which could be optimized with bus-only lanes for the last mile near these busy centers - for possibly a BILLION less dollars! Without hurting so many existing neighborhoods! And leaving the flexibility that the system will need as ground transportation is massively changed by autonomous vehicles. See stopthetrain.org for more details.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mrs.	Kathleen	Cimo			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	This plan will be devastating to Downing Creek and will without a doubt adversely affect the neighborhood and its property values. Further, it will increase congestion on the already- congested Route 54E, which will cause traffic to backup into Downing Creek.
Mr	Brent	Clark			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	15-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Cindy	Clark			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	16-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Brent	Clark			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	15-Sep-15	N/G
MS	AMY	CLAYTON			DURHAM	NC	N/G	27707	26-Jul-15	STOP THE LIGHT RAIL AND SUBSTATION!!!
N/G	David	Cocchetto			Durham	N/G	USA	27707	25-Sep-15	N/G
Ms	maria	coleman			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	This is partially what Meadowmont was designed for, and that would be the perfect place just as originally layer out.
N/G	Rodalyn	Coleman			chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	I reject Farrington Road as a location for Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility. My home is located directly across the street and the maintenance facility poses both a major health risk, as well as a traffic problem. My tax dollars should be spent on education not on premier expensive seats for a small number of people.
N/G	Rodalyn	Coleman			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	26-Jul-15	I strongly oppose the Go Triangle Lite Rail because the cost hits me as a tax payer on the Federal, state and local levels and will continue to take my retirement and use in wasteful spending to keep up with the deteriorating conditions of the lite rail.
Mr	Ron	Coltrane			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	12-Jun-15	I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area where I own.
mr	john	conklin			durham	NC	USA	27807	12-Aug-15	No light rail PLEASR
Mr	Paul	Coon			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Paul	Coon			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Sep-15	Does not meet the master plan with the growth trends in the region.
ms.	Wallis	Cooper			Chapel Hill	NC - North	USA	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
Dr.	Rand	Cork			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Light rail is trying to fill a need that doesn't exist - waste of money & threat to our neighborhoods.
N/G	Belinda	Corpening			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517B5	27-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	John	Corpening			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Helen	Courvoisie			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Susan	Cowart			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Oct-15	Delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Dr.	Doug	Cowart			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Oct-15	WE must delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County.A single line through low density areas is a BAD idea. There is simply no evidence that this light rail is needed at this time. Transit needs are better served in a fiscally responsible manner by expansion of the bus services and establish of bus lanes on surface highways. The costs and the proposed route are ill advised, and do NOT address the needs of the population growth area. The ultimate effect on taxes and the funding sources are not clear.
N/G	Laura	Cox			Durham	Durham	USA	27705	30-Sep-15	There is no need for this stilted version of public transit which does not serve routes of greatest use such as the airport or Wake County, whose residents were smart enough to stop this effort in its tracks.
N/G	Hunter	Crandall			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Claudia	Crassweller			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	10-Oct-15	Please stop this gross misuse of our county and state tax dollars for a poorly thought out plan that reaches too few people. You will be placing a burden on us and the people who live in the affected areas in the future. Billions of dollars is not worth throwing away for the very few people who will utilize this service. The route is not logical or useful for the amount being spent. Get an outside source for making this decision. If Wake County opted out with their large population, how do you think it will work for much smaller counties. Stop this madness.
N/G	Peter	Crassweller			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	10-Oct-15	I am all for mass transit, but for the amount of money being used by this plan is not justified. I don't want the cost associated with this plan to be sucking the money out of my wallet. This is crazy! Why doesn't this involve transportation to RTP, Southpoint, or the airport. Those would increase the potential for ridership. Our counties are not large enough to support this kind of expensive system. Stop!

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
ms	sheila	creth			chapel hill	orange cou	USA	27514	10-Jun-15	This is an extraordinary expense & disruption for what may be a limited ridership between UNC & Duke universities. Why not consider a light rail line to provide Chatham & Orange county residents a fast way to get to areas of Chapel Hill & Durham (not just the universities). Or a light rain line from Chatham to Raleigh (parallel to I 40) with a Chapel Hill to Raleigh include the RT park! Now that's lots of people.
Ms	Caroline	Crocker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Charles	Crocker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Henrietta	Croom			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Lorna Lynn	Culton			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	I don't support the proposed rail. Stats on systems in other areas (larger than Durham and Chapel Hill) indicate that rails become a financial burden to taxpayers and ticket prices bring in less than 1/4 the operating cost. I would rather see my taxpayer money go to towards upgrading the current bus service, which would give riders more destinations and be financially self sufficient. The glamor of a train is no comparison to the functionality of an upgraded commuter bus system and not worth the money! I would like to see dedicated lanes for busses with enhancements made to the bus stops (like at the airport) and to the busses (offering WiFi and more comfortable seating as airport shuttles). I visualize commuters working on laptops or watching CNN on overhead screens while on their commute to work. If busses were to become more attractive, ridership will go up and still serve the same purpose as the rail without the disruption to neighboring communities and the burden to taxpayers. Why not take the lead of Raleigh and Wake County? They see the rail as a losing proposition and are finding alternatives that make more sense. Please don't let this monstrosity ruin our area!
N/G	Gail	Culton			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	Waste of our tax money. Improve bus service like our neighbors in Raleigh instead.
N/G	Patrick	Culton			chaple hill	North Caro	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Donna	Culton			Chapel Hill	N.C.	USA	27517	4-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Lynda	Cunningham			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Oct-15	Choose the "NO Build" Alternative and build as Bus Rapid Transit system that can be integrated into Wake County's plan for BRT. Then there will be public transportation to RTP. Light Rail is too expensive, and the technology is obsolete

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Patrick	Curley			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	Originally concerned about the routes proposed and at grade crossing safety and traffic issues. Upon review, now very concerned about financial viability and the permanent subsidy Light Rail will require, and tremendous safety issues. We can do better with a 1.8 Billion dollar budget.
Mrs.	Wendy	Curtis			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	24-Jun-15	The placement of this rail system will snarl the ALREADY awful traffic that is around the Barbee Chapel Road Chapel Hill.
N/G	Nan M.	Cushing			Durham	N/G	N/G	27707	20-Sep-15	Small buses with wider routes could be more conveient and less expensive.
N/G	Katherine	Dancel			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Aug-15	Meadowmont was designed with the Light Rail in mind. The intersections with Hwy 54 near the Friday Center are already extremely congested. Please reconsider!
N/G	Karima and Shiva	Das			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	NO to the Durham/Orange Co. light rail train! Makes no sense...the buses that go back and forth b/t orange and Durham co have a minimal amount of passengers. It would make more sense to fill these hybrid buses first before even thinking of embarking on this very expensive light rail project and all of its ramifications.
Mrs	Patricia	Daves			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	Highway 54 is already very congested so I don't think the Light Rail Train should be built thus adding to the congestion.
Ms	Kathryn	Davis			Chapel Hill	N. C.	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Nancy W	Davis			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Oct-15	The light rail as presently proposed does not make sense. At the speeds proposed, bus transportation works without disrupting neighborhoods.
N/G	M.	de Bruyn			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27516	10-Jun-15	N/G
DR	Ellen	De Flora			Durham	NC	USA	27707	22-Aug-15	The proposed light rail system for the Durham Chapel Hill area will hurt communities and not help alleviate the congestion of the area. The ROMF are placed in areas not designated for industrial use and will dirty up areas that were meant for communities, small businesses and schools. Other more flexible and cost effective alternatives should be sought.
Ms	Allison	Deal			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Trish	Dean			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	Decision making about the location of stations, at-grade crossings and ROMF seem very narrow-minded and not keeping in mind the new reality this will create for the people who live and travel in those areas.
N/G	Heath	Dedmond			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Aug-15	N/G
Ms	Molly	Dempsey			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs.	Kathleen	Dennis			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
mr.	Luther	Dennis			Chapel Hill	nC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Ashley	DeSena			Hillsborough	North Caro	USA	27278	1-Oct-15	N/G
Ms	Nancy	Dewhirst			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Mark	Dewhirst			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Barbara	Dickinson			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	I STRONGLY OPPOSE the placement of the Light Rail maintenance facility being placed in the peaceful, heavily-residential area on Farrington Road in Durham and the passenger station in Downing Creek in CHAPEL HILL. The placement of both facilities will create tremendous traffic problems to already-existing overloaded traffic congestion, extensive noise issues for peaceful residential areas, and thel decrease in property values for hundreds of homes -- not to mention the eminent domain of many decades-long residents. VOTE with a heart; listen to your constituents; place these two transit facilities in an industrial section on Cornwallis in Durham; that area is suited for such uses. SAY NO TO RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT!
Dr.	Margie	Dietz			Durham	NC	USA	27705	21-Aug-15	My perception is that the route has been so compromised at this point, it no longer serves the needs of the citizens of Durham.
N/G	L	DiGiovanni			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	27-Sep-15	I am concerned that the rail is cutting off access to the main roads for emergency vehicles and causing danger for residents of Downing Creek subdivision.
Ms	Anna	Dnegan			Chapel Hill	Nc	USA	27517	10-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Carol	Dodge			CHAPEL HILL	NC - North	USA	2.75E+08	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Patricia	Dorsch			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Ernst	Dorsch			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	John	Dorward			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	James	Doughty			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	13-Jun-15	I am pro-transit and pro-future. But this project has been planned along illogical lines to serve certain people's interests. Our civil attempts to steer it in a rational direction were met with deaf ears. Opposing the whole thing is our only remaining option. I hope this course of action is scrapped and that the Triangle starts over to design a rail system that will actually serve people's needs.
Ms.	Donna	Douglas			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Michael	Douglas			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Dr.	Danielle	Doyle			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	17-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Nancy	Drozd			LEXINGTON	NC	USA	27295	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Edward	Drozd			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Steven	Drysdale			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	Not in favor of the construction of the maintenance facility for light rail so close to our neighborhood.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Mary Jo	Dunnington			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Jean	Durham			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Beverly	Dyer			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Sam	Dyer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	1. Costs: 1.05B to Durham according to the Durham County Bus and LRT plan. Read ODU State of the region report, construction delays and cost overruns are endemic with LRT const, according to the American J. of Planning, costs are up to 40% greater than estimates, either miscalculating costs or initial low ball from contractors to secure contracts. 2. Safety: LRT death rate (not counting suicide) 5-10 times greater than bus--source US DOT, nearly all are pedestrians at grade crossings 3. Gentrification of east Durham: Multiple studies show this around Urban LRT stations 4. Who is going to ride it: Read the 2011 city and county issue guide from the John Locke Foundation. Very few riders, and many of those will come from prior bus riders who no longer have service (gotta pay for it somehow) 5. Decrease property value: Read Impact of LRT on residential property value (PV) in Houston by Qisheng Pan, multiple studies and analysis show a significant decrease in PV 1/4 mile from the station; that will affect a significant number of homes in the Oaks, Downing Creek and Meadowmont. 6. Visual and asthetic issue, Downing Creek residents will have high exposure and sensitivity to an LRT/statn
N/G	jeff	earley			Durham	NC	USA	27707	23-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Jessica	Edwards		.	Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	larry	eimers			durham	nc	N/G	27705	30-Aug-15	ridiculous waste of money with poor planning!
Mr	Peter	Einaudi			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27157	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Mary	Elkins			Chapel hill	NC	N/G	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Kathryn	Enchelmayer			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Although I believe the Light Rail is a good thing, I don't understand why it cannot be on the other side of Hwy 54 from Downing Creek where there is no development.
Capt	Peter	Enchelmayer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	2.75E+08	9-Jun-15	The concept of a train isworth consideration, however, locating the tracks across NC54 would not negatively affect our neighborhood as much as current plans. Rush hour egress/ingress would be f'd up severely were the current options selected.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Thomas	Englund			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jul-15	This is a poor plan that will impact hundreds of homeowners in a very negative way. It will never pay off and will cost all area taxpayers an incredible amount of money so that very few can take a train to and from work every day. Go Triangle has been dishonest with the public, steadfastly adhering to their current proposal in a desperate effort to get the project underway. Please investigate further without relying on their numbers or projections. Please look into the stories of the families who will be displaced or otherwise damaged. Please investigate the environmental damage that will be caused by the ROMF on Farrington Road.
Ms	Sharon	Epstein			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Stanley	Epstein			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	1-Aug-15	N/G
Ms	Carolyn	Epstein			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Aug-15	This project is not good for the area and is far too expensive, and benefits too few to justify the huge expense. Lets expand the bus service at very much less expense.
Ms	Susan	Erickson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	Originally, RDU and RTP were to be included as part of the plan. After Wake County opted out, this was no longer possible. The present plan shows that the rail line will originate at UNC Hospitals with stops at DUMC and other locations on Hwy 54 and 15-501. and end on Alston Ave near the intersection with Hwy55. This will create traffic nightmares on roads that are already congested with traffic, and disrupt established neighborhoods along the route. There is already dependable bus service which travels the same route as the proposed train. This train will cost billions, and ridership will be limited. It would make sense to stop the project now, and consider other options (improved bus routes, eco friendly buses, designated bus lanes on !40 to RDU and RTP). There are also plans to build a Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility on Farrington Rd on 25 acres of land near Ephesus Church Rd that is presently zoned for Residential use. Commercial development on land bordering the facility is also planned. This is totally unacceptable for neighborhoods and schools near the site. Let's stop this project now before it is too late. Wake Co, said "no". Let's be wise and do the same
Mr	Eugene	Eschmann			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Bren	Eskridge			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	How can light rail be justified when people are not even using the buses.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Marsha	Fancher			Durham	NC	USA	27707	25-Jul-15	This project is far too expensive for the tax payer to support when other transit alternatives can be identified that are far less costly. The estimated number of riders is in excess of the standard percentages of ridership across the country (Source:: Quarterly and Annual Totals by Mode - collected by American Public Transportation Association)
Mrs	Rebekah	Farris			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Charlie	Farris			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Lida	fay			Chapel hill	nc	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	margaret	fetters			chapel hill	N/G	N/G	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	paul	fitts			Raleigh	North Caro	USA	27615	16-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Marilyn	Flanary			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	9-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Gita	Fleischman			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	15-Jul-15	N/G
Dr.	Jeremy	Force			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	25-Jul-15	We request the rail system not be built near or on Farrington Road.
N/G	Jenny	Force			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Jul-15	As a local Farrington home owner, I reject the idea of putting a light rail maintenance facility on Farrington Rd.
Mr	Dick	Ford			Durham	NC	USA	276517	8-Jun-15	Chapel Hill and UNC must be held accountable for their routing preferences adopted by GoTriangle. They are using light occupancy rail for their elite interests. Look at how GoTriangle has turned its back on East Durham and the Judea campus. How many at-grade crossings do Chapel Hill neighborhoods face??? Why is light occupancy transit elevated thru the UNC Campus at a cost of millions, but not for our neighborhoods??
N/G	Rosemary	Ford			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	10-Jun-15	It has been very disheartening to see the process by which the light rail plan has been made--rife with favoritism toward the wealthy city of Chapel Hill and disregard for the interests of East Durham (as well as my own neighborhood of Downing Creek.)
mrs	Cheryl	Fox			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Mike	Fox			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Morgan	Fox			Chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	John	Frackoviak			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Frances	Freedman			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Joel	Freelander			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Oct-15	N/G
Dr.	Susan N	Friel			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	I oppose the development and construction of the Durham - Orange county Light Rail Train System.
Ms	Donna	Fudale			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Edward	Fudale			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Deborah	Fulghieri			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	29-Sep-15	I oppose this high-cost, low-efficiency light rail project, because -on its western half, it is to be built on protected Jordan reservoir lands; -it is designed to serve primarily tax-exempt properties in Orange County (Friday Center, Mason Farm Road, UNC Hospitals); -it explicitly assumes that the CHC School District will sell Glenwood Elementary School to developers (per the Chapel Hill Transportation Planning Manager to the Planning Board); -all of Orange County is paying into this plan which does not serve the Chapel Hill's 15-501 commercial corridor; -and finally, I hate the Orwellian use of "preferred route" by GoTriangle to describe the route through Jordan reservoir lands, when it is obvious that no one prefers it. Chapel Hill is building densely everywhere but along this proposed rail line.
N/G	Paul	Gala			Chapel hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Carol	Garth			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	This limited ridership is served well by busses and the proposed location for rail and vehicle maintenance facility is targeted for a zoned residential area. I am concerned about increase in crime as people have unrestricted access to a residential area with limited access at the present time, the impact on housing values, and impeding traffic flow for an already overly trafficked road being Farrington Rd. the planned rail crossings will only worsen the already bad situation especially during peak hours. We don't need this rail service. It is duplicating bus service already provided and is a waste of tax money needed elsewhere.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	David	Gavin	davidgavin@bellsou	103 Blakely Drive	Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	Without a direct line to RDU airport from downtown Chapel Hill AND from downtown Durham, this project is a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. There is no possible way non rush-hour traffic (or rush-hour traffic for that matter) between Durham and Chapel Hill is creating sufficient congestion to warrant such an expenditure. In fact, based upon the design layout of the system, traffic congestion will only increase, particularly along the highway 54 section of the plan near exit 273 on I-40. And if the goal of the plan is to provide transportation to those unable to afford an car, the existing bus system is already providing that service more than adequately and with less intrusiveness to the infrastructures of residential neighborhoods. The only people who support this plan are hospital workers at Duke and UNC, individuals who have invested time and/or money in the plan, and government officials who want to force this system on the community due to their own vanity and/or lust for power. There is not a single person I have spoken to in the last year that supports this project that wasn't in one of these groups. This project is more self serving than it is community serving.
Ms	Julia	Geddings			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	15-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Weston	Geddings			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	15-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Bernard	Geller			Chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Eric	Ghysels			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	James	Gibson			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	12-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Karen	Gibson			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	12-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	James	Gibson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jul-15	No to light rail
Mrs	Charlotte	gilbert			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	26-Jul-15	Using Farrington Road is a terrible idea!! South Point or 15/501 would be a better use of land - Please do not build on Farrington Rd
N/G	Bill	Gilbert			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Aug-15	This is a big waste of tax payer money. A train that goes nowhere and picks up no one.
N/G	Tyler	Glasco			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	28-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	Richard	Glover			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Desiree	Goldman			CHAPEL HILL	NC	USA	27514	20-Aug-15	N/G
ms	shari	Goldstein			chapel hill	nc	USA	27516	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Avery	Goldstein			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	25-Jun-15	Do not destroy the most family friendly area in Durham! Why would you build a light rail that no one will ride? Please spend the funds improving our schools and become a city others look to as a model instead of a place people make fun of!

