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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. official</td>
</tr>
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<td>James Lin</td>
<td>tine.rtp.org</td>
<td>27713 / 27707</td>
<td>c. non-profit representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM McGurk</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tim.mcgurk@virginia.gov">tim.mcgurk@virginia.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Brubaker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbrubaker@townfcamboro.org">jbrubaker@townfcamboro.org</a></td>
<td>27510</td>
<td>a. private citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Jacobson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hannah.jacobson@loumamn.gov">hannah.jacobson@loumamn.gov</a></td>
<td>27713</td>
<td>b. official</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Meeting Date: 3. May 2012
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Shifletz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwash@goph-2.com">mwash@goph-2.com</a></td>
<td>27704</td>
<td>d. other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Pittman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nipp797@nc.rr.com">nipp797@nc.rr.com</a></td>
<td>27515 27516</td>
<td>a. private citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Lakefake</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hilitchfield@triangleland.org">hilitchfield@triangleland.org</a></td>
<td>27500</td>
<td>b. official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Rich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pennyrich.och@gmail.com">pennyrich.och@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>27516</td>
<td>c. non-profit representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project:
Officials Briefing

Below: Conceptual Transit-Oriented Development near Durham Station
Slide presentation included the Overview of the Triangle Regional Transit Program video, click here to view.
Introduction

Purpose of the Meeting

To provide information to project stakeholders and to receive input on the scope of the federal environmental review process in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
Meeting Agenda

- Introductions
- What is your role?
- What is the process?
- What is the purpose and need for the project?
- What is the project?
- What will be studied?
- How will stakeholders be involved?
- What is the project schedule?
- Corridor Review Comments
Program Partners
What is your role?
What is your role?

Project Agency Coordination

➢ Lead Agencies

  – Federal Lead Agency: Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
    • Brian Smart – Environmental Protection Specialist
  – Local Lead Agency: Triangle Transit
    • Damien Graham – Dir. of Communications & Govt. Affairs
    • Greg Northcutt – Dir. of Capital Development

➢ Other Participating Agencies
What is your role?

Responsibilities of officials and partners:

- Early identification of issues of concern
- Participate in the scoping process
- Participate in coordination meetings
- Keep up with project information and progress
- Relay information to others
- Provide point of contact information
What is the process?
What is the process?

FTA Project Planning and Development Process
What is the process?

Environmental Scoping Purpose:

- Present information about the project
- Obtain input on Purpose and Need, alternatives under consideration, and impacts to be evaluated
- Inform the public and governmental review agencies that the FTA and Triangle Transit will be preparing an EIS for this project
What is the process?

Environmental Scoping Process

- Public, elected officials, and interested government agencies assist in shaping the course and direction of the environmental review process and ultimately the project that will be implemented.

- Juncture at which open coordination with Federal, state, and local agencies, elected officials, project partners, and the public is conducted to identify and define the issues to be studied in detail through the NEPA environment review process.
What is the purpose and need for the project?
Purpose:
The purpose of the proposed premium high-capacity transit investment in the Durham-Orange County (D-O) Corridor is to provide a transit solution that addresses the following mobility and development needs:

Need:

- Need to enhance mobility
  - Capacity of roadway system cannot accommodate increased travel demand.
  - Limited capacity and availability of transit service.

- Need to expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill
  - Existing buses operate in mixed traffic along increasingly congested roadways.
  - Bus travel time offers no savings over automobile.
  - Lack of premium service that can attract choice riders.
Draft Purpose & Need

Need:

- Need to serve populations with high propensity for transit use
  - Limited transit service for university travel markets
  - Limited transit service for transit-dependent populations
- Need to foster compact development
  - Existing transit infrastructure is not supportive of land use plans
  - Existing transit infrastructure does not support long-term economic development
What is the project?
Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project

- Locally Preferred Alternative
- 17 miles
- 17 Stations
- $1.4 Billion (2011 $)
Project Background

1995-2005
- Transit studies, including:
  - Environmental Study
  - Single Corridor
  - Diesel rail technology

2002
- First Long Range Transportation Plan

2005
- Update Long Range Transportation Plan

2008
- Special Transit Advisory Commission’s Vision Plan (STAC report)

2009
- Passage of House Bill 148
- The Congestion Relief and 21st Century Transport Fund of 2009

2009
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations release their joint Long Range Transportation Plan

Spring 2010
- Alternatives Analysis started (current project)

Early 2012
- MPO’s & Triangle Transit select a Locally Preferred Alternative per corridor

Fall 2011
- Durham passes referendum: ½ cent Sales tax for transit

2012
- New Starts package will be submitted to Federal Transit Administration
Project Background

2035 Long Range Transportation Plan

Study areas are based on the CAMPO and DCHC MPO approved Long Range Transportation Plan of Spring 2009.

Starting Point for Analysis
Project Background

Transitional Analysis defined Priority Study Corridors - May 2010 – Sept 2010

- Wake County Corridor
- Durham-Wake County Corridor
- Durham-Orange County Corridor

Criteria

- Mobility
- Financial
- Land Use
- Socioeconomic
Durham-Orange Corridor
Alternatives Analysis


• Technical analysis determining the alignment, technology, and conceptual station locations that best meet the Purpose and Need and would be most competitive for state and federal funding

• Required first step if we seek federal funding
## AA Goals and Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Conceptual Screening Criteria</th>
<th>Detailed Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Improve mobility through and within the study corridor.</td>
<td>• Potential transit ridership <em>(Population and Employment Concentrations/Suitability of Transit Mode)</em></td>
<td>• 2035 Ridership Forecasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Increase transit efficiency and quality of service.</td>
<td>• Consistency with existing plans and studies</td>
<td>• Transportation Operations <em>(Traffic Impacts/Travel Times)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Improve transit connections.</td>
<td>• Community support</td>
<td>• Expansion Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Support local and regional economic development and planned growth management initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic Development Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Foster environmental stewardship.</td>
<td>• Irresolvable environmental impacts</td>
<td>• Public and Agency Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Provide a cost-effective transit investment.</td>
<td>• Technical and financial feasibility</td