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Susan	Goldstein			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	Have you seen the back-up on Farrington Road during rush hour? There must be a better place for this!
Mr.	Buddy	Golubiewski			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	kimberly	gooden			Raleigh	N/G	N/G	27606	27-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Len	Grande			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Sep-15	N/G
Mr	Jim	Green			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Oct-15	The project as it is currently conceived is -based on fundamentally unsound ridership projections and will not result in any appreciable reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel Hill-Durham road corridor. -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not aligned with the higher density compact neighborhood developments in Orange and Chatham counties. -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small percentage of the annual operating costs. -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is necessary in order to support light rail transit. The Chapel Hill-Durham corridor has a population density less than 20% of that threshold. -The ridership projections for the D-O LRT are wildly optimistic, with estimated daily boardings of 23,000. -I support the NO BUILD OPTION. The projected growth in the Triangle is predominately weighted toward Wake County, and Wake County, with a much larger population than Orange or Durham Counties has rejected the Light Rail option.
Dr	Sandra	Greene			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Margaret	Gresham			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	This will ruin my neighborhood.
N/G	Maggie	Griffin			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	15-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Shauna	Griffin			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Erika	Griffin			Chapel hill	Nc	USA	27514	14-Sep-15	N/G
Mr.	Albert	Gusman			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Stacy	Hagerty			Chapel HIll	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Jan	Halle			1002 Arrowhead Rd	Chapel Hill	USA	27514	4-Jul-15	This light rail is a ruse. Lots of money and effort has been put into something that must be lining someone's pocket. There is not significant population density to support it. Who benefits I don't know but someone.
Mr	Steven	Hamelly			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Martha	Hamlett			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Oct-15	Needs more study

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Dr	David	Hardman			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	20-Sep-15	The Durham Orange Light Rail Transit proposal is no longer cost effective, nor does it address the commuting needs of the entire metropolitan Triangle area. Improving bus service and frequency in the Durham-Orange corridor will be cheaper, flexible, sustainable, and will minimize negative environmental impact. I am a fan of mass transit in general, but this proposal is misguided and not a viable plan.
Ms	Cheryl	Hardman			Chapel Hill	Nc	USA	27517	22-Sep-15	I am opposed to light rail in Orange and Durham counties. It is a waste of tax funds because it is not a high traffic area vs ch to RTP. Low ridership on existing buses.
\Ms	Kimberly	Hardman			chapel hil	nc	USA	27517	26-Sep-15	This electric rail system is not needed for the traffic between Durham and Chapel Hill It is unsafe, based on statistics in other cities. It is unfunded by at least 40 percent and could be higher with cost over runs. It is old technology. As a millenial, I prefer using uber or my own car. It is not connecting to anything in Wake County, the airport or Southpoint where I may actually use it .
N/G	Jack	Harless			Chapel Hill	NORTH CAI	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Toby	Harrell			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Review this D-O rail routing. As it stands, it is significantly hazardous and a major inconvenience to those of us east of the proposed line.
N/G	Cheryl	Harrell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Reject the Durham-Orange Light Rail project. It is disruptive to neighborhoods and is not cost effective. Instead increase bus frequency and route coverage.
Ms	Bette	Harrington			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs.	Diane	Hartley			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Sep-15	I share a desire to solve congestion and traffic issues. This light rail, as currently planned, does neither.
N/G	Barbara	Harwell			Sanford	NC	USA	27330	24-Jun-15	I own property on the corner of Barbee Chapel & Pearl Lane & am very concerned about the number and frequency of highway crossings and safety issues.
Mr.	Thomas	Hauck			Pittsboro	North Caro	USA	27312	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Bonnie	Hauser			Hillsborough	N/G	N/G	27278	10-Jun-15	.
N/G	Kathleen	Havlin			Chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Erika	Hawkins			Winston Salem	NC	USA	27104	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Michelle	Hayward			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Oct-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Dr.	Robert	Healy			Durham	NC	N/G	27705	18-Aug-15	The LRT line between Durham and Chapel will do almost nothing to relieve congestion on 15-501, has an astronomical cost per rider, will have impacts on neighborhoods and on wetlands, and will drain funds for personalized transit for the elderly and disabled. A very poor investment.
Mrs	Denise	Heil			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	James	Heil			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	I believe the massive expenditures for this rail system are an ineffective way to use taxpayer money. The GoTriangle buses already cover this route. If demand increases, just add more buses! The cost is minimal compared to a train. I've heard bus and train funding are considered separately. This needs to be combined to ensure fiscal responsibility. If a train is inevitable, it needs to run to the RTP and Raleigh, not UNC to Duke.
Mr.	D. Bruce	Henschel			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	2-Sep-15	N/G
Mrs.	Rosemary	Herbst			Chapel Hill	N.C.	N/G	27514	22-Jun-15	Totally against Light Rail.
Mrs	Belinda	Hereghty			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Anne	Heymann			Chapel Hill	Nc	USA	27517	12-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Wesley	Heymann		t	Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	4-Jul-15	Does not go to the airport so not a fan.
N/G	N	Hibbard			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	4-Oct-15	I don't think it is "enough" and the "shed" is a major issue in terms of appearance/traffic, etc.
Dr	Anthony	Hickey			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	23-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Steve	Hicks			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Lydia	Hill			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Peter	Hinkle			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	I do not believe that the rail line as proposed makes fiscal sense.
Mr	Peter	Hinkle			Chapel hill	Nc	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	Bs3z
N/G	Mike and Denise	Hoffman			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	28-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Michael	Hoglund			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27507	23-Jun-15	I support the petition to reject the proposed Durham-Orange Light rail project.
N/G	Lucinda	Hohn			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Thomas	Hohn			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Donald	Holloway			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Oct-15	We do not need it, it is too extremely expensive, will confiscate properties of others.
Ms.	Elaine	Holmes			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	3-Aug-15	N/G
Mr.	Dennis	House			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Elizabeth	House			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	28517	7-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Ms	Grace Meyer	Howell			CH, Durham County	North Caro	USA	27517	12-Oct-15	The light rail is far too expensive based upon the per user cost of the likely users of this rail. The rail system will block both entrances to our neighborhood, making it almost impossible for us to enter and exit our neighborhood 18 hours per day. The rail project should be cancelled entirely and the funds diverted to far more pressing issues in education, health care and job development.
Dr.	Ping-Chuan	Hu			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	15-Jun-15	It is none sense to put a railroad in front of a well-established niborhood. While the other side of the highway was empty. Don't do it.
N/G	Burk and Mary	Huey			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	6-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Dale	Huff			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	We do not support the proposed Light Rail plan. It needs an independent review by qualified experts to assure better options are found. Both traffic and noise issues created by the plan are unacceptable.
N/G	Andrea	Huffman			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Laura	Hulett			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Charles	Humble			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	28-Jun-15	After living in urban centers with rapid transit, my initial position was in favor of Light Rail. However, we are not Boston and our many communities in the Triangle have not evolved along the proposed transit lines. Stop the studies and direct our efforts to better and more buses.
N/G	Robert	Humphreys			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and not realistic.
N/G	Stephanie	Humphreys			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic.
N/G	Makiko	Humphreys			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic.
Mr	Craig	Hyatt			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Marija	Ivanovic			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Susan	Jackson			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Matthew	Jackson			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Paul	Jackson			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Reitha	Jackson			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	Unbelievable that you would even consider doing this project. Traffic, parking and a station that doesn't even serve our community. Please stop this project now!
Mr.	Sonny	Jackson			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	Money can be spent in better ways especially in a tight economy. We do NOT need the entrance to our development messed up or blocked in anyway and do not need added traffic problems. There are enough traffic issues already.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Dr.	Rachida	Jackson			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	This project is very expensive, and it is not going to help us. It is going to make our life miserable and create more traffic and stress. If many people are against it, then you need to find a solution to this huge problem!
N/G	Jane	Jannelli			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Valarie	jarvis			Durham	nc	USA	27703	9-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Immanuel	Jarvis			Durham	NC	USA	27703	30-Sep-15	N/G
Dr.	Larry	Jenkins			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Pamela	Jenkins			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	The proposed route of the light rail makes no sense and does not meet the intention of the rail. An independent auditor needs to review the plan to make recommendations on how to get this plan back on the correct path.
Mrs	Julie	Johnson			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	Please do not allow the light rail project to go through. The communities it will impact are full of children and families in an area that was never designed to support such a project. While meadowmont was the obvious choice (and was created to be such a center) now that it is off the table please do not go ahead with plan B. Please stand up for those who do not have the bullying power that meadowmont has used. Please do not allow this!
Mr	Timothy	Johnson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	There are significant safety concerns with the Downing Creek and Little John crossings and nearby station in the proposed plan. Not to mention the questionable rationale given a station within walking distance at the Friday Center (with significantly more parking area too) and that Meadowmont was designed to have light rail run through it.
N/G	Nancy	Johnson			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	If this project included the entire triangle area it might be worthy of consideration but as it does not, it does not.
N/G	James	Johnson			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Leslie	Johnson			Durham	NC	N/G	27707	30-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Mark	Johnson			Durham	N/G	N/G	27712	30-Sep-15	The economic "case" for this project proposal is less than weak, but the cost is enormous. This is at best a complete boondoggle.
Dr	amy	jones			chapel hill	N/G	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Bishop	Jordan			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	It is a waste of money that is not supported by the facts.
Ms.	Spencia	Joyner			Durham	North Caro	USA	27704	5-Sep-15	N/G
Professor	Joseph	Kalo			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
Dr.	David	Kao			Chapel Hill	NORTH CA	USA	27517	9-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr	Laurence	Katz			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	The current transit system is underutilized and there is no reliable evidence that the light rail will be better utilized. There is evidence that the light rail will be an environmental and economic disaster and needs to be stopped. The federal government should not waste money on this project.
N/G	Laura	Kelly			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	Agree that the Farrington corridor is not the appropriate location for a train track much less a train maintenance depot. Regardless of the historic home sites, which would be a shame to lose, the area just is not large enough to accommodate such an undertaking. Using 15-501 makes much more sense, and trains could run right down the middle of the boulevard without much change in the landscape.
N/G	Everett	Kemp			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Sep-15	This project wastes hard earned resources of residents to build an unusable system destroying natural areas and creating problems for residents. The only benefit of the project is to allow some uninformed government officials the opportunity to grandstand about their accomplishment.
N/G	james	kernodle			durham	nc orange	N/G	27705	9-Sep-15	You can count the train passengers nowon one hand. Not enuff people ride now....its a waste of our money.STOP THE TRAIN...and waste of OUR money !
Mr.and Mr	Graham and Susan	King			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	Our townhouse is right after the entrance to Downing Creek. Going in and out will be a constant issue. A real estate friend has told us our property value will drop even with this possibility.
Mr	EDWARD	KINNAIRD			CHAPEL HILL	NC	USA	27517	23-Sep-15	I do not support the light rail proposal (DOLRT). The municipalities simply do not have the financial resources to support this project. While transportation is an important issue for our area, I believe this solution will lead to more traffic congestion, a more dangerous community, a significant debt burden, and will be a blight on a beautiful community that took many years to build. I stand firmly behind the NO BUILD option
N/G	Jane	Kirsch			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	10-Jun-15	Please stop spending good money on a bad idea.
N/G	Jane	Kirsch			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	28-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Mary Ann	Klompmaker			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Jay	Klompmaker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	I believe this project is both unfeasible and unnecessary.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr	Daniel	Knoll			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Ann	Koerber			chapel Hill	Durham co	USA	27517	30-Jul-15	Just the noise levels are enough to show that this is a bad location for this industrial facility
N/G	William	koerber			chapel hill	N/G	N/G	27517	2-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Joseph	Koontz			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jun-15	N/G
Miss	Aynalem	Kumela			Bury	GraterMan	UK	BL9 9HD	23-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Kathryn	Ladd			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Fred	Lampe			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27514	13-Jun-15	The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already figured this out. To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown.
N/G	Fred	Lampe			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27514	27-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Lilly	Langer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	David	Lapp			Chapel Hill	NORTH CA	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Dana	Lapple		r	Durham	NC	N/G	27707	19-Aug-15	N/G
Mrs.	Crystal	Lara			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	27-Aug-15	N/G
Mr.	James	Larkin			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	10-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Kenneth	Larsen			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	Light Rail is a complete waste of money. It's too inflexible and will only benefit people who live within a quarter mile of a station and whose destination is also within a quarter mile of a station. If you do the math, that's a very small number of people.
N/G	Sara	Larson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route.
Dr	Sylvia	Leaver			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Oct-15	I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment.
Mr.	Steve	LeGardeur			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Peggy	Leggett			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	8-Aug-15	N/G
Mt	Frederick	Leitner			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	Cost too large for too little positive value
Ms	Bernice	Leitner			Chapel Hill	Nc	N/G	27517	7-Jul-15	Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit
Mr.	Robert	Leopold			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Ingeborg	Leopold			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	John	Lewis			Durahm	NC	USA	27707	23-Aug-15	N/G
Ms.	Melanie	Leyden			Durham	NC	USA	27707	28-Jul-15	This is residential, suburban area consisting of a quiet country setting, three local schools, and serene neighborhoods. It is not the place for a 24 hour maintenance facility. It is absolutely unfair to the property owners in this area to rezone and create this facility. People invested in this neighborhood because of its county setting. Disrupting existing neighborhoods is unjust when there are better location available that are already zoned for industrial endeavors; Corwallis!
N/G	joseph & janet	liegl			chapel hill	Durham NC	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	Ridership seems unlikely to warrant the cost, given proposed route, and will cause great disturbance to existing neighborhoods and home values.
Dr	Jason	Liss			Chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Henry	Lister			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	Please reject route C2 and C2A in favor of the route through Meadowmont, for which that development was originally approved.
N/G	K	Liu			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	25-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Qi	Liu			Chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	13-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Brodie	Lloyd			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Ann	Loftin			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27516	14-Sep-15	What might make more sense, in my view, is a trolley along the middle of 15/501, all the way from Durham to Chapel Hill. It could go up Franklin, which would benefit from becoming a two-lane street again. Or along 54 and up to the hospital. Or both. And we need public transportation from Chapel Hill and Durham to the airport, whether bus or rail.
Mr.	Johnny	Long			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	29-Jul-15	I strongly reject the current proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region. This route will be detrimental to the value and quality of living for homes and residents of Falconbridge/Huntingbridge, Downing Creek, Homes along Barbee Chapel Road, Chapelwood, and other areas along N.C. 54 East between Chapel Hill and Interstate 40.
Mrs	Joan	Long			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27516	26-Sep-15	N/G
Mr	Martin	Lopez			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	This project is totally unnecessary. The majority of taxpayers affected do not want it. Put it to a vote.
N/G	Carter	Love			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	9-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Michael David	Loven			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	12-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	James	Lowe			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Carmen	Lowe			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	26-Jul-15	N/G
Dr.	Louchie	Lu			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Aaron	Lubeck			Durham	N/G	N/G	27701	19-Aug-15	N/G
MR	Clark	Luikart			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Jean	Lusted			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Jul-15	N/G
Mx	Bob	Lynch			Durham	N/G	N/G	27703	9-Jun-15	LR would be ok, but Rapid Bus Transit, (RBT) is much, much better. Also 1/2 the cost.
N/G	Lianne	MacGregor			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Ridwan	Mahbub			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27514	21-Aug-15	We don't need this train system. There is already a free Chapel Hill wide public transportation system and a triangle-wide bus system that does an effective job of taking away residents. This costly train serves no real purpose and may have unintended consequences like bringing in crime, noise, quality of life, etc. It is unlikely the train will go everywhere we want it to.
Mr	Josh	Manchester			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Michael	Mangili			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	23-Aug-15	I believe the project is not servicing enough of the Triangle. I was in favor with Wake Co. involved but the latest plan is bad. Location of the ROMF is in a residential area and located to closely to an elementary school. It is going to lead to more headaches!
Dr	Arun	Manikumar			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	30-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Kristi	Mann			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Kelly	Mansfield			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Raquel	Maradiaga			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Luis	Maradiaga			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	The Durham-Orange Light Rail Train is unnecessary and will be underused. We already have a working bus system for public transportation.
N/G	Bonita	Marks			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	This is a poorly conceived idea and the needs assessment report is fraudulent. There are too many safety, economic and environmental issues to approve the LRT project in this region.
N/G	Maria	Marquis			Durham	NC	USA	27707	28-Aug-15	N/G
Mrs.	M	Mars			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	mary	mars			chapel hill	nc	N/G	27517	6-Aug-15	N/G
Mr	James	Mars			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Aug-15	N/G
mr	wayne	marshall			raleigh	nc	N/G	27609	16-Jun-15	Stop it now !
N/G	lesley	marson			chapel hill	durham	N/G	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Caroline	Mason			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	21-Jul-15	Do NOT want to see the access to 54/Little John Road CLOSED! Too many people use it.
Ms	Laurin	Massengale			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	If a light rail is put in I believe the Meadowmont location will get better ridership and interfere with traffic less than the C2A route.
N/G	Shelley	Masters			Chapel Hill	NC - North	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Marianna	Matinyan			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	I find the project utterly unnecessary .
N/G	Pamela	Mayer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Philip	Mayer			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	No thank you! Please do not put the stop here
N/G	david	mayer			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	27-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Rebecca	Mayew			Chapel hill	Nc	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Kathleen	McAndrews			Chapel Hill	nc	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	We do not need a 17 mile bridge to no where. It doesn't even go to RTP, the airport or Raleigh. It cost billions of dollars with not much value. Raleigh gave up on this idea because it made no sense. We should do so as well. Please cancel this.
Ms	Renee	McBride			Durham	NC	USA	27712	24-Jun-15	RDU, RTP and Southpoint should be served, and it should extend farther east and north in Durham to serve members of those communities (of which I am one). Serving Carrboro and Hillsborough should also be considered.
N/G	Julie	McBrierty			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Mike	McBrierty			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	S. G.	McCain			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27516	8-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Debbie	McCarthy			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	D. C.	McCarthy			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	This is an ill-conceived plan. It will aid to the destruction of a rural buffer between Durham and Chapel Hill and is not in keeping with any plans. As usual the construction, long term water and air pollution, and the noise impacts will be on the citizens of Durham Co. thus maintaining the character of Chapel Hill. The water runoff from this facility and the noise and the ugliness are not something Durham residents want.
Mrs.	Kathy	McCord			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	1-Aug-15	This is a total waste of resources because it will not benefit the people who need transportation.
N/G	Timothy	McCord			Durham	North Caro	USA	27705	9-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Diane	McElroy			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Diane	McGrath			Chapel Hill	Durham Co	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	This plan will create significant problems as well as very significant unintended consequences. For example the station for Woodmont has no parking spaces and the projected numbers for use are fantasy not fact.
Ms	Chris	McHugh			Durham	NC	USA	27707	28-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Philip	McHugh			Durham	NC	USA	27707	29-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Scott	McIlhenny			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Ingrid	McIntosh			CHAPEL HILL	N/G	N/G	27517	21-Jun-15	The Farrington Road proposed location for the Maintenance Facility will destroy our 55 plus community. The creation of an industrial area in our rural, quiet community will significantly lower our property values, increase local crime and threaten the financial andn physical security of our senior citizens in this area.
N/G	James	McIntosh			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	Location of maintenance facility near school & our 55 plus community and other residential areas.
Mrs	Kathleen	McManus			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Aug-15	Because of the already existing traffic congestion along this route, adding more stops will only increase the problems. Additionally, light rail has not proven to benefit municipalities and consumer satisfaction.
N/G	Hannah	Meador			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	10-Jun-15	Properties on Meadowmont Lane (and in the rest of the neighborhood) were all purchased with the full disclosure of future light rail plans in place going through that location. My parents considered this fact 13 years ago when building a house in Meadowmont. The basis for altering these plans seems nonsensical, biased, and not in keeping with Chapel Hill's reputation for thoughtful long-term planning in the interest of the community as a whole.
N/G	Judith	Mellyn			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	The process leading up to the selection of light rail and its preferred route alignments undervalued, or in many instances ignored, the needs and concerns of Orange/Durham residents. Unless and until we, the citizens of Orange and Durham, receive equitable services, expert opinion validating the applicability of light rail to our specific population distributions, and full disclosure of the cost and ridership methodologies used to justify Go-Triangle / MPO request for funding from the FTA, it is unconscionable to even consider expending our limited tax dollars on this flawed proposal.
Mrs	Marcia	Mensah			Durham	NC	USA	27707	19-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Roger	Messier			Chapel hill	North Caro	N/G	28480	22-Jun-15	There are better ways to spend text dollars. Z
N/G	Caroline	Mikaloff			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	18-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	June	Milby			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr.	Norbert	Mildner			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	This is a absolute Waste of taxpayer's money. The cost per ridership does not add up. Line of travel is very insufficient, does not go to airport, big mall's, stadium. Charlotte, which is 3 x as big as chapel hill does not cover the cost yet, means taxpayer still has to support the project. By the time the LR is built the technology is outdated. There are better alternatives to meat the proposed demand for the CH area. The maintenance , upkeep safety issue are Oslo a big concern.
mr.	Norbertt	Mildner			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	15-Sep-15	L
Mrs	Theresa	Miles			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	I do not think the light rail is a good idea for several reason. I rode the light rail in Baltimore for five years (starting with first year). I would be surprised if this saves money and created jobs. I only saw the crime on the light rail and the communities it brought crime to. I also do not think any light rail is truly making money or saving money. I also do not see why Meadowmont can say no they do not want it after the decision was made to have it. I feel that you are just putting across the street because we do not have the money to fight it and the Finley Forest community will only be hurt more, with the home values decreasing. I am not against the idea of going green, but I do see where the benefits out way the means on this one.
N/G	Christopher	Miles			Baltimore	Maryland	USA	410	25-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Jeff	Miller			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	9-Sep-15	This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!!
Ms	Esther	Miller			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	9-Sep-15	This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!!
N/G	gerry & adele	mittelstadt			chapel hill	nc durham	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	We are living in a 55 and older community across from the proposed repair and maintenance facility. we are against this construction being built and totally against the light rail train.
Mrs	Mary	Moeller			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	Too close to my children's school and my neighborhood which is going to cause significant increase in traffic as well as strande people meandering in close proximity to over 900 elementary children!!
Mr	Andrew	Moeller			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Jason	Moon			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Tara	Moon			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Reginald	Moore			Hickory	NC	USA	28601	11-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Debbie	Moore			DURHAM	NC - North	USA	27707	25-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Sandra	Morgan			CHAPEL HILL	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Dr	William	Morley			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Lauren	Morris			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Craig	Morris			Chapel hill	N/G	N/G	27514	14-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Betty	Morris			Chapel Hill	Durham	N/G	27517	12-Oct-15	Please do not start a light rail system just for UNC, DUKE, NCC! A rail system is needed for Raleigh Chapel Hill Durham where I 40 is packed, not just the universities! Also, look at the fiasco of Charlotte rail system! It's an embarrassment!!!! Do we want the same for Furham and Chapel Hill? NO LIGHT RAIL!!! NO REZONING!!!
N/G	Bonnie	Morrison			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Ellen	Moul			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	30-Sep-15	very expensive project with minimal value to residents. Money can be spent more effectively without disrupting our lovely neighborhoods.
N/G	Nell	Mowry			Durham	NC	USA	27705	7-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Felicisimo	Munda			Durham	N/G	N/G	27707	23-Aug-15	N/G
Ms	felicia	mundy			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	29-Jul-15	While I favor light rail in general, I don't believe this project and its current route will alleviate traffic problems. I think this is a huge waste of tax payer money.
Dr	William	mundy			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	29-Jul-15	Route will not solve traffic problems.
Ms	felicia	mundy			chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	26-Aug-15	This is not a good use of taxpayer money and the existing plan will not solve our current traffic issues.
N/G	Joyce	munkacsi			chapel hill	nc	N/G	27517	7-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	James	Munkacsi			Chapel Hill	North aCar	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Beth	Myers			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	26-Aug-15	N/G
Mrs.	Darlene	Naugle			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Dennis	Naugle			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Dao	Ngo			Durham	NC	USA	27707	13-Sep-15	We don't really need it. Train takes longer where we want to go. Cost a lot to build it. Waste time and money for it.
Mrs	Chi	Nguyen			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Michael	Nguyen			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Robert	Nickerson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27516	2-Oct-15	This is a boondoggle of major proportion. If completed everyone 30 years from now will look back and say "WHAT WERE THEY THINKING."
Mrs	Hadley	Nixon			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Candace	Noel			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	20-Aug-15	Noise, disrupted traffic at at-grade crossings, home values negatively affected, horribly expensive given the limited businesses that can be accessed along the route.
N/G	Brian	Norris			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	15-Sep-15	I would like to see much more investigation into the possibilities of BRT for this corridor!
Mr.	Blaise	Noto			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr.	Blaise	Noto			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	The costs of this project are astronomical and will only escalate over time with the costs l once again be assumed by the taxpayers. Focus on making the roads better, wider, and more and better bus transportation.
N/G	Robert	O'Connell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. Think deeply and wisely!
N/G	Peggy	O'Connell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jul-15	Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. Think deeply and wisely!
Ms.	Maureen	Oakes			Chapel Hill	Norfh Caro	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Ilana	Osten		e	Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	William	Ott			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Marissa	Outten			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27514	21-Jul-15	Due to safety issues with cars and pedestrians this project needs to be stopped.
N/G	karen	paden			chapel hill	NC	N/G	27517	30-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Susan	Palmer			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	5-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	John	Parker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Patrick	Parks			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	17-Aug-15	N/G
Dr.	Kristi	Passaro			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Paul	Passaro			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Virginia	Pate			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	I am particularly concerned about the safety of multiple grade level crossings around my neighborhood but also question who will actually benefit from this project. Traffic between South Durham & UNC along Barbee Chapel Rd seems to be one of the more highly traveled routes in this area, perhaps second only to US-54 to I-40 from UNC to RTP; the light rail will not serve either of those communities and will actually cause increased traffic delays due to street level crossing on the south side of 54.
Dr	Scottie	Pate			chapel hill	nc	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	My objection is to ground level tracks in an already congested high-traffic area
N/G	Frances	Patterson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Hal	Patterson			Chapel Hill	nc	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
mr	louis	payne			Chapel hill	North Caro	USA	27517	27-Sep-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mrs	Susan	Pearl			Durham	Nc	USA	27713	2-Oct-15	This money would be better served to be used for high occupancy lanes and better bus service
Ms	Barbara	Pelet			Chapel hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Sandy	Pendergraft			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	I live near the intersection of Barbee Chapel and NC HWY54. The traffic is already very bad during the rush hours. Sometimes it takes a while to just get out of my driveway. This rail system would make it unbearable.
mr.	Steve	Pendergraft			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	LeeAnne	Pendergraft			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	2-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	LuAnne	Pendergraft			Chapel hill	N/G	USA	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Don	Pendergraft			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	Roger	Pendleton			Chapel Hill	N.C.	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Lawrence	Perkins			Chapel hill	Nc	USA	27517	26-Aug-15	I oppose the light rail project. It is expensive and since it won't go to the airport or the RTP, it won't be used.
N/G	mary	Pettiette			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Mitch	Phillips		d	West Jefferson	NC	USA	28694	15-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Christine	Phillips			Durham	N/G	USA	27707	25-Jul-15	Putting an industrial maintenance facility in an area that is full of homes, near an elementary school and where it will drive out local wildlife is not acceptable. There are several more reasons why this is not a good idea: traffic issues, value of real estate and increases in the taxes around this area to pay for the outrageous cost of building this. I am against this and it is not necessary between Durham and chapel hill.
Mr.	Dustan	Phillips			Durham	North Caro	N/G	27707	11-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	susan	pierce			chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	Maintenance facility at Farrington is a hazard both to the elementary school and an over 55 community. Toxic fumes are a special hazard for the young and the elderly. D3
Dr.	Susan	Pierce			Chapel Hill	Durham Co	USA	27517	28-Jun-15	Grade-level crossings are NOT safe. Farrington RAMF next to an elementary school and a community for elders is NOT safe -- pending the need to evacuate due to "accidents" from flammable liquids that will be used daily, 24 hours, 7 days/week. . . not to mention that this area is zoned R-20, residential.
mr	William	Pitts			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	There is not sufficient density to support light rail in this area at this time. Building a light rail system to encourage density is totally backwards.
Mrs	Amanda	Podgoreanu			Chapel hill	Nc	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Joel	Poe			Liberty	N C	USA	27298	12-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Patricia	Porter			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Barbara	Post			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Oct-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Philp	Post	p		Chapel Hill	Durham	N/G	27517	2-Oct-15	We need and can afford Bus Rapid Transit, which has the power to serve a much wider area of Orange and Durham Counties. We do Not need a fixed rail system and we cannot afford it and it will not be flexible enough to serve our citizens.
MS	Teresa	Priboth			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	24-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Joe	Procopio			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	25-Jul-15	Light rail is not feasible for a metro area as widely spread as ours. This is a train to nowhere.
Mrs.	Allison	Procopio			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	25-Jul-15	Please do not spoil our quiet family communities when alternatives like 15-501 would be less intrusive and be accessible to so many more people. Plus, traffic on Farrington is already terrible in the morning and rush hour.
Mr. and M	Mark	Prokop			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Aug-15	Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train
Prof.	John	Pucher			Raleigh	NC	USA	27615	18-Aug-15	The planned LRT from Chapel Hill to Durham should be cancelled, as it would be a tragic waste of scarce tax dollars needed to fund improvements in bus services, including express service and Bus Rapid Transit throughout the Triangle Area. All studies show that express bus service and BRT are much more effective than LRT, which is an outdated technology. It would take 15 years to complete the D-O LRT, while improved bus service could start within a year or two.
Mrs	Pamela	Pulsfort			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	I believe that the light rail project as it is proposed if extremely ill conceived. I do not believe that there will be enough people riding it to off set the enormous expense and it will be very disruptive to traffic at the Downing Creek entrance and along Hwy. 54. Not to mention the already huge traffic tie ups during UNC events. It will be a huge disaster that we have to pay for with taxpayer funds and traffic congestion. Also, the state wants to widen Hwy 54 after light rail is in place. That will be a double disaster. Build it then move it??? Who is making these decisions?

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	J.	Pulsfort			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	15-Sep-15	We personally know of at least 26 years of mass transit promotion via the multitude of adjustable bussing routes by numerous federally & state subsidized programs which to date, by your own figures, have failed to carry more than some 1500 riders, despite regional growth that exceeds Charlotte's. Raleigh already rejected this faulty plan. Quit trying to foist it upon us. The federal budget can't afford it, neither can the state, we don't want it & terrorist attacks in Spain, England & France prove it's too dangerous for our children and families anyway. Scrap this nonsense and accelerate the safer more useful road widenings that are already planned for UNC's needs, which arrive by roads, not expensively limited light rail.
N/G	John	Quinterno			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27514	14-Sep-15	N/G
Mr.	JERRY	RAWLINSON			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Aug-15	N/G
Mr	James	Ray			Durham	NC	USA	27705	8-Oct-15	There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will not encompass the entire triangle nor have any federal help. waste of money as usual
Mrs	Marcia	Rea			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	19-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Ervin	Rea			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	19-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Ann	Recesso			Chapel Hill	N.C.	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	Placing light rail across the entrance to Downing Creek is dangerous and will cause unnecessary traffic congestion. It seems this area cannot support light rail regardless as the population, no matter how lawyers fiddle with the statistics, does not warrant it.
N/G	Michael	Reed			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jun-15	The current light rail commuter train plan will not meet the transportation needs of our community.
N/G	Christine	Reed			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Lucas	Reed			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Sep-15	The current route does not reach those areas with the greatest ridership needs. I prefer the no build option to the current plan.
N/G	Kelly	Reilly			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	27-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Jeffrey	Reilly			Durham	NC	USA	27707	27-Jul-15	N/G
Ms.	Judith	Rhew			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Pamela	Rhodes			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Susan	Rice			Durham	NC	N/G	27707	20-Aug-15	Do NOT build the Light Rail Train!!
Mrs.	Stacey	Richardson			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	28-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Becky	Riggsbee			Carrboro	NC	USA	27510	21-Aug-15	N/G
Mr	John	Riordan			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	12-Jun-15	The Durham-Orange Light Rail plans seem quite incomplete and very poorly developed.
N/G	Rita	Robbins			Chapel Hill	Durham Co	N/G	27517	9-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Henry	robbins			chapel hill	nc	USA	27517	14-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Janet	roberson			chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Roderick	Roberson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Robyn Weaver	Robyn			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	I don't support nor do I believe the light rail system as proposed would be utilized as much as the proponents would like taxpayers to believe. This seems like a waste of my tax dollars especially given the monumental problems on the I-40 corridor between Chapel Hill and Raleigh, which the light rail will do nothing to help and will only leave a greater deficit of tax dollars to resolve the I-40 immediate and future problems.
Mrs.	Nora	Rohde			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Mallory	Roman			Durham	NC	USA	27707	1-Aug-15	The costs far outweigh the benefits of the light rail. Most people in the region already have transportation. A much less invasive transportation solution can be offered to those who don't by simply improving the bus system. Building and operating the light rail will disturb hundreds of homeowners and decrease property values for many of us who already live here. Stop the light rail!
Ms	Margaret q	Roos-Codsi			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	25-Aug-15	The safety of the road crossings concerns me. I also question the projected use/ridership figures, With non-flexible routes. BRT would have the ability to flex with the situations as they change in coming years.6bv
N/G	Eugene	Rossitch			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	5-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Steffi	Rubin			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	20-Jul-15	N/G
Mr.	Charles	Rushbrook			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Charles	Rushbrook			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Paula	Russell			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Dana	Saleeby			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Sheila	Salter			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	13-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	rhoda	samuels			chapel hill	NC	N/G	27517	12-Jun-15	Too expensive and too visually unappealing. Too dangerous and too inconvenient.
N/G	Ariel and Phil	Sandick			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Donna	sayers			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	The light rail was to go through Meadowmont and as promised, it still should.
Mr	Christopher	Scallion			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Ashley	Scallion			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	N/G
Dr	Allison	Schmitt			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	Too much noise for a residential neighborhood and too much environmental impact. Traffic congestion would be unbearable
Mr	Christopher	Schmitt			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	We strongly oppose this development.
mrs	vicki	scott			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	This proposal is very damaging to our community and not financially smart with the amount of usage that is expected.
N/G	Lauren	Scott			Chapel hill	Nc	USA	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Carl	Scott			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	I oppose this Lite Rail on Patterson Rd
Ms	Nancy	Scott			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	I oppose the Lite Rail on Patterson Rd5
N/G	Stephanie	Scotti			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Ms	E. Jane	Seeley			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	While I, in general, support the light rail concept; there are elements of the proposed plan that are so egregious that I don't think the project should proceed. At grade crossings are dangerous and impede already burdened traffic; the proposed maintenance station on Farrington Road is unconscionable - being placed in a quiet residential neighborhood and near a school.
Ms	Anita	Shanker			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	27-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	George	Sharpley			Raleigh	North Caro	USA	27609	8-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Michael	Shepard			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	I don't wish to have this rail system. This is a huge impact to me and my lifestyle.
N/G	Rachel	Shepard			Chapel hill	nc	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Ruth	Shrieve			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs.	Julia	Simons			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	3-Oct-15	I observe most buses in our area, SW Durham, only have a few passengers! We could use smaller buses . I don't see the need for light-rail in this area, at all!!
N/G	Richard	Sloane			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	19-Jul-15	Although I'm a life-long fan and user of alternative transportation (bikes, buses, and car-pools), I believe this project does little if anything to alleviate current congestion, and costs way to much. Get more buses and add a stop in front of Downing Creek - so much cheaper than this project. The widened shoulder on Barbee Chapel has been a great improvement for cyclists!
N/G	Teresa	smith			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Kelly	Smith			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Tim	Smith			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Josh	Smith			Durham	NC	USA	27713	12-Jun-15	I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area close to where I work and live.
N/G	Christine	Smith			Durham	Nc	USA	27713	12-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs.	Barbara	Smith			Chapel Hill	N.C.	USA	27517	19-Jul-15	The Light rail project will cost a lot of money and benefit a few. We already have very good bus service for people who desire to use mass transit.
N/G	Scott	Smith			Chapel Hill	Orange Cou	USA	27516	30-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Thomas	Smith	t		Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27516	25-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	LuAnn	Smith			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27516	25-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Alan	Snavely			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27516	14-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Anna	Snavely			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	11-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Allison	Snyder			Hillsborough	NORTH CA	USA	27278	1-Oct-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Ms	Susan	Sonberg			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	23-Jun-15	I am concerned with the safety of the rail project, especially the C2A route which will place 3 at grade crossings. This will exacerbate the significant traffic congestion that exists at the dangerous intersection of Barbee Chapel Rd/NC54 and obstruct the only points residents of Little John Rd and Downing Creek Pkwy have to access NC 54. Trains will run unsynchronized in each direction every ten minutes making it nearly impossible to get in and out of our neighborhood without risking our lives and that of children on school buses or bikes. The methodology and logic used to establish ridership estimates that favored C2A are flawed. They are based on a premise that a slight differential in overall time-dramatically changes the ridership projections of a given route. This is an illogical premise given there will ultimately be one route... It will not deliver on promise of reducing congestion on NC54 as the route doesn’t run to RTP, the airport or help with a commutes to anywhere but Duke or UNC. Taxpayers will bear the burden of costs and issues from this project for years to come. The promise of transit could be delivered more flexibility using a Bus Rapid Transit concept.
N/G	Shirley	Sopko			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	29-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Lisa	Spadafino			Durham	North Caro	USA	27703	2-Oct-15	I believe that a light rail will not be helpful to us in this region. It will not be cost effective, very disruptive while being constructed,and not utilized by Durham and Chapel Hill residents. All in all, it is a waste of tax payers money.
N/G	Linda	Spallone			Chapel hill	Durham co	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	With reluctance I have to oppose construction, it seems this project is way off course with the actual needs of the area. It has lost support of wake co participation and emphasizing a route between hospitals does not seem the best way to control traffic. They need to step back ,regroup and solicit is comments and input from all stakeholders, the seem to be bouncing from one alternative to another when ever they meet any kind of opposition I am also questioning the many at level crossings which further impede traffic flow

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	linda	spallone			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Oct-15	THe future Durham and Chapel Hill will be so angry with you, Go Traiangle when they see you destroyed a majot wetland area and you created all this at grade crossings. The future will have no clean water to drink and they will tear out your at grade crossing and say how dumb was that .. Shame on you
Mr	Gary	Spitz			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	Very much OPPOSED to this initiative across from our Culp Arbor community.
N/G	Julia	spring			chapel Hill	nc	USA	27527	3-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Bill	Stagg			Durham	NC	USA	27705	25-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Elisabeth	Stagg			Durham	Durham	USA	27705	25-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Ilene	Stewart			Chapel Hill	Durham Co	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Catherine	Stewart			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Jim	Stikeleather			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27514	9-Jun-15	Wait for Raleigh. Durham is easily assessable by car without getting impacting I40 traffic.
N/G	Amanda	Strawbridge			chapel hill	N/G	N/G	27517	1-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	George	Stuart			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
mr	Gregory	Sulin			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	Meadowmount was designed and approved for light rail please put it where it was meant to go.
Mrs.	Cynthia	Sundy			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Kristin	Sundy			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Anna	Sundy			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Thomas	Swasey			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Judith	Swasey			Chapel Hill	Durham	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Thomas	Swasey			Chapel Hill	NC - North	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	Light rail as planned ignores the needs of the neighborhoods and there are better, less expensive alternatives like electric buses and protected bike lanes
N/G	Dorothy	Sylvestre			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Cindy Lee	Talisman			Hillsborough	NC	USA	27278	8-Oct-15	There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will not encompass the entire triangle nor have any federal help. Yes the area is growing BUT this area also like their cars and this will be an needless expenditure for maybe a chosen few. We are NOT NYC or DC that enjoy the rail system and no matter how hard transplants come here and try to change the area it won't work!
Mrs	Iwona	Tauer			Hillsborough	Orange	USA	27278	4-Oct-15	N/G
Mr.	Ronald	Tell			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	The grade crossings at Barbie Chapel Road and Downing Creek Parkway will be unsafe for the volume of traffic using both street. You must find a better solution.
Mrs.	Jean	Tell			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	11-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	W George	Thomason			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	13-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Alexis	Thompson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	Please run the light rail throught the intended development of Meadowmont that was built and approved as a light rail development.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mr	PAUL	THOMPSON			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	22-Jul-15	We do not need this expensive boondoggle!
N/G	Julie	Thurman			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	19-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Taylor	Thurman			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
Ms	Anne	Tice			Durham	NC	USA	27713	2-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Margie	Tippett			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	29-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Elaine	Tomberlin Lopez			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Ingrid	Toth			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	3-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Sally	Trauco			13 Littlejohn Rd	N/G	N/G	27517	6-Jul-15	In support of the rail just not the location along Stancil where traffic is already horrendous!
Dr.	Dimitri	Trembath			Durham	NC	USA	27707	26-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Dina	Trobbiani			Durham	NC	N/G	27707	26-Jun-15	At grade rail line crossing will seriously disrupt traffic flow and increase congestion along Farrington Rd, particularly throttling commute to/from 54/40/UNC/Raleigh; planned industrial zoned ROMF site will do same and devalue properties in Farrington Rd. dependent communities.
N/G	Gil	Turner			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	30-Jul-15	The bottom line in all of this tax waste is that Chapel Hill and Durham will STILL NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION and their residents will be burdened with excessive tax and NO BENEFITS.
ms	Barbara	Ulam			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	I am against the proposed light rail system that will pass by the entrance to Downing Creek in Chapel Hill. It will effect property values and will be noisy and congested.
Dr	Jan	Ulrich			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	14-Jun-15	N/G
Dr	Beth	Ulrich			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	14-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Gaby	Valdivia			Durham	N/G	USA	27707	25-Jul-15	The light rail to connect chapel hill and Durham is a wasteful project with little ridership impact. There's not sufficient congestion, we don't have the population numbers for this project. It will be a burden on residents, it will increase traffic on the arteries it crossed, and is based on dubious and poor research. Stop.
N/G	Stef	van Dijk			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Connie	Vance			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	7-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Andrea	Vinson			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	6-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Delores	Vitali			Chapel Hill	N. C.	USA	27517	26-Jun-15	This Rail system is going to hinder the traffic that already exists. How and how many people are going to ride it?? Certainly not the elderly and crippled. What is going to happen on Farrington Road is a total disgrace. What are you people thinking of , besides putting money in your pockets!
Ms.	Ann	Von Holle			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	9-Jun-15	The light rail will be a danger and nuisance to Downing Creek, the community in which I live.

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mrs.	Jane	Wagstaff			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	1-Oct-15	DOLRT is a fiscal explosion that will never ever attract the projected ridership.
N/G	Shelley	Walter			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	17-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs.	Janie B.	Ward			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Robert	Ward			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	271517	26-Jun-15	N/G
MR	Blaine	Warren			Durham	NC	USA	27707	20-Aug-15	N/G
N/G	Leigh	Warren			Durham	NC	USA	27707	20-Aug-15	N/G
Mrs.	Julie	Warshaw			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	10-Jun-15	The poor planning and total lack of response in regard to the local stations and routing for the light rail system is an unfortunate indicator of the problems this system will cause as a whole.
Mrs	Suzanne	Waters			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	1-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Robert	Weaver			Chapel Hill (Durham	NC	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	Low riders to warrant expense.
N/G	Catharina	Weaver			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	23-Jun-15	To get a rail system to function it needs to cover all of Triangle. The area most benefiting from a light rail would be Research Triangle Park and the Raleigh-Durham Airport
Mrs	Mary	Webb			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27514	9-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Michael	Webb			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	Please reject
MR	Aaron	Webel			Mineola	New York	USA	11501	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Kym	Weed-Buzinski			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	24-Jun-15	N/G
Ms.	Janice	Welsh			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Rose	Wenzel			Chapel hill	N/G	N/G	27517	14-Jul-15	We, the public, have not received the necessary objective information to make an informed decision on this Durham-Orange Light Rail project
N/G	Stephen	Whilden			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	16-Jun-15	I like the idea of a light rail reducing congestion on HWY 54, but it needs to be on the OTHER side of the highway where there is NO development. Low-emission buses would be a good substitute to the current plan.
Mrs.	Courtney	Whilden			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	2-Sep-15	N/G
N/G	Julia	Whitaker			Durham	NC	N/G	27707	20-Jul-15	I am in favor of transportation improvement. But the LRT will cost more than it saves and is likely to be obsolete by the time it is built. Not to mention the environmental and residential negative impacts it will have. Give us a more fiscally responsible option.
N/G	Kenneth	White			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517-722	17-Jun-15	I am strongly opposed to going forward with the proposed DO Light Rail Project. The project has the potential to create nightmarish traffic problems on major commuter roadways, be a noise and safety hazard in established residential neighborhoods, and be a huge tax burden on the citizens of these communities.
mr	landon	whitt			hillsborough	nc	USA	27278	13-Aug-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
N/G	Marc	Wiesenberg			Chapel Hill	N/G	N/G	27517	8-Jun-15	The choice of the "preferred" Light Rail route is both inconsistent with the NC 54 corridor study and ignores areas within the City of Durham whose populace would actually benefit from an LRT line. Documented concerns regarding citizen serious safety and exacerbated existing traffic congestion issues, to name just two, have either been marginalized or simply ignored. Aside from these matters, the cost of this proposal, including an expectation of significant Federal assistance, makes this project ill-advised. Tax revenue would be far better utilized by funding current NC DOT plans to streamline Highway 54 between 15/501 and I-40. The implementation of these improvements would make a huge difference toward relieving traffic congestion for commuters, whose daily destinations rarely coincide with those serviced by the current LRT proposal.
Mrs.	Joni	Williams			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Robert	Williams			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
Mr.	Travis	Williams			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Carrie	Williams			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Jonathan	Williams			Chapel Hill	North Caro	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	PLEASE, PLEASE do not proceed with Orange County--Durham County light rail project. (1) In my opinion this is not an acceptable use for tax payer dollars. (2) Personally, I hate to think of the disruption this will cause to my Downing Creek neighborhood. (3) IF there should be any light rail in the Triangle, and that is highly debatable, its primary goal should be to alleviate congestion on I-40. Orange County--Durham County light rail plan does not.
Mrs.	Anne D.	Williams			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	22-Jun-15	N/G
Mrs	Elizabeth	Williams			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	10-Sep-15	I think the cost to use ratio is to high. Fix roads and bus lines.
ms	dottie	williford			durham	North Caro	USA	27707	1-Jul-15	stop the rail it ruins peoples homes
Ms	Diane	Willis			Chapel Hill	NC, Orange	USA	27517	15-Jul-15	This light rail project is worthless without going to RTP and the airport. The cost is way too high and the disruptions to neighborhoods are far too great. Let's do bus rapid transit instead, with much better coverage for a much lower cost.
Mr	Erik	Wilson			Raleigh	NC	USA	27606	1-Oct-15	We don't need this. We need to get out of debt
N/G	Alison	Windram			Chapel Hill	N/G	USA	27514	22-Sep-15	NO LITE RAIL. DONT WASTE MY MONEY!!
Ms.	Leslie	Wiseman			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	4-Jul-15	Does not go to the airport so not a fan.
N/G	Robin	Wood			Durham	NC	N/G	27713	8-Aug-15	N/G

Title	FirstName	Surname	Email	Address	Town/City	S/C/P	Region	Zip/PC	Date	Comment
Mrs	Rhonda	Woodell			Durham	North Caro	USA	27707	23-Jul-15	N/G
Ms	Lucy	Woodell			Durham	Durham	N/G	27707	24-Jul-15	I feel further studies involving traffic, noise and ruining a wonderful residential setting is so unnecessary by putting the maintenance facility on Farrington Road when there other places that would be much more suited for this type of structure. I think some of the information presented to the affected neighborhoods is not accurate and some studies have been eliminated altogether it seems. This is simply not the place for what has been proposed.
Mr.	Philip	Woodell			Durham	NC	USA	27707	24-Jul-15	The light rail project is not needed because I feel that the ridership will be much less than what has been advertised. The proposed maintenance facility should not be located on Farrington Road because it will make traffic worst than it is already.
N/G	Regina	Wyatt			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Edward	Wyatt			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	14-Jul-15	N/G
Mr	Trent	Yancey			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	12-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	younger	ye			durham	N/G	N/G	27707	27-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Younger	Ye			Durham	NC	N/G	27707	14-Sep-15	Waste of resources on rail that creates noise, pollution, property degradation, all but a solution to traffic. It must stop!
Mr	Richard	Yenoff			Chapel Hill	NC	USA	27517	21-Jun-15	N/G
Dr.	Susan	Yeyeodu			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	13-Jul-15	N/G
Mrs	Laura	Yost-Grande			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	11-Jul-15	N/G
N/G	Lesley	Young			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Stephen	Young			Chapel Hill	North Caro	USA	27517	8-Jun-15	N/G
N/G	Jackie	Young			CHAPEL HILL	NC	USA	27516	27-Aug-15	N/G
mR	Edward	Zapolsky			Hillsborough	NC	N/G	27278	1-Oct-15	N/G
N/G	Xiao	Zhang			Apex	North Caro	USA	27539	12-Jun-15	N/G
Mr	Bingjun	Zheng			Chapel Hill	NC	N/G	27517	9-Jun-15	N/G
* N/C - field not collected by the author										
* N/G - not given by the signer										
* S/C/P - State, County or Province										
* PC - Post Code										

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	CLARE	ABRAHAMSON	I REJECT THE CURRENT PROPOSED DURHAM ORANGE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT AND AM PURSUING MORE COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES THAT WILL MEET THE LONG TERM NEEDS OF THE REGION.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			
Ms	Marilyn	Agney	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Dona	Aguayo	No Depot on Farrington Rd.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives considered.			
N/G	Barbara	Ailsworth	N/G				
Mrs	Kimberly	Aitken	I do not want this noisy place so close to my nice housing community and am worried it will lower my house value. Please find a non-residential location.	As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. The determination is based on the noise and vibration analysis conducted in accordance with FTA guidance.			
N/G	Benjamin	Aitken	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Kimberly	Aitken	This area is all residential with nice communities of school children, retirees, and hard working people who have worked their lives to be able to live in these homes. An industrial facility like this has no place in this area and should find a more business oriented industrial location.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to participate in the design as part of the City and/or County approval process.			
Mrs.	Alyssa	Alegre	N/G				
N/G	Louis	Almekinders	N/G				
ms	jennifer	anderson	N/G				
Dr	Thomas	Anderson	Terrible waste of my tax dollars. Please don't build this expensive piece of junk.	Comment Noted			
Ms	Elizabeth	Andrews	N/G				
N/G	Dave	Anna	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Mark	Anna	Commuter populations don't travel these routes as is. The general population doesn't travel to either downtown chapel hill or Durham on a regular basis. A major waste of money that couldn't be diverted towards usable infrastructure.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
Mr.	Michael	Anna	I am strongly opposed to the current plan for this light rail system.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Kathrynne	Anna	N/G				
N/G	Nancie	Archin	N/G				
N/G	N. J.	B.	N/G				
Dr.	Bok	Baek	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Ann	Bailey	The purpose of this very expensive project is questionable, since much of the growth in the RTP area is in Raleigh. There is not sufficient traffic between durham and orange counties to warrant this massive endeavor	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
Mrs	ross	baker	If this route must happen, it should be built above grade level. At ground level, people south of the railway will be trapped in case of an emmergency such as needing to get someone to the hospital.	Section 4.12.4.6 states that Triangle Transit will coordinate with law enforcement, emergency and medical personnel, and other public agencies to investigate impacts of the light rail system on their day-to-day operations.			
N/G	Jeff	Baldino	N/G				
N/G	Christopher	Baldino	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Deborah	Barab	The financial numbers need to be re-crunched. The cost vs. need/use does not seem realistic or feasible. I think that the companies associated with the building of this project are pushing to hard and not using reasonable arguments for the need. It's like the apples to apples argument. You've got apples to squash. (not even fruit) As a Durham resident, I ask you to review the need vs cost. Would make more sense to connect Raleigh to Durham before Chapel Hill. (and I love Chapel Hill)	The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under development. For more information, please see WakeTransit.com			
N/G	Natalie	Barbare	N/G				
Ms	Marcia	Barfield	N/G				
Mr	William T. Toby	Barfield	N/G				
N/G	Kaye	Barker	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Ted	Barrow	Cutting off proper vehicle access to and from the areas south of the light rail grade level crossings will only create congestion, especially during rush hour for communities such as Chapelwood and Downing Creek. Meadowmont was designed to allow for this access and has a very small vehicle load as compared to the area affected by C2/C2A.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Alice	Barrow	I do not agree with the light rail project crossing the intersection of Barbee Chapel Road nor the other 3 intersections near it. This will cause too much congestion and create safety issues for the many people who already commute using Barbee Chapel to access route 54. This would only be safe and sane if a bridge was built for the light rail to go over these intersections. In addition, the original plan of the rail going through Meadowmont should not now be changed to the detriment of those living south of 54.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines. NC 54 will continue to be coordinated in the east/west direction. Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak		
N/G	Taren	Basnight	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Anthony	Batton	I feel the light rail as presented is a waste of money. It falls short on providing parking and weather protection for riders if it has riders. This area's culture is drive solo first. Many do this to have transportation available in case of emergency be it a child or whatever. That is why carpooling and buses as ideas have failed or are seldom used. It will cause unprecedented traffic delays for Barbee Chapel Road which gets worse with every passing day. If you proceed with this project, please hear my resounding "I told you so" every 10-15 minutes when those empty cars go round and round.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Parking is proposed at several stations as described in DEIS section 3.3. The number of parking spaces proposed varies and are based on forecasted ridership and land availability. Stations with park-and-ride facilities would include bus bays for connecting feeder bus routes and “kiss-and-ride” spaces for passenger pick-up and drop-off. Walk-up stations would be accessed primarily by pedestrians, bicyclists, and passengers transferring from bus service. In general, automobile parking would not be provided at walk-up stations (section 2.3.2.1). See also typical images on p.2-23 and conceptual designs in appendix L.	NC 54 will continue to be coordinated in the east/west direction. Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The stop/yield controlled right turns do not	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Betsy	Batton	It's a waste of money and time and will cause lots of traffic problems on Barbee Chapel Road	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	NC 54 will continue to be coordinated in the east/west direction. Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The stop/yield controlled right turns		
Mrs	Tanja	Bauer	N/G				
Mr	Daniel	Bauer	N/G				
Mrs	Kimberly	Bauer	N/G				
Mr	Eugene	Bauer	N/G				
N/G	Ginger	Bauer	I vigorously OPPOSE the proposed light rail system.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Steven	Bearden	N/G				
N/G	bradford	becken	N/G				
Mr	Larry	Beckler	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Joanne	Beckman	Trains may be good for long distances at high speed, but not short distances with multiple stops. If public transportation is needed, buses or vans are preferable, because routes can be changed to accomodate technology, population changes. and economical needs of the community as it develops. Light rail is not cost-effective for the future. Use the money to enhance bus service and fix the roads.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic development along a high-capacity transportation network (ES-5).	
N/G	David	Bell	I reject the current proposal, but I am in favor of a Durham-Orange Light Rail project.	Comment Noted			
Ms	Sharon	Bellmore	Please reject the current proposed track down through Farrington Rd.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Dane	Berglund	The Lite Rail train system will potentially ruin our residential retirement community	Comment Noted			
Dr	Marcus	Berzofsky	N/G				
N/G	Anne	Billings	I oppose the current DO Light Rail Project and strongly urge that all facets of the plan be re-evaluated by an independent organization.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Timothy	Billings	stop this	Comment Noted			
N/G	David	Biswell	N/G				
Mrs	Sue	Biswell	Where are car parking sites going to be located for those driving to a rider depot located? Not connecting to airport is a major flaw.	As described in Table 2.3-2 and further detailed in Table 3.3-2, park-and-ride facilities are currently planned at the following stations: - Friday Center - Leigh Village - Gateway - MLK Jr. Parkway - South Square - Durham - Dillard Street - Alston Avenue.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU is not warranted or cost effective for the Project.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Lori	Black	The project as it is currently conceived is -based on fundamentally unsound ridership projections and will not result in any appreciable reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel Hill-Durham road corridor. -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not aligned with the higher density compact neighborhood developments in Orange and Chatham counties. -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small percentage of the annual operating costs. -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is necessary in order to support light rail transit.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
N/G	Robin	Blackmon	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Tony	Blake	Ask yourself if LRT will make for a better transit experience and if it does, for whom. How it is rational people justify +1.8 Billion (much more, if other cities experiences are any guide) for an inflexible 17 mile system through a critical watershed that will be made mostly irrelevant by technology before it is completed?	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.		
N/G	Laura	Blank	N/G				
Mr.	Edward	Blasius	N/G				
mrs	pat	blasius	N/G				
N/G	Jennifer	Blazing	N/G				
Ms.	Margaret	Boccieri	N/G				
N/G	Christopher	Boehlke	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Kenneth	Bogue	Light rail may cost $1,600,000,000 to construct (or more if there are cost overruns). Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens each workday. Some reasonable projections of ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. This is an investment of about $140,000 to $320,000 for each and every citizen who might benefit from a light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or federal level. The proposed light rail system should not be built because it costs too much and will serve too small a portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in Orange and Durham counties.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Elizabeth	Bonnet	Light rail may cost $1,600,000,000 to construct (or more if there are cost overruns). Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens each workday. Some reasonable projections of ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. This is an investment of about $140,000 to $320,000 for each and every citizen who might benefit from a light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or federal level. The proposed light rail system should not be built because it costs too much and will serve too small a portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in Orange and Durham counties.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
N/G	Rebecca	Bostian	N/G				
N/G	Michael	Bostian	N/G				
m	Robert	Bowerman	N/G				
N/G	Kathy	Bowerman	N/G				
Dr	Laura	Bowers	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Ellen	Boylan	Expanded bus service is much less expensive, more flexible, and less disruptive for our communities.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic development along a high-capacity transportation network (ES-5).	
N/G	Richard C	Boylan Jr	N/G				
Ms	Lisa	Brach	Please do not waste my taxpayer money on a system that is doomed by its design and will ultimately have a negative impact on my neighborhood, our community and the whole City of Durham!	Comment Noted			
N/G	stephen	brackett	N/G				
N/G	Steve	Brackett	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Kathryn	Breen	N/G				
Mr.	Walter	Brittle	N/G				
N/G	Rosemary	Brookman	Light rail is responsible for more deaths and accidents than any other form of transportation except motorcycles. This is a bad solution. Enchanced bus service would solve the problem with much less cost and much less environmental impact.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic development along a high-capacity transportation network (ES-5).
N/G	Daniel	Bruce	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
ms	mary	buchanan	I grew up two miles from here and bought this house five years ago, as my forever home. Now there is a plan to make, literally, my backyard into the train line. I object and will continue to object until they drop the plan completely as there is not now and will never be a need for a light rail in the triangle of NC at all.	Comment Noted			
N/G	MEGAN	BUCKLEY	N/G				
Mr	Aaron	Buckley	N/G				
N/G	Thomas	Bulthuis	N/G				
N/G	Lauren	Burke	N/G				
N/G	Gary	Burke	N/G				
Mr.	Brian	Burke	N/G				
Dr	Lauren	Burke	N/G				
N/G	Edith	Burns	N/G				
N/G	Julie	Burson	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Eric	Butler	Light rail is not the proper solution for our community. It cost too much money, will never reach sustainable ridership levels and will be a public burden. Further, it will certainly cause many fatalities which could have been avoided due to excessive at grade crossings. With regard to the local 54 corridor, it will increase congestion by usurping other more narrowly focused and thoughtful traffic solutions. With regard to Downing Creek, it will cut off access and impose a major safety risk to the hundreds of families in our neighborhood. All in all, the antiquated concept of light rail should be abandoned as outdated and intellectually dull and lazy. The area would be better served by doing	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.
Ms.	Megan	Butler	N/G				
Dr.	Steven	Buzinski	N/G				
N/G	Carol	Bylinski	N/G				
Mr	Freddy	Byrth	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Alex	Cabanes	As a resident of Downing Creek, myself and others in the neighboring communities have repeatedly expressed our concerns about the impact and safety of the proposed C2/C2A at-grade routing along the NC54 corridor. Despite repeated requests and outreach by the community, GoTriangle has to date failed to address these community concerns. These concerns have been discussed on numerous occasions directly with GoTriangle representatives in public and private forums, email, phone, letters, surveys, etc. Needless to say, this is extremely frustrating for the over 90% of local residents in opposition to the C2/C2A at-grade routing who believe their voices are not being heard or interests adequately represented.	Triangle Transit has continually reviewed the project and have made modifications to alterantives or added alternatives based on public and stakeholder feedback. Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Pam	Calderwood	The costs benefit is just not there for light rail - just see the amount of people taking buses between the two medical groups. Safety is also an issue regarding a neighborhood which has prided itself on family activities with small children riding bikes everywhere!	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Caroline	Cameron	My main concern is the safety of the rail, especially the C2A route. There will be 3 at-grade crossings, two of them are the entrances to Downing Creek and all are within a 1/2 miles stretch. This is a set-up for the worst-case scenario - the train hitting a car or a bus. The traffic on NC54 comes to a stop during peak times and there will be no traffic lights guaranteeing access to NC54 and there is a real potential a car will get stuck on the tracks and the gate will come down behind the car, trapping the car. The fact that there are going to be numerous stations without parking or any additional parking is also a boondoggle. The fact that technology has moved beyond light rail is also very short sighted especially for the billions	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.	Parking is proposed at several stations as described in DEIS section 3.3. As described in Table 2.3-2 and further detailed in Table 3.3-2, park-and-ride facilities are currently planned at the following stations: • Friday Center • Leigh Village • Gateway • MLK Jr. Parkway • South Square • Durham • Dillard Street • Alston Avenue The number of parking spaces proposed varies and are based on forecasted ridership and land availability. Stations with park-and-ride facilities would include bus bays for connecting feeder bus routes and "kiss-and-ride" spaces for passenger pick-up and drop-off. Walk-up stations would be accessed primarily by pedestrians, bicyclists, and passengers transferring from bus service. In general, automobile parking would not be provided at	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West
Mr.	Keith	Cameron	Please note that the vast majority of taxpayers affected by this project would not use it and DO NOT WANT IT!	Comment Noted			
N/G	Christina	Cameron	N/G				
N/G	John	Cameron	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Harriet	Cannon	The planning commitee of Durham is being run by folks who have little interest in the thoughts or feelings of anyone they don't consider "progressive" I have lived in Durham all my life and love the fact that it has never felt or been urban. I am not a fan of light rail and what it will do to the hometown feel of Durham. It is going to ruin a lot of nice neighborhood. If urban is where these planners want to live, they should move to or back to a big urbanized city instead of trying to change ours.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	John	Capell	I oppose the crossing planned at Downing Creek. I am an owner in 11 town homes at Bradford place.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage	The C1A Alternative has the longest length of the Little Creek Alternatives. As a result, it has the longest travel times and least ridership of the Little Creek Alternatives. In terms of impacts to the natural environment, the C1A Alternative would impact undisturbed forested areas and wetlands associated with Little Creek, in particular, the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage Area on the periphery of the USACE-owned property. Therefore, as compared to the NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) and the other alternatives, the C1A Alternative would not minimize adverse impacts to the natural environment or use and enhance existing and underutilized transportation rights-of-way. The evaluation of the NEPA Preferred Alternative and all Project Element Alternatives are included in the DEIS and are summarized in DEIS chapter 8,		
N/G	Linda	Carmichael	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
ms	maureen	carroll	please think about how much good the money you folks have tossed down the drain for no good reason. money that could have been spent on the rapid transit or feeding and housing veterans, helping the homeless....a million ways to spend that cash. yes, we need better transportation here, but it is beginning to look like some kind of criminal mismanagement of funds is happening and pockets are get lined and nothing is getting accomplished. i think the whole matter should be thoroughly investigate by an independent group of knowledgeable citizens	The DEIS public comment period is one of the many the opportunities for stakeholders and the public to review the D-O LRT Project and provide input.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	maureen	carroll	stop spending the money on a useless proposition. where is the money now? has it been used for anything?	As noted in Table 5.3-1 of the DEIS, the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is not being used solely to fund light rail project development. Revenue from the half-cent sales tax has already been used to implement near term improvements to DATA bus services. In addition, the sales tax will be used to support the design and construction of a Neighborhood Transit Center at The Village Shopping Center near the intersection of Raynor Street and Miami Boulevard, a location in east Durham that has the second-highest level of bus boardings in Durham after Durham Station. In coordination with the City of Durham, revenue from the half-cent sales tax will also be used to make improvements to bus stops and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure along a Transit Emphasis Corridor where DATA routes 3 and 16 run through the city, including east Durham.			
N/G	Tami	Carter	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	David	Carter	This light rail fiasco was shoved down the voters throats. It's not feasible or sustainable without punishing the citizens further. Why not use existing rail lines with a LOT less money?	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. The existing freight rail tracks are currently being utilized for freight rail purposes.			
N/G	Mary	Carter	N/G				
N/G	David	Carter	N/G				
Mrs.	Jennifer	Cayless	N/G				
Dr	Hugh	Cayless	N/G				
N/G	Brian	Chacos	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Ryan	Chamberlain	Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollution already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this train to areas where people NEED mass transit... who in Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to low- income? At-grade crossings are probably the worst part of all of this in this area. A huge reason trains on this entire coast are problematic is because of at- grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backups, low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disaster at these crossings especially.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	
N/G	Allison	Chandler	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Suzanne and Steve	Chaney	We have free buses in Chapel Hill and they run empty. Why does one think they will ride a train that they have to pay for. The low income individuals don't have the money to pay for a train ticket. The majority of people have their own cars and are not going to give up their time (the train transit time is long than it takes to drive from Chapel Hill to Durham) nor their freedom they enjoy with their car...they go and come on their own schedule not the train schedule. They have transportation when they get to Durham. They don't have to find a way to get from the Durham train station to their destination. If they drive their car, they can drive directly to their destination.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	The D-O LRT Project would benefit transit-dependent populations by providing increased mobility and improved access and connectivity. The Light Rail Alternative would serve as a spine to link the residential growth with new employment opportunities in the D-O Corridor. A discussion of potential impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in detail in DEIS chapter 5. As listed in Table 4.2-4, the proposed station areas of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would serve approximately 53,000 residents, 25,800 households, and employment of 119,100, in 2040. The NEPA Preferred Alternative would also serve over 13,000 transit dependent persons living within ½-mile of the stations, as well as a LEP population of over 2,600.		
Mrs	Pal	Cheema	N/G				
Dr	Zibin	Chen	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Dawn	Chin-Quee	I live in the area of Farrington and already have problems with traffic getting to I-40 and 54 from Farrington. Also, I don't want the value of my condo to be compromised by Light Rail project.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Kathleen	Christian	This train is massively expensive to build and will drain funds from future transit needs with operation and maintenance costs over 16 million per year. It harms multiple neighborhoods that its tracks border, both by destroying air-cleaning, sound-buffering trees and by creating unsafe at-grade train-auto intersections. The results are higher air pollution, increased sound pollution from nearby highways such as Rt 54 and I-40, and dangerous, traffic bottlenecks at the car-train intersections. All this to decrease the need for bus service at Duke and UNC medical centers, which could be optimized with bus- only lanes for the last mile near these busy centers - for possibly a BILLION less dollars! Without hurting so many	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Section 4.4.3.1 states that for visual impacts Triangle Transit will use interdisciplinary design teams to create aesthetics guidelines and stands in the design of project element s and provide landscaping and aesthetic treatments with in close proximity to residences.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	Annual operating and maintenance costs will be paid for with revenue from fares as well as local tax dollars, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes.

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Kathleen	Cimo	This plan will be devastating to Downing Creek and will without a doubt adversely affect the neighborhood and its property values. Further, it will increase congestion on the already- congested Route 54E, which will cause traffic to backup into Downing Creek.	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	NC 54 will continue to be coordinated in the east/west direction. Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The stop/yield controlled right turns do not	
Mr	Brent	Clark	N/G				
Mrs.	Cindy	Clark	N/G				
Mr	Brent	Clark	N/G				
MS	AMY	CLAYTON	STOP THE LIGHT RAIL AND SUBSTATION!!!	Comment Noted			
N/G	David	Cocchetto	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	maria	coleman	This is partially what Meadowmont was designed for, and that would be the perfect place just as originally layer out.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Rodalyn	Coleman	I reject Farrington Road as a location for Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility. My home is located directly across the street and the maintenance facility poses both a major health risk, as well as a traffic problem. My tax dollars should be spent on education not on premier expensive seats for a small number of people.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
N/G	Rodalyn	Coleman	I strongly oppose the Go Triangle Lite Rail because the cost hits me as a tax payer on the Federal, state and local levels and will continue to take my retirement and use in wasteful spending to keep up with the deteriorating conditions of the lite rail.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Ron	Coltrane	I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area where I own.	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.			
mr	john	conklin	No light rail PLEASR	Comment Noted			
Mr	Paul	Coon	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Paul	Coon	Does not meet the master plan with the growth trends in the region.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1.			
ms.	Wallis	Cooper	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Rand	Cork	Light rail is trying to fill a need that doesn't exist - waste of money & threat to our neighborhoods.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
N/G	Belinda	Corpening	N/G				
N/G	John	Corpening	N/G				
N/G	Helen	Courvoisie	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Susan	Cowart	Delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Doug	Cowart	WE must delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County.A single line through low density areas is a BAD idea. There is simply no evidence that this light rail is needed at this time. Transit needs are better served in a fiscally responsible manner by expansion of the bus services and establish of bus lanes on surface highways. The costs and the proposed route are ill advised, and do NOT address the needs of the population growth area. The ultimate effect on taxes and the funding sources are not clear.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5).	As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Laura	Cox	There is no need for this stilted version of public transit which does not serve routes of greatest use such as the airport or Wake County, whose residents were smart enough to stop this effort in its tracks.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	Hunter	Crandall	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Claudia	Crassweller	Please stop this gross misuse of our county and state tax dollars for a poorly thought out plan that reaches too few people. You will be placing a burden on us and the people who live in the affected areas in the future. Billions of dollars is not worth throwing away for the very few people who will utilize this service. The route is not logical or useful for the amount being spent. Get an outside source for making this decision. If Wake County opted out with their large population, how do you think it will work for much smaller counties. Stop this madness.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Peter	Crassweller	I am all for mass transit, but for the amount of money being used by this plan is not justified. I don't want the cost associated with this plan to be sucking the money out of my wallet. This is crazy! Why doesn't this involve transportation to RTP, Southpoint, or the airport. Those would increase the potential for ridership. Our counties are not large enough to support this kind of expensive system. Stop!	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
ms	sheila	creth	This is an extraordinary expense & disruption for what may be a limited ridership between UNC & Duke universities. Why not consider a light rail line to provide Chatham & Orange county residents a fast way to get to areas of Chapel Hill & Durham (not just the universities). Or a light rain line from Chatham to Raleigh (parallel to I 40) with a Chapel Hill to Raleigh include the RT park! Now that's lots of people.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
Ms	Caroline	Crocker	N/G				
Mr	Charles	Crocker	N/G				
Dr.	Henrietta	Croom	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Lorna Lynn	Culton	I don't support the proposed rail. Stats on systems in other areas (larger than Durham and Chapel Hill) indicate that rails become a financial burden to taxpayers and ticket prices bring in less than 1/4 the operating cost. I would rather see my taxpayer money go to towards upgrading the current bus service, which would give riders more destinations and be financially self sufficient. The glamor of a train is no comparison to the functionality of an upgraded commuter bus system and not worth the money! I would like to see dedicated lanes for busses with enhancements made to the bus stops (like at the airport) and to the busses (offering WiFi and more comfortable seating as airport shuttles). I visualize commuters	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-	As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Gail	Culton	Waste of our tax money. Improve bus service like our neighbors in Raleigh instead.	Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse			
N/G	Patrick	Culton	N/G				
N/G	Donna	Culton	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Lynda	Cunningham	Choose the "NO Build" Alternative and build as Bus Rapid Transit system that can be integrated into Wake County's plan for BRT. Then there will be public transportation to RTP. Light Rail is too expensive, and the technology is obsolete	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	While RTP has a significant number of jobs, they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under development. For more information, please see WakeTransit.com		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Patrick	Curley	Originally concerned about the routes proposed and at grade crossing safety and traffic issues. Upon review, now very concerned about financial viability and the permanent subsidy Light Rail will require, and tremendous safety issues. We can do better with a 1.8 Billion dollar budget.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Wendy	Curtis	The placement of this rail system will snarl the ALREADY awful traffic that is around the Barbee Chapel Road Chapel Hill.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Nan M.	Cushing	Small buses with wider routes could be more conveient and less expensive.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Even under current demands, the region’s transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region’s explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Katherine	Dancel	Meadowmont was designed with the Light Rail in mind. The intersections with Hwy 54 near the Friday Center are already extremely congested. Please reconsider!	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Karima and Shiva	Das	NO to the Durham/Orange Co. light rail train! Makes no sense...the buses that go back and forth b/t orange and Durham co have a minimal amount of passengers. It would make more sense to fill these hybrid buses first before even thinking of embarking on this very expensive light rail project and all of its ramifications.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Patricia	Daves	Highway 54 is already very congested so I don't think the Light Rail Train should be built thus adding to the congestion.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			
Ms	Kathryn	Davis	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Nancy W	Davis	The light rail as presently proposed does not make sense. At the speeds proposed, bus transportation works without disrupting neighborhoods.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Even under current demands, the region’s transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region’s explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-		
N/G	M.	de Bruyn	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
DR	Ellen	De Flora	The proposed light rail system for the Durham Chapel Hill area will hurt communities and not help alleviate the congestion of the area. The ROMF are placed in areas not designated for industrial use and will dirty up areas that were meant for communities, small businesses and schools. Other more flexible and cost effective alternatives should be sought.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states	In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives considered.	
Ms	Allison	Deal	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Trish	Dean	Decision making about the location of stations, at-grade crossings and ROMF seem very narrow-minded and not keeping in mind the new reality this will create for the people who live and travel in those areas.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be aimed towards the ROMF to reduce spillage onto neighboring properties and adjacent roadways. In addition,	In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives considered.		
N/G	Heath	Dedmond	N/G				
Ms	Molly	Dempsey	N/G				
Mrs.	Kathleen	Dennis	N/G				
Title	FirstName	Surname	Comment				
mr.	Luther	Dennis	N/G				
Ms.	Ashley	DeSena	N/G				
Ms	Nancy	Dewhirst	N/G				
Dr	Mark	Dewhirst	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Barbara	Dickinson	I STRONGLY OPPOSE the placement of the Light Rail maintenance facility being placed in the peaceful, heavily-residential area on Farrington Road in Durham and the passenger station in Downing Creek in CHAPEL HILL. The placement of both facilities will create tremendous traffic problems to already-existing overloaded traffic congestion, extensive noise issues for peaceful residential areas, and thel decrease in property values for hundreds of homes -- not to mention the eminent domain of many decades-long residents. VOTE with a heart; listen to your constituents; place these two transit facilities in an industrial section on Cornwallis in Durham; that area is suited for such uses.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states	In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives considered.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Margie	Dietz	My perception is that the route has been so compromised at this point, it no longer serves the needs of the citizens of Durham.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
N/G	L	DiGiovanni	I am concerned that the rail is cutting off access to the main roads for emergency vehicles and causing danger for residents of Downing Creek subdivision.	Section 4.12.4.6 states that Triangle Transit will coordinate with law enforcement, emergency and medical personnel, and other public agencies to investigate impacts of the light rail system on their day-to-day operations.			
Ms	Anna	Dnegan	N/G				
N/G	Carol	Dodge	N/G				
N/G	Patricia	Dorsch	N/G				
Dr	Ernst	Dorsch	N/G				
N/G	John	Dorward	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	James	Doughty	I am pro-transit and pro-future. But this project has been planned along illogical lines to serve certain people's interests. Our civil attempts to steer it in a rational direction were met with deaf ears. Opposing the whole thing is our only remaining option. I hope this course of action is scrapped and that the Triangle starts over to design a rail system that will actually serve people's needs.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
Ms.	Donna	Douglas	N/G				
Mr.	Michael	Douglas	N/G				
Dr.	Danielle	Doyle	N/G				
N/G	Nancy	Drozd	N/G				
N/G	Edward	Drozd	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Steven	Drysdale	Not in favor of the construction of the maintenance facility for light rail so close to our neighborhood.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives			
N/G	Mary Jo	Dunnington	N/G				
Mrs.	Jean	Durham	N/G				
N/G	Beverly	Dyer	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Sam	Dyer	1. Costs: 1.05B to Durham according to the Durham County Bus and LRT plan. Read ODU State of the region report, construction delays and cost overruns are endemic with LRT const, according to the American J. of Planning, costs are up to 40% greater than estimates, either miscalculating costs or initial low ball from contractors to secure contracts. 2. Safety: LRT death rate (not counting suicide) 5-10 times greater than bus--source US DOT, nearly all are pedestrians at grade crossings 3. Gentrification of east Durham: Multiple studies show this around Urban LRT stations 4. Who is going to ride it: Read the 2011 city and county issue guide from the John Locke Foundation. Very few	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.	It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be aimed towards the ROMF to reduce spillage onto neighboring properties and adjacent roadways. In addition, source-shielding would be used in exterior lighting at the ROMF.	
N/G	jeff	earley	N/G				
N/G	Jessica	Edwards	N/G				
N/G	larry	eimers	ridiculous waste of money with poor planning!	Comment Noted			
Mr	Peter	Einaudi	N/G				
Ms	Mary	Elkins	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Kathryn	Enchelmayer	Although I believe the Light Rail is a good thing, I don't understand why it cannot be on the other side of Hwy 54 from Downing Creek where there is no development.	The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill's Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies.			
Capt	Peter	Enchelmayer	The concept of a train isworth consideration, however, locating the tracks across NC54 would not negatively affect our neighborhood as much as current plans. Rush hour egress/ingress would be f'd up severely were the current options selected.	Littlejohn Road and Downing Creek Parkway were not included in the original microsimulation traffic analysis as they are three-legged unsignalized intersections with turning volumes below 115 vehicles per hour for all movements from or to these roadways during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The majority of volumes turning onto or exiting these roadways are below 60 vehicles per hour. The highest turning volumes at these locations are right turns that are stop controlled. These intersections do not meet the minimum volume conditions for a signal warrant, which would be required to install signals. The intersections will operate with the gates up or open Littlejohn Road and Downing Creek for 90% of the peak hours and this percentage will increase during off-peak hours when there are fewer trains.	NC 54 will continue to be coordinated in the east/west direction. Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The stop/yield controlled right turns		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Thomas	Englund	This is a poor plan that will impact hundreds of homeowners in a very negative way. It will never pay off and will cost all area taxpayers an incredible amount of money so that very few can take a train to and from work every day. Go Triangle has been dishonest with the public, steadfastly adhering to their current proposal in a desperate effort to get the project underway. Please investigate further without relying on their numbers or projections. Please look into the stories of the families who will be displaced or otherwise damaged. Please investigate the environmental damage that will be caused by the ROMF on Farrington Road.	Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states	Section 4.8.3.1 discusses groundwater quality and states that the 116 privately –owned wells that are within 1,500 feet of the D-O Corridor would not be affected by the operation of the light rail vehicles because the vehicles do not have gasoline or oils that could spill and contaminate the groundwater. In addition, the use of concrete ties avoids the environmental issue of leaching creosote from wood ties. The addition of impervious surfaces, particularly at the park-and-rides lots, ROMF, and stations, would require the implementation of best management practices for the collection and treatment of stormwater runoff. The proposed D-O LRT Project would include a ROMF where light rail vehicles would be stored and maintained. This facility would have the indirect effect of generating regulated materials associated because of maintenance activities. These materials would include oils, greases, solvents, and other	Cumulative stormwater runoff Anticipated cumulative impacts to water quality from the NEPA Preferred Alternatives, including the ROMF, would be additional impervious surface and modification of stream channels as a direct result of the project. These would combine with other new impervious surface area and modification of stream channels resulting from other urban development in the watersheds. This could contribute to further degradation of water quality in the Jordan Lake and Upper Neuse watersheds. However, the project would comply with stormwater management permitting requirements and include DWR stormwater management BMPs.
Ms	Sharon	Epstein	N/G				
N/G	Stanley	Epstein	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Carolyn	Epstein	This project is not good for the area and is far too expensive, and benefits too few to justify the huge expense. Lets expand the bus service at very much less expense.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-	As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Susan	Erickson	Originally, RDU and RTP were to be included as part of the plan. After Wake County opted out, this was no longer possible. The present plan shows that the rail line will originate at UNC Hospitals with stops at DUMC and other locations on Hwy 54 and 15-501. and end on Alston Ave near the intersection with Hwy55. This will create traffic nightmares on roads that are already congested with traffic, and disrupt established neighborhoods along the route. There is already dependable bus service which travels the same route as the proposed train. This train will cost billions, and ridership will be limited. It would make sense to stop the project now, and consider other options (improved bus routes, eco friendly buses,	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF	
Mr	Eugene	Eschmann	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Bren	Eskridge	How can light rail be justified when people are not even using the buses.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Marsha	Fancher	This project is far too expensive for the tax payer to support when other transit alternatives can be identified that are far less costly. The estimated number of riders is in excess of the standard percentages of ridership across the country (Source:: Quarterly and Annual Totals by Mode - collected by American Public Transportation Association)	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in section 3.1.1 of the DEIS, "Ridership forecasts were developed for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives and No Build Alternative for forecast year 2040 using the Triangle Regional Model (TRM), Version 5 based on the operating plans included in appendix K.1, consistent with appendix K.2. The TRM was developed by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), NCDOT, and Triangle Transit. The TRMSB is housed at the North Carolina State University Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE). The model is designed to forecast travel throughout the Triangle region's transit and roadway system. As such, it contains a network of existing and planned future transit services consistent with		
Mrs	Rebekah	Farris	N/G				
Mr.	Charlie	Farris	N/G				
Mr	Lida	fay	N/G				
N/G	margaret	fetters	N/G				
N/G	paul	fitts	N/G				
N/G	Marilyn	Flanary	N/G				
Dr.	Gita	Fleischman	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Jeremy	Force	We request the rail system not be built near or on Farrington Road.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Jenny	Force	As a local Farrington home owner, I reject the idea of putting a light rail maintenance facility on Farrington Rd.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Dick	Ford	Chapel Hill and UNC must be held accountable for their routing preferences adopted by GoTriangle. They are using light occupancy rail for their elite interests. Look at how GoTriangle has turned its back on East Durham and the Judea campus. How many at-grade crossings do Chapel Hill neighborhoods face??? Why is light occupancy transit elevated thru the UNC Campus at a cost of millions, but not for our neighborhoods??	The D-O Corridor was identified as a high priority transit corridor as early as the 1990s due to the rapid growth in the corridor. The D-O Corridor includes the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), Duke University, downtown Durham, and North Carolina Central University (ES-2).	The D-O LRT Project consists of approximately 43 at-grade interfaces with 22 LRT crossings.	The design of the alignment with regards to at-grade crossings, grade-separated crossings, or closures/elimination of crossings is primarily based on an assessment of the topography to be traversed by the alignment as well as the projected traffic on the roadway that is crossed. To maintain the cost effectiveness of the LRT project in order to qualify for federal funding, the alignment will be at-grade unless either of these two criteria requires grade-separation. The topography and traffic at Barbee Chapel Road do not warrant a grade separated crossing. In addition, an elevated LRT alignment crossing over Barbee Chapel Road would conflict with an alternative interchange plan proposed by the NCDOT to elevate Barbee Chapel Road over NC 54. The grade separation planned for Manning Drive is due to the steep topography in this area east of the proposed Mason Farm Road	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Rosemary	Ford	It has been very disheartening to see the process by which the light rail plan has been made--rife with favoritism toward the wealthy city of Chapel Hill and disregard for the interests of East Durham (as well as my own neighborhood of Downing Creek.)	As noted in Table 5.3-1 of the DEIS, the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is not being used solely to fund light rail project development. Revenue from the half-cent sales tax has already been used to implement near term improvements to DATA bus services. In addition, the sales tax will be used to support the design and construction of a Neighborhood Transit Center at The Village Shopping Center near the intersection of Raynor Street and Miami Boulevard, a location in east Durham that has the second-highest level of bus boardings in Durham after Durham Station. In coordination with the City of Durham, revenue from the half-cent sales tax will also be used to make improvements to bus stops and pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure along a Transit Emphasis Corridor where DATA routes 3 and 16 run through the city, including east Durham. When the light rail opens, funds for bus services made redundant by rail operations will also be used to	The D-O Corridor was identified as a high priority transit corridor as early as the 1990s due to the rapid growth in the corridor. The D-O Corridor includes the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), Duke University, downtown Durham, and North Carolina Central University (ES-2).		
mrs	Cheryl	Fox	N/G				
Mr	Mike	Fox	N/G				
N/G	Morgan	Fox	N/G				
N/G	John	Frackoviak	N/G				
N/G	Frances	Freedman	N/G				
Mr	Joel	Freelander	N/G				
Dr.	Susan N	Friel	I oppose the development and construction of the Durham - Orange county Light Rail Train System.	Comment Noted			
Ms	Donna	Fudale	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Edward	Fudale	N/G				
N/G	Deborah	Fulghieri	I oppose this high-cost, low-efficiency light rail project, because -on its western half, it is to be built on protected Jordan reservoir lands; -it is designed to serve primarily tax-exempt properties in Orange County (Friday Center, Mason Farm Road, UNC Hospitals); -it explicitly assumes that the CHC School District will sell Glenwood Elementary School to developers (per the Chapel Hill Transportation Planning Manager to the Planning Board); -all of Orange County is paying into this plan which does not serve the Chapel Hill's 15-501 commercial corridor; -and finally, I hate the Orwellian use of "preferred route" by GoTriangle to describe the route through Jordan reservoir lands, when it is	Water resources are discussed in DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential impacts the NEPA Preferred Alternative (which includes the Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects to Water Resources are described in DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page 4-292, existing federal and state regulations (as described previously) would protect water resources from future indirect or development related impacts. These regulations include Section 404, with its avoidance, minimization, and mitigation hierarchy, FEMA regulations, Section 401 and the Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as state approvals of sediment and erosion control plans. The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north	In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail sections supported by bridge piers. This will allow for terrestrial wildlife to pass easily underneath, maintaining the connectivity of this important wildlife corridor. The opening of forest habitat will also be minimized by only clearing vegetation along the rail corridor to the extent necessary and allowing vegetation to regenerate as close to the rail lines as is safe and practical. Construction impacts could also be minimized by using techniques such as “top down” construction, described in section 4.16 of the DEIS.	Enhancements to bus service are part of the Durham County and Orange County Bus and Rail Investment Plans (BRIPs). Both BRIPs were developed and approved by county commissioners before the successful sales tax referenda in 2011 and 2012, and both have guided the provision of new bus service in the two counties over the past few years. For more information about provisions for improved bus service under the BRIPs, please see http://ourtransitfuture.com/durham-county-bus-and-rail-investment-plan/. As noted in DEIS Table 5.3-1, the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is being used to fund project development for the proposed D-O LRT Project and to implement improvements to DATA bus services. In addition, the sales tax will be used to support the design and construction of Neighborhood Transit Centers and make	Land use broadly refers to the different functions of human use of land (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial) and is influenced by development patterns and activity centers, population and employment levels, growth potential and trends, local and regional land use policies, and other factors that affect area growth. DEIS section 4.1 describes land use and land use policy in the D-O Corridor and the potential impacts of the alternatives under study in the DEIS. Population and employment data related to land uses are presented in DEIS section 4.2. Transit-supportive growth and development is expected to continue throughout the corridor due largely to positive market forces, supportive land use policies, and capacity for growth and supportive public investments. Market support for this type of development includes shifting lifestyle preferences
N/G	Paul	Gala	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Carol	Garth	This limited ridership is served well by busses and the proposed location for rail and vehicle maintenance facility is targeted for a zoned residential area. I am concerned about increase in crime as people have unrestricted access to a residential area with limited access at the present time, the impact on housing values, and impeding traffic flow for an already overly trafficked road being Farrington Rd. the planned rail crossings will only worsen the already bad situation especially during peak hours. We don't need this rail service. It is duplicating bus service already provided and is a waste of tax money needed elsewhere.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	The proposed D-O LRT Project would be designed and operated in accordance with Triangle Transit’s current safety and security plans. These plans would be updated to include specific requirements for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element alternatives, reviewed by FTA, and submitted through the NCDOT State Safety Oversight process for approval prior to revenue service. Triangle Transit uses Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts to assist in deterring criminal activity in the design of its facilities. The basic principle of CPTED is to increase natural surveillance by providing good sight-lines and avoiding conditions such as tall landscaping that could potentially provide individuals with areas to hide or obstruct mechanical methods of surveillance, such as closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	David	Gavin	Without a direct line to RDU airport from downtown Chapel Hill AND from downtown Durham, this project is a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. There is no possible way non rush-hour traffic (or rush-hour traffic for that matter) between Durham and Chapel Hill is creating sufficient congestion to warrant such an expenditure. In fact, based upon the design layout of the system, traffic congestion will only increase, particularly along the highway 54 section of the plan near exit 273 on I-40. And if the goal of the plan is to provide transportation to those unable to afford an car, the existing bus system is already providing that service more than adequately and with less intrusiveness to the	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	
Ms	Julia	Geddings	N/G				
Dr.	Weston	Geddings	N/G				
N/G	Bernard	Geller	N/G				
Dr	Eric	Ghysels	N/G				
Dr	James	Gibson	N/G				
Mrs.	Karen	Gibson	N/G				
Dr	James	Gibson	No to light rail	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Charlotte	gilbert	Using Farrington Road is a terrible idea!! South Point or 15/501 would be a better use of land - Please do not build on Farrington Rd	Hundreds of commuters to UNC from RTP, Morrisville, Cary, and Raleigh already park and ride today at parking lots at Southpoint Mall, Exit 282 off of I-40 at the Regional Transit Center, and at District Drive in Raleigh. They choose to use these bus services even though they are subjected to traffic on NC 54. The light rail, with a major park-and-ride facility at Leigh Village, will offer a higher level of frequency than these routes and will not be subject to traffic congestion in the future when traffic is worse.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Bill	Gilbert	This is a big waste of tax payer money. A train that goes nowhere and picks up no one.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
N/G	Tyler	Glasco	N/G				
Mr.	Richard	Glover	N/G				
Ms	Desiree	Goldman	N/G				
ms	shari	Goldstein	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Avery	Goldstein	Do not destroy the most family friendly area in Durham! Why would you build a light rail that no one will ride? Please spend the funds improving our schools and become a city others look to as a model instead of a place people make fun of!	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
N/G	Susan	Goldstein	Have you seen the back-up on Farrington Road during rush hour? There must be a better place for this!	Comment Noted			
Mr.	Buddy	Golubiewski	N/G				
N/G	kimberly	gooden	N/G				
N/G	Len	Grande	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Jim	Green	The project as it is currently conceived is -based on fundamentally unsound ridership projections and will not result in any appreciable reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel Hill-Durham road corridor. -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not aligned with the higher density compact neighborhood developments in Orange and Chatham counties. -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small percentage of the annual operating costs. -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is necessary in order to support light rail transit.	As stated in section 3.1.1 of the DEIS, "Ridership forecasts were developed for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives and No Build Alternative for forecast year 2040 using the Triangle Regional Model (TRM), Version 5 based on the operating plans included in appendix K.1, consistent with appendix K.2. The TRM was developed by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), NCDOT, and Triangle Transit. The TRMSB is housed at the North Carolina State University Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE). The model is designed to forecast travel throughout the Triangle region's transit and roadway system. As such, it contains a network of existing and planned future transit services consistent with the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2040 MTP)."	Land use broadly refers to the different functions of human use of land (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial) and is influenced by development patterns and activity centers, population and employment levels, growth potential and trends, local and regional land use policies, and other factors that affect area growth. DEIS section 4.1 describes land use and land use policy in the D-O Corridor and the potential impacts of the alternatives under study in the DEIS. Population and employment data related to land uses are presented in DEIS section 4.2. Transit-supportive growth and development is expected to continue throughout the corridor due largely to positive market forces, supportive land use policies, and capacity for growth and supportive public investments. Market support for this type of development includes shifting lifestyle	Annual operating and maintenance costs will be paid for with revenue from fares as well as local tax dollars, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under development. For more information, please see WakeTransit.com	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor.
Dr	Sandra	Greene	N/G				
N/G	Margaret	Gresham	This will ruin my neighborhood.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Maggie	Griffin	N/G				
N/G	Shauna	Griffin	N/G				
Mrs	Erika	Griffin	N/G				
Mr.	Albert	Gusman	N/G				
N/G	Stacy	Hagerty	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Jan	Halle	This light rail is a ruse. Lots of money and effort has been put into something that must be lining someone's pocket. There is not significant population density to support it. Who benefits I don't know but someone.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor.		
Mr	Steven	Hamelly	N/G				
N/G	Martha	Hamlett	Needs more study	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	David	Hardman	The Durham Orange Light Rail Transit proposal is no longer cost effective, nor does it address the commuting needs of the entire metropolitan Triangle area. Improving bus service and frequency in the Durham-Orange corridor will be cheaper, flexible, sustainable, and will minimize negative environmental impact. I am a fan of mass transit in general, but this proposal is misguided and not a viable plan.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Cheryl	Hardman	I am opposed to light rail in Orange and Durham counties. It is a waste of tax funds because it is not a high traffic area vs ch to RTP. Low ridership on existing buses.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future	As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT).	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
\Ms	Kimberly	Hardman	This electric rail system is not needed for the traffic between Durham and Chapel Hill It is unsafe, based on statistics in other cities. It is unfunded by at least 40 percent and could be higher with cost over runs. It is old technology. As a millenial, I prefer using uber or my own car. It is not connecting to anything in Wake County, the airport or Southpoint where I may actually use it .	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future	**State Funding** A provision was added to the final version of the state budget that limits the use of state funds for light rail projects to $500,000. GoTriangle remains confident that the funding cap can be addressed in the future and will continue to seek state funding for the D-O LRT project. Potential impacts of the funding cap are still being assessed. CAN ADD THIS…. However, construction of the D-O LRT Project will be funded through a variety of local, state, and federal sources. The local funding will be paid from a portion of the half-cent sales tax dedicated for transit in Durham and Orange counties, $10 annual vehicle registration fee dedicated for transit, and 5% tax surcharge on car rentals dedicated for transit. Other local funding sources such as value capture strategies may also be pursued. State funding is allocated to the project through the State Transportation Improvement Program. Federal funding is	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.
N/G	Jack	Harless	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Toby	Harrell	Review this D-O rail routing. As it stands, it is significantly hazardous and a major inconvenience to those of us east of the proposed line.	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Cheryl	Harrell	Reject the Durham-Orange Light Rail project. It is disruptive to neighborhoods and is not cost effective. Instead increase bus frequency and route coverage.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
Ms	Bette	Harrington	N/G				
Mrs.	Diane	Hartley	I share a desire to solve congestion and traffic issues. This light rail, as currently planned, does neither.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Barbara	Harwell	I own property on the corner of Barbee Chapel & Pearl Lane & am very concerned about the number and frequency of highway crossings and safety issues.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.		
Mr.	Thomas	Hauck	N/G				
N/G	Bonnie	Hauser	.				
N/G	Kathleen	Havlin	N/G				
N/G	Erika	Hawkins	N/G				
N/G	Michelle	Hayward	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Robert	Healy	The LRT line between Durham and Chapel will do almost nothing to relieve congestion on 15-501, has an astronomical cost per rider, will have impacts on neighborhoods and on wetlands, and will drain funds for personalized transit for the elderly and disabled. A very poor investment.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process.	The D-O LRT Project would benefit transit-dependent populations by providing increased mobility and improved access and connectivity. The Light Rail Alternative would serve as a spine to link the residential growth with new employment opportunities in the D-O Corridor. A discussion of potential impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in detail in DEIS chapter 5. As listed in Table 4.2-4, the proposed station areas of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would serve approximately 53,000 residents, 25,800 households, and employment of 119,100, in 2040. The NEPA Preferred Alternative would also serve over 13,000 transit dependent persons living within ½-mile of the stations, as well as a LEP population of over 2,600.	The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact inner portions of the New Hope Creek bottomland forest by following along the existing US 15-501 through the most sensitive portions of the New Hope Creek bottomlands. In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail sections supported by bridge
Mrs	Denise	Heil	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	James	Heil	I believe the massive expenditures for this rail system are an ineffective way to use taxpayer money. The GoTriangle buses already cover this route. If demand increases, just add more buses! The cost is minimal compared to a train. I've heard bus and train funding are considered separately. This needs to be combined to ensure fiscal responsibility. If a train is inevitable, it needs to run to the RTP and Raleigh, not UNC to Duke.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
Mr.	D. Bruce	Henschel	N/G				
Mrs.	Rosemary	Herbst	Totally against Light Rail.	Comment Noted			
Mrs	Belinda	Hereghty	N/G				
Mrs	Anne	Heymann	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Wesley	Heymann	Does not go to the airport so not a fan.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project.			
N/G	N	Hibbard	I don't think it is "enough" and the "shed" is a major issue in terms of appearance/traffic, etc.	Comment Noted			
Dr	Anthony	Hickey	N/G				
N/G	Steve	Hicks	N/G				
N/G	Lydia	Hill	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Peter	Hinkle	I do not believe that the rail line as proposed makes fiscal sense.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			
Mr	Peter	Hinkle	Bs3z				
N/G	Mike and Denise	Hoffman	N/G				
Mr.	Michael	Hoglund	I support the petition to reject the proposed Durham-Orange Light rail project.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Lucinda	Hohn	N/G				
N/G	Thomas	Hohn	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Donald	Holloway	We do not need it, it is too extremely expensive, will confiscate properties of others.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical	In order to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed D-O LRT Project, it will be necessary for Triangle Transit to acquire private property. When property is selected to be acquired, all other alternatives will have been considered. That property will have been determined to be the best location for the D-O LRT Project to serve the public. As a result, some citizens may be displaced from their homes or businesses. Local, state, and federal regulations and laws govern the acquisition of private property for public use. These laws ensure that owners of property acquired for public projects are treated fairly and consistently. They are designed to encourage and expedite acquisition by agreements with property owners, to minimize litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and to promote public confidence in land acquisition programs designed to benefit the public as a whole.		
Ms.	Elaine	Holmes	N/G				
Mr.	Dennis	House	N/G				
Mrs.	Elizabeth	House	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Grace Meyer	Howell	The light rail is far too expensive based upon the per user cost of the likely users of this rail. The rail system will block both entrances to our neighborhood, making it almost impossible for us to enter and exit our neighborhood 18 hours per day. The rail project should be cancelled entirely and the funds diverted to far more pressing issues in education, health care and job development.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
Dr.	Ping-Chuan	Hu	It is none sense to put a railroad in front of a well-established niborhood. While the other side of the highway was empty. Don't do it.	The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill's Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Burk and Mary	Huey	N/G				
N/G	Dale	Huff	We do not support the proposed Light Rail plan. It needs an independent review by qualified experts to assure better options are found. Both traffic and noise issues created by the plan are unacceptable.	DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives. Additional detail on the impacted receptors is provided in appendix K.24. As described in 4.10, noise and	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	URS/AECOM, a company consulting with Triangle Transit, prepared the technical information and environmental impact analysis for the Project on behalf of the Federal Transit Administration as well as GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); Environmental Impact and Related Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A legal sufficiency review of the DEIS was also conducted by the FTA and Triangle Transit.	
N/G	Andrea	Huffman	N/G				
Ms	Laura	Hulett	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Charles	Humble	After living in urban centers with rapid transit, my initial position was in favor of Light Rail. However, we are not Boston and our many communities in the Triangle have not evolved along the proposed transit lines. Stop the studies and direct our efforts to better and more buses.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
N/G	Robert	Humphreys	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and not realistic.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Stephanie	Humphreys	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Makiko	Humphreys	Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic.	Comment Noted			
Mr	Craig	Hyatt	N/G				
Ms	Marija	Ivanovic	N/G				
N/G	Susan	Jackson	N/G				
N/G	Matthew	Jackson	N/G				
N/G	Paul	Jackson	N/G				
N/G	Reitha	Jackson	Unbelievable that you would even consider doing this project. Traffic, parking and a station that doesn't even serve our community. Please stop this project now!	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Sonny	Jackson	Money can be spent in better ways especially in a tight economy. We do NOT need the entrance to our development messed up or blocked in anyway and do not need added traffic problems. There are enough traffic issues already.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Rachida	Jackson	This project is very expensive, and it is not going to help us. It is going to make our life miserable and create more traffic and stress. If many people are against it, then you need to find a solution to this huge problem!	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
N/G	Jane	Jannelli	N/G				
N/G	Valarie	jarvIs	N/G				
Mr.	Immanuel	Jarvis	N/G				
Dr.	Larry	Jenkins	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Pamela	Jenkins	The proposed route of the light rail makes no sense and does not meet the intention of the rail. An independent auditor needs to review the plan to make recommendations on how to get this plan back on the correct path.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	URS/AECOM, a company consulting with Triangle Transit, prepared the technical information and environmental impact analysis for the Project on behalf of the Federal Transit Administration as well as GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); Environmental Impact and Related Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A legal sufficiency review of the DEIS was also conducted by the FTA and Triangle Transit.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Julie	Johnson	Please do not allow the light rail project to go through. The communities it will impact are full of children and families in an area that was never designed to support such a project. While meadowmont was the obvious choice (and was created to be such a center) now that it is off the table please do not go ahead with plan B. Please stand up for those who do not have the bullying power that meadowmont has used. Please do not allow this!	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage	The C1A Alternative has the longest length of the Little Creek Alternatives. As a result, it has the longest travel times and least ridership of the Little Creek Alternatives. In terms of impacts to the natural environment, the C1A Alternative would impact undisturbed forested areas and wetlands associated with Little Creek, in particular, the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage Area on the periphery of the USACE-owned property. Therefore, as compared to the NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) and the other alternatives, the C1A Alternative would not minimize adverse impacts to the natural environment or use and enhance existing and underutilized transportation rights-of-way. The evaluation of the NEPA Preferred Alternative and all Project Element Alternatives are included in the DEIS and are summarized in DEIS chapter 8,		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Timothy	Johnson	There are significant safety concerns with the Downing Creek and Little John crossings and nearby station in the proposed plan. Not to mention the questionable rationale given a station within walking distance at the Friday Center (with significantly more parking area too) and that Meadowmont was designed to have light rail run through it.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Nancy	Johnson	If this project included the entire triangle area it might be worthy of consideration but as it does not, it does not.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	James	Johnson	N/G				
Dr.	Leslie	Johnson	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Mark	Johnson	The economic "case" for this project proposal is less than weak, but the cost is enormous. This is at best a complete boondoggle.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			
Dr	amy	jones	N/G				
Mr	Bishop	Jordan	It is a waste of money that is not supported by the facts.	Comment Noted			
Ms.	Spencia	Joyner	N/G				
Professor	Joseph	Kalo	N/G				
Dr.	David	Kao	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Laurence	Katz	The current transit system is underutilized and there is no reliable evidence that the light rail will be better utilized. There is evidence that the light rail will be an environmental and economic disaster and needs to be stopped. The federal government should not waste money on this project.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT).		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Laura	Kelly	Agree that the Farrington corridor is not the appropriate location for a train track much less a train maintenance depot. Regardless of the historic home sites, which would be a shame to lose, the area just is not large enough to accommodate such an undertaking. Using 15-501 makes much more sense, and trains could run right down the middle of the boulevard without much change in the landscape.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives	Section 4.4.3.1 states that for visual impacts Triangle Transit will use interdisciplinary design teams to create aesthetics guidelines and stands in the design of project elements and provide landscaping and aesthetic treatments within close proximity to residences.	Various alternative alignments were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Alternatives considered during the AA included routes along US 15-501. Through the Alternatives Analysis, the alignment that follows NC 54, George King Road, and Farrington Road was selected as the best alternative to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Everett	Kemp	This project wastes hard earned resources of residents to build an unusable system destroying natural areas and creating problems for residents. The only benefit of the project is to allow some uninformed government officials the opportunity to grandstand about their accomplishment.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	james	kernodle	You can count the train passengers nowon one hand. Not enuff people ride now....its a waste of our money.STOP THE TRAIN...and waste of OUR money !	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.and Mr	Graham and Susan	King	Our townhouse is right after the entrance to Downing Creek. Going in and out will be a constant issue. A real estate friend has told us our property value will drop even with this possibility.	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	EDWARD	KINNAIRD	I do not support the light rail proposal (DOLRT). The municipalities simply do not have the financial resources to support this project. While transportation is an important issue for our area, I believe this solution will lead to more traffic congestion, a more dangerous community, a significant debt burden, and will be a blight on a beautiful community that took many years to build. I stand firmly behind the NO BUILD option	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Jane	Kirsch	Please stop spending good money on a bad idea.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			
N/G	Jane	Kirsch	N/G				
Ms	Mary Ann	Klompmaker	N/G				
Dr.	Jay	Klompmaker	I believe this project is both unfeasible and unnecessary.	Comment Noted			
Title	FirstName	Surname	Comment				
Mr	Daniel	Knoll	N/G				
N/G	Ann	Koerber	Just the noise levels are enough to show that this is a bad location for this industrial facility	As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	William	koerber	N/G				
N/G	Joseph	Koontz	N/G				
Miss	Aynalem	Kumela	N/G				
N/G	Kathryn	Ladd	N/G				
N/G	Fred	Lampe	The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already figured this out. To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	Fred	Lampe	N/G				
Dr	Lilly	Langer	N/G				
Mr	David	Lapp	N/G				
N/G	Dana	Lapple	N/G				
Mrs.	Crystal	Lara	N/G				
Mr.	James	Larkin	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Kenneth	Larsen	Light Rail is a complete waste of money. It's too inflexible and will only benefit people who live within a quarter mile of a station and whose destination is also within a quarter mile of a station. If you do the math, that's a very small number of people.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Sara	Larson	This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Sylvia	Leaver	I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
Mr.	Steve	LeGardeur	N/G				
Ms	Peggy	Leggett	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mt	Frederick	Leitner	Cost too large for too little positive value	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Bernice	Leitner	Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			
Mr.	Robert	Leopold	N/G				
Mrs	Ingeborg	Leopold	N/G				
N/G	John	Lewis	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Melanie	Leyden	This is residential, suburban area consisting of a quiet country setting, three local schools, and serene neighborhoods. It is not the place for a 24 hour maintenance facility. It is absolutely unfair to the property owners in this area to rezone and create this facility. People invested in this neighborhood because of its county setting. Disrupting existing neighborhoods is unjust when there are better location available that are already zoned for industrial endeavors; Corwallis!	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be aimed towards the ROMF to reduce spillage onto neighboring properties and adjacent roadways. In addition,	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF	While the Cornwallis Road ROMF alternative would result in fewer overall impacts to water resources as compared to the NEPA Preferred Alternative site (Farrington Road), the Cornwallis Road ROMF Alternative may result in adverse impacts to community resources (The Levin Jewish Community Center, Lerner Community Day School, Carter Community Charter School, and Judea Reform Congregation) and a higher constructability cost. In addition, the NEPA Preferred Alternative would allow for a superior yard layout from an operational perspective, whereas the Cornwallis Road ROMF site would require operational compromises, which would result in higher operational and maintenance costs (section 8.2.2.2).	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	joseph & janet	liegl	Ridership seems unlikely to warrant the cost, given proposed route, and will cause great disturbance to existing neighborhoods and home values.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.		
Dr	Jason	Liss	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Henry	Lister	Please reject route C2 and C2A in favor of the route through Meadowmont, for which that development was originally approved.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage	The C1A Alternative has the longest length of the Little Creek Alternatives. As a result, it has the longest travel times and least ridership of the Little Creek Alternatives. In terms of impacts to the natural environment, the C1A Alternative would impact undisturbed forested areas and wetlands associated with Little Creek, in particular, the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage Area on the periphery of the USACE-owned property. Therefore, as compared to the NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) and the other alternatives, the C1A Alternative would not minimize adverse impacts to the natural environment or use and enhance existing and underutilized transportation rights-of-way. The evaluation of the NEPA Preferred Alternative and all Project Element Alternatives are included in the DEIS and are summarized in DEIS chapter 8,		
N/G	K	Liu	N/G				
Ms	Qi	Liu	N/G				
Mr	Brodie	Lloyd	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Ann	Loftin	What might make more sense, in my view, is a trolley along the middle of 15/501, all the way from Durham to Chapel Hill. It could go up Franklin, which would benefit from becoming a two-lane street again. Or along 54 and up to the hospital. Or both. And we need public transportation from Chapel Hill and Durham to the airport, whether bus or rail.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Johnny	Long	I strongly reject the current proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region. This route will be detrimental to the value and quality of living for homes and residents of Falconbridge/Huntingbridge, Downing Creek, Homes along Barbee Chapel Road, Chapelwood, and other areas along N.C. 54 East between Chapel Hill and Interstate 40.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.		
Mrs	Joan	Long	N/G				
Mr	Martin	Lopez	This project is totally unnecessary. The majority of taxpayers affected do not want it. Put it to a vote.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Carter	Love	N/G				
N/G	Michael David	Loven	N/G				
N/G	James	Lowe	N/G				
N/G	Carmen	Lowe	N/G				
Dr.	Louchie	Lu	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Aaron	Lubeck	N/G				
MR	Clark	Luikart	N/G				
Ms	Jean	Lusted	N/G				
Mx	Bob	Lynch	LR would be ok, but Rapid Bus Transit, (RBT) is much, much better. Also 1/2 the cost.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			
N/G	Lianne	MacGregor	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Ridwan	Mahbub	We don't need this train system. There is already a free Chapel Hill wide public transportation system and a triangle-wide bus system that does an effective job of taking away residents. This costly train serves no real purpose and may have unintended consequences like bringing in crime, noise, quality of life, etc. It is unlikely the train will go everywhere we want it to.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-		
Mr	Josh	Manchester	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Michael	Mangili	I believe the project is not servicing enough of the Triangle. I was in favor with Wake Co. involved but the latest plan is bad. Location of the ROMF is in a residential area and located to closely to an elementary school. It is going to lead to more headaches!	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF		
Dr	Arun	Manikumar	N/G				
Ms.	Kristi	Mann	N/G				
Ms	Kelly	Mansfield	N/G				
N/G	Raquel	Maradiaga	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Luis	Maradiaga	The Durham-Orange Light Rail Train is unnecessary and will be underused. We already have a working bus system for public transportation.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
N/G	Bonita	Marks	This is a poorly conceived idea and the needs assessment report is fraudulent. There are too many safety, economic and environmental issues to approve the LRT project in this region.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Maria	Marquis	N/G				
Mrs.	M	Mars	N/G				
N/G	mary	mars	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	James	Mars	N/G				
mr	wayne	marshall	Stop it now !	Comment Noted			
N/G	lesley	marson	N/G				
Mrs.	Caroline	Mason	Do NOT want to see the access to 54/Little John Road CLOSED! Too many people use it.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Littlejohn Road is a three-legged unsignalized intersections with turning volumes below 115 vehicles per hour for all movements from or to these roadways during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The majority of volumes turning onto or exiting these roadways are below 60 vehicles per hour. The highest turning volumes at these locations are right turns that are stop controlled. The intersection does not meet the minimum volume conditions for a signal warrant, which would be required to install signals. The intersection will operate with the gates up or open Littlejohn Road for 90% of the peak hours and this percentage will increase during off-peak hours when there are fewer trains.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Laurin	Massengale	If a light rail is put in I believe the Meadowmont location will get better ridership and interfere with traffic less than the C2A route.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			
N/G	Shelley	Masters	N/G				
Ms	Marianna	Matinyan	I find the project utterly unnecessary .	Comment Noted			
N/G	Pamela	Mayer	N/G				
N/G	Philip	Mayer	No thank you! Please do not put the stop here	Comment Noted			
N/G	david	mayer	N/G				
N/G	Rebecca	Mayew	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Kathleen	McAndrews	We do not need a 17 mile bridge to no where. It doesn't even go to RTP, the airport or Raleigh. It cost billions of dollars with not much value. Raleigh gave up on this idea because it made no sense. We should do so as well. Please cancel this.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Renee	McBride	RDU, RTP and Southpoint should be served, and it should extend farther east and north in Durham to serve members of those communities (of which I am one). Serving Carrboro and Hillsborough should also be considered.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Extensions of the project, including those to Carrboro and Hillsborough, are not precluded as part of this project. Such projects, if studied, would be done so under a separate NEPA process.		
N/G	Julie	McBrierty	N/G				
Mr.	Mike	McBrierty	N/G				
N/G	S. G.	McCain	N/G				
N/G	Debbie	McCarthy	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	D. C.	McCarthy	This is an ill-conceived plan. It will aid to the destruction of a rural buffer between Durham and Chapel Hill and is not in keeping with any plans. As usual the construction, long term water and air pollution, and the noise impacts will be on the citizens of Durham Co. thus maintaining the character of Chapel Hill. The water runoff from this facility and the noise and the ugliness are not something Durham residents want.	Section 4.8.3.1 discusses groundwater quality and states that the 116 privately –owned wells that are within 1,500 feet of the D-O Corridor would not be affected by the operation of the light rail vehicles because the vehicles do not have gasoline or oils that could spill and contaminate the groundwater. In addition, the use of concrete ties avoids the environmental issue of leaching creosote from wood ties. The addition of impervious surfaces, particularly at the park-and-rides lots, ROMF, and stations, would require the implementation of best management practices for the collection and treatment of stormwater runoff.	As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred	Section 4.4.3.1 states that for visual impacts Triangle Transit will use interdisciplinary design teams to create aesthetics guidelines and stands in the design of project element s and provide landscaping and aesthetic treatments with in close proximity to residences.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Kathy	McCord	This is a total waste of resources because it will not benefit the people who need transportation.	The D-O LRT Project would benefit transit-dependent populations by providing increased mobility and improved access and connectivity. The Light Rail Alternative would serve as a spine to link the residential growth with new employment opportunities in the D-O Corridor. A discussion of potential impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in detail in DEIS chapter 5. As listed in Table 4.2-4, the proposed station areas of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would serve approximately 53,000 residents, 25,800 households, and employment of 119,100, in 2040. The NEPA Preferred Alternative would also serve over 13,000 transit dependent persons living within ½-mile of the stations, as well as a LEP population of over 2,600.			
N/G	Timothy	McCord	N/G				
N/G	Diane	McElroy	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Diane	McGrath	This plan will create significant problems as well as very significant unintended consequences. For example the station for Woodmont has no parking spaces and the projected numbers for use are fantasy not fact.	Parking is proposed at several stations as described in DEIS section 3.3. As described in Table 2.3-2 and further detailed in Table 3.3-2, park-and-ride facilities are currently planned at the following stations: • Friday Center • Leigh Village • Gateway • MLK Jr. Parkway • South Square • Durham • Dillard Street • Alston Avenue The number of parking spaces proposed varies and are based on forecasted ridership and land availability. Stations with park-and-ride facilities would include bus bays for connecting feeder bus routes and “kiss-and-ride” spaces for passenger pick-up and drop-off. Walk-up stations would be accessed primarily by pedestrians, bicyclists, and passengers transferring from bus service. In general, automobile parking would not be provided at walk-up stations (section 2.3.2.1). See also typical images on p.2-23 and conceptual designs in appendix			
Ms	Chris	McHugh	N/G				
Dr.	Philip	McHugh	N/G				
Mr	Scott	McIlhenny	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Ingrid	McIntosh	The Farrington Road proposed location for the Maintenance Facility will destroy our 55 plus community. The creation of an industrial area in our rural, quiet community will significantly lower our property values, increase local crime and threaten the financial andn physical security of our senior citizens in this area.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be aimed towards the ROMF to reduce spillage onto neighboring properties and adjacent roadways. In addition,	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	James	McIntosh	Location of maintenance facility near school & our 55 plus community and other residential areas.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Kathleen	McManus	Because of the already existing traffic congestion along this route, adding more stops will only increase the problems. Additionally, light rail has not proven to benefit municipalities and consumer satisfaction.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Hannah	Meador	Properties on Meadowmont Lane (and in the rest of the neighborhood) were all purchased with the full disclosure of future light rail plans in place going through that location. My parents considered this fact 13 years ago when building a house in Meadowmont. The basis for altering these plans seems nonsensical, biased, and not in keeping with Chapel Hill's reputation for thoughtful long-term planning in the interest of the community as a whole.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Judith	Mellyn	The process leading up to the selection of light rail and its preferred route alignments undervalued, or in many instances ignored, the needs and concerns of Orange/Durham residents. Unless and until we, the citizens of Orange and Durham, receive equitable services, expert opinion validating the applicability of light rail to our specific population distributions, and full disclosure of the cost and ridership methodologies used to justify Go-Triangle / MPO request for funding from the FTA, it is unconscionable to even consider expending our limited tax dollars on this flawed proposal.	Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.	URS/AECOM, a company consulting with Triangle Transit, prepared the technical information and environmental impact analysis for the Project on behalf of the Federal Transit Administration as well as GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); Environmental Impact and Related Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A legal sufficiency review of the DEIS was also conducted by the FTA and Triangle Transit.	Information on the project capital and operations and maintenance costs can be found in DEIS chapter 7. More detailed information on capital costs can be found in appendix K27. More detail on operating and maintenance costs can be found in appendix K29.
Mrs	Marcia	Mensah	N/G				
N/G	Roger	Messier	There are better ways to spend text dollars. Z	Comment Noted			
N/G	Caroline	Mikaloff	N/G				
Ms	June	Milby	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Norbert	Mildner	This is a absolute Waste of taxpayer's money. The cost per ridership does not add up. Line of travel is very insufficient, does not go to airport, big mall's, stadium. Charlotte, which is 3 x as big as chapel hill does not cover the cost yet, means taxpayer still has to support the project. By the time the LR is built the technology is outdated. There are better alternatives to meat the proposed demand for the CH area. The maintenance , upkeep safety issue are Oslo a big concern.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project’s capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.	
mr.	Norbertt	Mildner	L	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Theresa	Miles	I do not think the light rail is a good idea for several reason. I rode the light rail in Baltimore for five years (starting with first year). I would be surprised if this saves money and created jobs. I only saw the crime on the light rail and the communities it brought crime to. I also do not think any light rail is truly making money or saving money. I also do not see why Meadowmont can say no they do not want it after the decision was made to have it. I feel that you are just putting across the street because we do not have the money to fight it and the Finley Forest community will only be hurt more, with the home values decreasing. I am not against the idea of going green, but I do see where the benefits out way the means on	The proposed D-O LRT Project would be designed and operated in accordance with Triangle Transit's current safety and security plans. These plans would be updated to include specific requirements for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element alternatives, reviewed by FTA, and submitted through the NCDOT State Safety Oversight process for approval prior to revenue service. Triangle Transit uses Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts to assist in deterring criminal activity in the design of its facilities. The basic principle of CPTED is to increase natural surveillance by providing good sight-lines and avoiding conditions such as tall landscaping that could potentially provide individuals with areas to hide or obstruct mechanical methods of surveillance, such as closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.	
N/G	Christopher	Miles	N/G				
N/G	Jeff	Miller	This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!!	Comment Noted			
Ms	Esther	Miller	This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!!	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	gerry & adele	mittelstadt	We are living in a 55 and older community across from the proposed repair and maintenance facility. we are against this construction being built and totally against the light rail train.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Mary	Moeller	Too close to my children's school and my neighborhood which is going to cause significant increase in traffic as well as strande people meandering in close proximity to over 900 elementary children!!	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF		
Mr	Andrew	Moeller	N/G				
Mr	Jason	Moon	N/G				
Dr.	Tara	Moon	N/G				
Dr	Reginald	Moore	N/G				
Mrs	Debbie	Moore	N/G				
Ms	Sandra	Morgan	N/G				
Dr	William	Morley	N/G				
N/G	Lauren	Morris	N/G				
N/G	Craig	Morris	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Betty	Morris	Please do not start a light rail system just for UNC, DUKE, NCC! A rail system is needed for Raleigh Chapel Hill Durham where I 40 is packed, not just the universities! Also, look at the fiasco of Charlotte rail system! It's an embarrassment!!!! Do we want the same for Furham and Chapel Hill? NO LIGHT RAIL!!! NO REZONING!!!	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	Bonnie	Morrison	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Ellen	Moul	very expensive project with minimal value to residents. Money can be spent more effectively without disrupting our lovely neighborhoods.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			
N/G	Nell	Mowry	N/G				
N/G	Felicisimo	Munda	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	felicia	mundy	While I favor light rail in general, I don't believe this project and its current route will alleviate traffic problems. I think this is a huge waste of tax payer money.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	William	mundy	Route will not solve traffic problems.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	felicia	mundy	This is not a good use of taxpayer money and the existing plan will not solve our current traffic issues.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
N/G	Joyce	munkacsi	N/G				
Mr	James	Munkacsi	N/G				
Mrs	Beth	Myers	N/G				
Mrs.	Darlene	Naugle	N/G				
Mr	Dennis	Naugle	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Dao	Ngo	We don't really need it. Train takes longer where we want to go. Cost a lot to build it. Waste time and money for it.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		
Mrs	Chi	Nguyen	N/G				
N/G	Michael	Nguyen	N/G				
Mr.	Robert	Nickerson	This is a boondoggle of major proportion. If completed everyone 30 years from now will look back and say "WHAT WERE THEY THINKING."	Comment Noted			
Mrs	Hadley	Nixon	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Candace	Noel	Noise, disrupted traffic at at-grade crossings, home values negatively affected, horribly expensive given the limited businesses that can be accessed along the route.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.	DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives. Additional detail on the impacted receptors is provided in appendix	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Brian	Norris	I would like to see much more investigation into the possibilities of BRT for this corridor!	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			
Mr.	Blaise	Noto	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Blaise	Noto	The costs of this project are astronomical and will only escalate over time with the costs l once again be assumed by the taxpayers. Focus on making the roads better, wider, and more and better bus transportation.	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5).	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Robert	O'Connell	Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. Think deeply and wisely!	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region’s existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Peggy	O'Connell	Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. Think deeply and wisely!	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region’s existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
Ms.	Maureen	Oakes	N/G				
N/G	Ilana	Osten	N/G				
Mr.	William	Ott	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Marissa	Outten	Due to safety issues with cars and pedestrians this project needs to be stopped.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.		
N/G	karen	paden	N/G				
Dr.	Susan	Palmer	N/G				
Mr.	John	Parker	N/G				
Mr	Patrick	Parks	N/G				
Dr.	Kristi	Passaro	N/G				
N/G	Paul	Passaro	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Virginia	Pate	I am particularly concerned about the safety of multiple grade level crossings around my neighborhood but also question who will actually benefit from this project. Traffic between South Durham & UNC along Barbee Chapel Rd seems to be one of the more highly traveled routes in this area, perhaps second only to US-54 to I-40 from UNC to RTP; the light rail will not serve either of those communities and will actually cause increased traffic delays due to street level crossing on the south side of 54.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Scottie	Pate	My objection is to ground level tracks in an already congested high-traffic area	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	The design of the alignment with regards to at-grade crossings, grade-separated crossings, or closures/elimination of crossings is primarily based on an assessment of the topography to be traversed by the alignment as well as the projected traffic on the roadway that is crossed. To maintain the cost effectiveness of the LRT project in order to qualify for federal funding, the alignment will be at-grade unless either of these two criteria requires grade-separation.		
N/G	Frances	Patterson	N/G				
N/G	Hal	Patterson	N/G				
mr	louis	payne	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Susan	Pearl	This money would be better served to be used for high occupancy lanes and better bus service	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			
Ms	Barbara	Pelet	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Sandy	Pendergraft	I live near the intersection of Barbee Chapel and NC HWY54. The traffic is already very bad during the rush hours. Sometimes it takes a while to just get out of my driveway. This rail system would make it unbearable.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			
mr.	Steve	Pendergraft	N/G				
N/G	LeeAnne	Pendergraft	N/G				
N/G	LuAnne	Pendergraft	N/G				
N/G	Don	Pendergraft	N/G				
Mr.	Roger	Pendleton	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Lawrence	Perkins	I oppose the light rail project. It is expensive and since it won't go to the airport or the RTP, it won't be used.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	mary	Pettiette	N/G				
N/G	Mitch	Phillips	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Christine	Phillips	Putting an industrial maintenance facility in an area that is full of homes, near an elementary school and where it will drive out local wildlife is not acceptable. There are several more reasons why this is not a good idea: traffic issues, value of real estate and increases in the taxes around this area to pay for the outrageous cost of building this. I am against this and it is not necessary between Durham and chapel hill.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.	
Mr.	Dustan	Phillips	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	susan	pierce	Maintenance facility at Farrington is a hazard both to the elementary school and an over 55 community. Toxic fumes are a special hazard for the young and the elderly. D3	The proposed D-O LRT Project would include a ROMF where light rail vehicles would be stored and maintained. This facility would have the indirect effect of generating regulated materials associated because of maintenance activities. These materials would include oils, greases, solvents, and other waste materials. While the light rail vehicles, as noted in DEIS section 4.8.3.1, do not operate on gasoline or oils that could spill and contaminate the groundwater through the operation of the light rail, as noted above, regulated materials would be generated from maintenance activities at the ROMF. As such, all regulated materials, including fluids (e.g., oils, greases, solvents and other waste materials), used at the ROMF will be captured and stored in tanks, where they will be periodically collected by an outside vendor for off-site recycling or disposal. All regulated materials will be disposed of in accordance with state and local guidelines and no substantial indirect impacts are anticipated.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Susan	Pierce	Grade-level crossings are NOT safe. Farrington RAMF next to an elementary school and a community for elders is NOT safe -- pending the need to evacuate due to "accidents" from flammable liquids that will be used daily, 24 hours, 7 days/week. . . not to mention that this area is zoned R-20, residential.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	The proposed D-O LRT Project would include a ROMF where light rail vehicles would be stored and maintained. This facility would have the indirect effect of generating regulated materials associated because of maintenance activities. These materials would include oils, greases, solvents, and other waste materials. While the light rail vehicles, as noted in DEIS section 4.8.3.1, do not operate on gasoline or oils that could spill and contaminate the groundwater through the operation of the light rail, as noted above, regulated materials would be generated from maintenance activities at the ROMF. As such, all regulated materials, including fluids (e.g., oils, greases, solvents and other waste materials), used at the ROMF will be captured and stored in tanks, where they will be periodically collected by an outside vendor for off-site recycling or disposal. All regulated materials will be disposed of in accordance with	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
mr	William	Pitts	There is not sufficient density to support light rail in this area at this time. Building a light rail system to encourage density is totally backwards.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT).	Land use broadly refers to the different functions of human use of land (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial) and is influenced by development patterns and activity centers, population and employment levels, growth potential and trends, local and regional land use policies, and other factors that affect area growth. DEIS section 4.1 describes land use and land use policy in the D-O Corridor and the potential impacts of the alternatives under study in the DEIS. Population and employment data related to land uses are presented in DEIS section 4.2. Transit-supportive growth and development is expected to continue throughout the corridor due largely to positive market forces, supportive land use policies, and capacity for growth and supportive public investments. Market support for this type of development includes shifting lifestyle	
Mrs	Amanda	Podgoreanu	N/G				
N/G	Joel	Poe	N/G				
Dr.	Patricia	Porter	N/G				
N/G	Barbara	Post	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Philp	Post	We need and can afford Bus Rapid Transit, which has the power to serve a much wider area of Orange and Durham Counties. We do Not need a fixed rail system and we cannot afford it and it will not be flexible enough to serve our citizens.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			
MS	Teresa	Priboth	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Joe	Procopio	Light rail is not feasible for a metro area as widely spread as ours. This is a train to nowhere.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Allison	Procopio	Please do not spoil our quiet family communities when alternatives like 15-501 would be less intrusive and be accessible to so many more people. Plus, traffic on Farrington is already terrible in the morning and rush hour.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Various alternative alignments were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Alternatives considered during the AA included routes along US 15-501. Through the Alternatives Analysis, the alignment that follows NC 54, George King Road, and Farrington Road was selected as the best alternative to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.		
Mr. and M	Mark	Prokop	Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Prof.	John	Pucher	The planned LRT from Chapel Hill to Durham should be cancelled, as it would be a tragic waste of scarce tax dollars needed to fund improvements in bus services, including express service and Bus Rapid Transit throughout the Triangle Area. All studies show that express bus service and BRT are much more effective than LRT, which is an outdated technology. It would take 15 years to complete the D-O LRT, while improved bus service could start within a year or two.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Pamela	Pulsfort	I believe that the light rail project as it is proposed if extremely ill conceived. I do not believe that there will be enough people riding it to off set the enormous expense and it will be very disruptive to traffic at the Downing Creek entrance and along Hwy. 54. Not to mention the already huge traffic tie ups during UNC events. It will be a huge disaster that we have to pay for with taxpayer funds and traffic congestion. Also, the state wants to widen Hwy 54 after light rail is in place. That will be a double disaster. Build it then move it??? Who is making these decisions?	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	J.	Pulsfort	We personally know of at least 26 years of mass transit promotion via the multitude of adjustable bussing routes by numerous federally & state subsidized programs which to date, by your own figures, have failed to carry more than some 1500 riders, despite regional growth that exceeds Charlotte's. Raleigh already rejected this faulty plan. Quit trying to foist it upon us. The federal budget can't afford it, neither can the state, we don't want it & terrorist attacks in Spain, England & France prove it's too dangerous for our children and families anyway. Scrap this nonsense and accelerate the safer more useful road widenings that are already planned for UNC's needs, which arrive by roads, not expensively limited light	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5).	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this		
N/G	John	Quinterno	N/G				
Mr.	JERRY	RAWLINSON	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	James	Ray	There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will not encompass the entire triangle nor have any federal help. waste of money as usual	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Construction of the D-O LRT Project will be funded through a variety of local, state, and federal sources. The local funding will be paid from a portion of the half-cent sales tax dedicated for transit in Durham and Orange counties, $10 annual vehicle registration fee dedicated for transit, and 5% tax surcharge on car rentals dedicated for transit. Other local funding sources such as value capture strategies may also be pursued. State funding is allocated to the project through the State Transportation Improvement Program. Federal funding is anticipated through the Federal Transit Administration “New Starts” Capital Investment Grant program.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	
Mrs	Marcia	Rea	N/G				
Mr	Ervin	Rea	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Ann	Recesso	Placing light rail across the entrance to Downing Creek is dangerous and will cause unnecessary traffic congestion. It seems this area cannot support light rail regardless as the population, no matter how lawyers fiddle with the statistics, does not warrant it.	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Michael	Reed	The current light rail commuter train plan will not meet the transportation needs of our community.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
N/G	Christine	Reed	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	Lucas	Reed	The current route does not reach those areas with the greatest ridership needs. I prefer the no build option to the current plan.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and			
N/G	Kelly	Reilly	N/G				
Mr	Jeffrey	Reilly	N/G				
Ms.	Judith	Rhew	N/G				
N/G	Pamela	Rhodes	N/G				
N/G	Susan	Rice	Do NOT build the Light Rail Train!!	Comment Noted			
Mrs.	Stacey	Richardson	N/G				
N/G	Becky	Riggsbee	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr	John	Riordan	The Durham-Orange Light Rail plans seem quite incomplete and very poorly developed.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Rita	Robbins	N/G				
N/G	Henry	robbins	N/G				
N/G	Janet	roberson	N/G				
Mr.	Roderick	Roberson	N/G				
N/G	Robyn Weaver	Robyn	I don't support nor do I believe the light rail system as proposed would be utilized as much as the proponents would like taxpayers to believe. This seems like a waste of my tax dollars especially given the monumental problems on the I-40 corridor between Chapel Hill and Raleigh, which the light rail will do nothing to help and will only leave a greater deficit of tax dollars to resolve the I-40 immediate and future problems.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
Mrs.	Nora	Rohde	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Mallory	Roman	The costs far outweigh the benefits of the light rail. Most people in the region already have transportation. A much less invasive transportation solution can be offered to those who don't by simply improving the bus system. Building and operating the light rail will disturb hundreds of homeowners and decrease property values for many of us who already live here. Stop the light rail!	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region’s existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.	

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Margaret q	Roos-Codsi	The safety of the road crossings concerns me. I also question the projected use/ridership figures, With non-flexible routes. BRT would have the ability to flex with the situations as they change in coming years.6bv	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	As stated in section 3.1.1 of the DEIS, "Ridership forecasts were developed for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives and No Build Alternative for forecast year 2040 using the Triangle Regional Model (TRM), Version 5 based on the operating plans included in appendix K.1, consistent with appendix K.2. The TRM was developed by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), NCDOT, and Triangle Transit. The TRMSB is housed at the North Carolina State University Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE). The model is designed to forecast travel throughout the Triangle region's transit and roadway system. As such, it contains a network of existing and planned future transit services consistent with	
N/G	Eugene	Rossitch	N/G				
N/G	Steffi	Rubin	N/G				
Mr.	Charles	Rushbrook	N/G				
Mr.	Charles	Rushbrook	N/G				
N/G	Paula	Russell	N/G				
Ms	Dana	Saleeby	N/G				
Ms	Sheila	Salter	N/G				
N/G	rhoda	samuels	Too expensive and too visually unappealing. Too dangerous and too inconvenient.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Ariel and Phil	Sandick	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Donna	sayers	The light rail was to go through Meadowmont and as promised, it still should.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			
Mr	Christopher	Scallion	N/G				
N/G	Ashley	Scallion	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Allison	Schmitt	Too much noise for a residential neighborhood and too much environmental impact. Traffic congestion would be unbearable	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred	The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact inner portions of the New Hope Creek bottomland forest by following along the existing US 15-501 through the most sensitive portions of the New Hope Creek bottomlands. In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail	
Mr	Christopher	Schmitt	We strongly oppose this development.	Comment Noted			
mrs	vicki	scott	This proposal is very damaging to our community and not financially smart with the amount of usage that is expected.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Lauren	Scott	N/G				
Mr	Carl	Scott	I oppose this Lite Rail on Patterson Rd	Comment Noted			
Ms	Nancy	Scott	I oppose the Lite Rail on Patterson Rd5	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Stephanie	Scotti	N/G				
Ms	E. Jane	Seeley	While I, in general, support the light rail concept; there are elements of the proposed plan that are so egregious that I don't think the project should proceed. At grade crossings are dangerous and impede already burdened traffic; the proposed maintenance station on Farrington Road is unconscionable - being placed in a quiet residential neighborhood and near a school.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF	
Ms	Anita	Shanker	N/G				
N/G	George	Sharpley	N/G				
Mr	Michael	Shepard	I don't wish to have this rail system. This is a huge impact to me and my lifestyle.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Rachel	Shepard	N/G				
N/G	Ruth	Shrieve	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Julia	Simons	I observe most buses in our area, SW Durham, only have a few passengers! We could use smaller buses . I don't see the need for light-rail in this area, at all!!	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Richard	Sloane	Although I'm a life-long fan and user of alternative transportation (bikes, buses, and car-pools), I believe this project does little if anything to alleviate current congestion, and costs way to much. Get more buses and add a stop in front of Downing Creek - so much cheaper than this project. The widened shoulder on Barbee Chapel has been a great improvement for cyclists!	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On-time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this	
N/G	Teresa	smith	N/G				
Mrs.	Kelly	Smith	N/G				
Mr.	Tim	Smith	N/G				
Mr	Josh	Smith	I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area close to where I work and live.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Christine	Smith	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Barbara	Smith	The Light rail project will cost a lot of money and benefit a few. We already have very good bus service for people who desire to use mass transit.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.		
N/G	Scott	Smith	N/G				
N/G	Thomas	Smith	N/G				
N/G	LuAnn	Smith	N/G				
N/G	Alan	Snavely	N/G				
N/G	Anna	Snavely	N/G				
N/G	Allison	Snyder	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Susan	Sonberg	I am concerned with the safety of the rail project, especially the C2A route which will place 3 at grade crossings. This will exacerbate the significant traffic congestion that exists at the dangerous intersection of Barbee Chapel Rd/NC54 and obstruct the only points residents of Little John Rd and Downing Creek Pkwy have to access NC 54. Trains will run unsynchronized in each direction every ten minutes making it nearly impossible to get in and out of our neighborhood without risking our lives and that of children on school buses or bikes. The methodology and logic used to establish ridership estimates that favored C2A are flawed. They are based on a premise that a slight differential in overall time- dramatically changes the	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high
N/G	Shirley	Sopko	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Lisa	Spadafino	I believe that a light rail will not be helpful to us in this region. It will not be cost effective, very disruptive while being constructed,and not utilized by Durham and Chapel Hill residents. All in all, it is a waste of tax payers money.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Linda	Spallone	With reluctance I have to oppose construction, it seems this project is way off course with the actual needs of the area. It has lost support of wake co participation and emphasizing a route between hospitals does not seem the best way to control traffic. They need to step back ,regroup and solicit is comments and input from all stakeholders, the seem to be bouncing from one alternative to another when ever they meet any kind of opposition I am also questioning the many at level crossings which further impede traffic flow	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	linda	spallone	THe future Durham and Chapel Hill will be so angry with you, Go Traiangle when they see you destroyed a majot wetland area and you created all this at grade crossings. The future will have no clean water to drink and they will tear out your at grade crossing and say how dumb was that .. Shame on you	The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact inner portions of the New Hope Creek bottomland forest by following along the existing US 15-501 through the most sensitive portions of the New Hope Creek bottomlands. In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail sections supported by bridge piers. This will allow for terrestrial wildlife	Water resources are discussed in DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential impacts the NEPA Preferred Alternative (which includes the Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects to Water Resources are described in DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page 4-292, existing federal and state regulations (as described previously) would protect water resources from future indirect or development related impacts. These regulations include Section 404, with its avoidance, minimization, and mitigation hierarchy, FEMA regulations, Section 401 and the Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as state approvals of sediment and erosion control plans.		
Mr	Gary	Spitz	Very much OPPOSED to this initiative across from our Culp Arbor community.	Comment Noted			
N/G	Julia	spring	N/G				
N/G	Bill	Stagg	N/G				
N/G	Elisabeth	Stagg	N/G				
N/G	Ilene	Stewart	N/G				
Ms	Catherine	Stewart	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr.	Jim	Stikeleather	Wait for Raleigh. Durham is easily assessable by car without getting impacting I40 traffic.	The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under development. For more information, please see WakeTransit.com			
N/G	Amanda	Strawbridge	N/G				
N/G	George	Stuart	N/G				
mr	Gregory	Sulin	Meadowmount was designed and approved for light rail please put it where it was meant to go.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Cynthia	Sundy	N/G				
Ms.	Kristin	Sundy	N/G				
Ms.	Anna	Sundy	N/G				
N/G	Thomas	Swasey	N/G				
N/G	Judith	Swasey	N/G				
Mr	Thomas	Swasey	Light rail as planned ignores the needs of the neighborhoods and there are better, less expensive alternatives like electric buses and protected bike lanes	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9.		
N/G	Dorothy	Sylvestre	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Cindy Lee	Talisman	There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will not encompass the entire triangle nor have any federal help. Yes the area is growing BUT this area also like their cars and this will be an needless expenditure for maybe a chosen few. We are NOT NYC or DC that enjoy the rail system and no matter how hard transplants come here and try to change the area it won't work!	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.		
Mrs	Iwona	Tauer	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Ronald	Tell	The grade crossings at Barbie Chapel Road and Downing Creek Parkway will be unsafe for the volume of traffic using both street. You must find a better solution.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	Under a separate planned NCDOT project, the nearest signal that would impact westbound NC 54 is located over 3,800 feet to the west of Littlejohn Road. The nearest signal that would impact eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The stop/yield controlled right turns do not operate on a fixed pattern and therefore the 12 or fewer		
Mrs.	Jean	Tell	N/G				
Mr	W George	Thomason	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Alexis	Thompson	Please run the light rail throught the intended development of Meadowmont that was built and approved as a light rail development.	The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage			
Mr	PAUL	THOMPSON	We do not need this expensive boondoggle!	Comment Noted			
N/G	Julie	Thurman	N/G				
N/G	Taylor	Thurman	N/G				
Ms	Anne	Tice	N/G				
N/G	Margie	Tippett	N/G				
Ms	Elaine	Tomberlin Lopez	N/G				
N/G	Ingrid	Toth	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Sally	Trauco	In support of the rail just not the location along Stancil where traffic is already horrendous!	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate			
Dr.	Dimitri	Trembath	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Dr	Dina	Trobbiani	At grade rail line crossing will seriously disrupt traffic flow and increase congestion along Farrington Rd, particularly throttling commute to/from 54/40/UNC/Raleigh; planned industrial zoned ROMF site will do same and devalue properties in Farrington Rd. dependent communities.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Gil	Turner	The bottom line in all of this tax waste is that Chapel Hill and Durham will STILL NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION and their residents will be burdened with excessive tax and NO BENEFITS.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
ms	Barbara	Ulam	I am against the proposed light rail system that will pass by the entrance to Downing Creek in Chapel Hill. It will effect property values and will be noisy and congested.	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.	Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail.	DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives. Additional detail on the impacted receptors is provided in appendix	
Dr	Jan	Ulrich	N/G				
Dr	Beth	Ulrich	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Gaby	Valdivia	The light rail to connect chapel hill and Durham is a wasteful project with little ridership impact. There's not sufficient congestion, we don't have the population numbers for this project. It will be a burden on residents, it will increase traffic on the arteries it crossed, and is based on dubious and poor research. Stop.	URS/AECOM, a company consulting with Triangle Transit, prepared the technical information and environmental impact analysis for the Project on behalf of the Federal Transit Administration as well as GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); Environmental Impact and Related Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A legal sufficiency review of the DEIS was also conducted by the FTA and Triangle Transit.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2.		
N/G	Stef	van Dijk	N/G				
N/G	Connie	Vance	N/G				
N/G	Andrea	Vinson	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Delores	Vitali	This Rail system is going to hinder the traffic that already exists. How and how many people are going to ride it?? Certainly not the elderly and crippled. What is going to happen on Farrington Road is a total disgrace. What are you people thinking of , besides putting money in your pockets!	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.		
Ms.	Ann	Von Holle	The light rail will be a danger and nuisance to Downing Creek, the community in which I live.	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Jane	Wagstaff	DOLRT is a fiscal explosion that will never ever attract the projected ridership.	As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT).			
N/G	Shelley	Walter	N/G				
Mrs.	Janie B.	Ward	N/G				
N/G	Robert	Ward	N/G				
MR	Blaine	Warren	N/G				
N/G	Leigh	Warren	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs.	Julie	Warshaw	The poor planning and total lack of response in regard to the local stations and routing for the light rail system is an unfortunate indicator of the problems this system will cause as a whole.	Comment Noted			
Mrs	Suzanne	Waters	N/G				
Mr	Robert	Weaver	Low riders to warrant expense.	GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Catharina	Weaver	To get a rail system to function it needs to cover all of Triangle. The area most benefiting from a light rail would be Research Triangle Park and the Raleigh-Durham Airport	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
Mrs	Mary	Webb	N/G				
Mr	Michael	Webb	Please reject	Comment Noted			
MR	Aaron	Webel	N/G				
N/G	Kym	Weed-Buzinski	N/G				
Ms.	Janice	Welsh	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Rose	Wenzel	We, the public, have not received the necessary objective information to make an informed decision on this Durham-Orange Light Rail project	Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9.			
N/G	Stephen	Whilden	I like the idea of a light rail reducing congestion on HWY 54, but it needs to be on the OTHER side of the highway where there is NO development. Low- emission buses would be a good substitute to the current plan.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill’s Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies.		
Mrs.	Courtney	Whilden	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Julia	Whitaker	I am in favor of transportation improvement. But the LRT will cost more than it saves and is likely to be obsolete by the time it is built. Not to mention the environmental and residential negative impacts it will have. Give us a more fiscally responsible option.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region's transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Kenneth	White	I am strongly opposed to going forward with the proposed DO Light Rail Project. The project has the potential to create nightmarish traffic problems on major commuter roadways, be a noise and safety hazard in established residential neighborhoods, and be a huge tax burden on the citizens of these communities.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. Triangle Transit will also pursue Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options.
mr	landon	whitt	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Marc	Wiesenberg	The choice of the "preferred" Light Rail route is both inconsistent with the NC 54 corridor study and ignores areas within the City of Durham whose populace would actually benefit from an LRT line. Documented concerns regarding citizen serious safety and exacerbated existing traffic congestion issues, to name just two, have either been marginalized or simply ignored. Aside from these matters, the cost of this proposal, including an expectation of significant Federal assistance, makes this project ill-advised. Tax revenue would be far better utilized by funding current NC DOT plans to streamline Highway 54 between 15/501 and I-40. The implementation of these improvements would make a huge difference toward	In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx.	Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines.	DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of	
Mrs.	Joni	Williams	N/G				
Mr.	Robert	Williams	N/G				
Mr.	Travis	Williams	N/G				
N/G	Carrie	Williams	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Jonathan	Williams	PLEASE, PLEASE do not proceed with Orange County- Durham County light rail project. (1) In my opinion this is not an acceptable use for tax payer dollars. (2) Personally, I hate to think of the disruption this will cause to my Downing Creek neighborhood. (3) IF there should be any light rail in the Triangle, and that is highly debatable, its primary goal should be to alleviate congestion on I-40. Orange County--Durham County light rail plan does not.	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina	Enhancements to bus service are part of the Durham County and Orange County Bus and Rail Investment Plans (BRIPs). Both BRIPs were developed and approved by county commissioners before the successful sales tax referenda in 2011 and 2012, and both have guided the provision of new bus service in the two counties over the past few years. For more information about provisions for improved bus service under the BRIPs, please see http://ourtransitfuture.com/durham-county-bus-and-rail-investment-plan/. As noted in DEIS Table 5.3-1, the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is being used to fund project development for the proposed D-O LRT Project and to implement improvements to DATA bus services. In addition, the sales tax will be used to support the design and construction of Neighborhood Transit Centers and make	There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times.
Mrs.	Anne D.	Williams	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mrs	Elizabeth	Williams	I think the cost to use ratio is to high. Fix roads and bus lines.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.	The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. Even under current demands, the region’s transportation system is beginning to strain. Levels of congestion are increasing and are anticipated to worsen, which will lead to increased travel times and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region’s explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-		
ms	dottie	williford	stop the rail it ruins peoples homes	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Diane	Willis	This light rail project is worthless without going to RTP and the airport. The cost is way too high and the disruptions to neighborhoods are far too great. Let's do bus rapid transit instead, with much better coverage for a much lower cost.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.	Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the “Alternatives Analysis” (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com.		
Mr	Erik	Wilson	We don't need this. We need to get out of debt	Comment Noted			
N/G	Alison	Windram	NO LITE RAIL. DONT WASTE MY MONEY!!	Comment Noted			

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms.	Leslie	Wiseman	Does not go to the airport so not a fan.	Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County.			
N/G	Robin	Wood	N/G				
Mrs	Rhonda	Woodell	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Ms	Lucy	Woodell	I feel further studies involving traffic, noise and ruining a wonderful residential setting is so unnecessary by putting the maintenance facility on Farrington Road when there other places that would be much more suited for this type of structure. I think some of the information presented to the affected neighborhoods is not accurate and some studies have been eliminated altogether it seems. This is simply not the place for what has been proposed.	As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the City and/or County approval process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be aimed towards the ROMF to reduce spillage onto neighboring properties and adjacent roadways. In addition,	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF		

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
Mr.	Philip	Woodell	The light rail project is not needed because I feel that the ridership will be much less than what has been advertised. The proposed maintenance facility should not be located on Farrington Road because it will make traffic worst than it is already.	Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives	As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT).		
N/G	Regina	Wyatt	N/G				
N/G	Edward	Wyatt	N/G				
Mr	Trent	Yancey	N/G				
Mr	younger	ye	N/G				

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
N/G	Younger	Ye	Waste of resources on rail that creates noise, pollution, property degradation, all but a solution to traffic. It must stop!	In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services.	In order to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed D-O LRT Project, it will be necessary for Triangle Transit to acquire private property. When property is selected to be acquired, all other alternatives will have been considered. That property will have been determined to be the best location for the D-O LRT Project to serve the public. As a result, some citizens may be displaced from their homes or businesses. Local, state, and federal regulations and laws govern the acquisition of private property for public use. These laws ensure that owners of property acquired for public projects are treated fairly and consistently. They are designed to encourage and expedite acquisition by agreements with property owners, to minimize litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and to promote public confidence in land acquisition programs designed to benefit the public as a whole.	DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of receptors that would be impacted by the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives. Additional detail on the impacted receptors is provided in appendix	Water resources are discussed in DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential impacts the NEPA Preferred Alternative (which includes the Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects to Water Resources are described in DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page 4-292, existing federal and state regulations (as described previously) would protect water resources from future indirect or development related impacts. These regulations include Section 404, with its avoidance, minimization, and mitigation hierarchy, FEMA regulations, Section 401 and the Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as state approvals of sediment and erosion control plans.
Mr	Richard	Yenoff	N/G				
Dr.	Susan	Yeyeodu	N/G				
Mrs	Laura	Yost-Grande	N/G				
N/G	Lesley	Young	N/G				
N/G	Stephen	Young	N/G				
N/G	Jackie	Young	N/G				
mR	Edward	Zapolsky	N/G				
N/G	Xiao	Zhang	N/G				
Mr	Bingjun	Zheng	N/G				
* N/C - field not collected by the							
* N/G - not given							

Title	FirstName	Last Name	Comment	Response 1	Response 2	Response 3	Response 4
* S/C/P - State, County or Province							
* PC - Post Code							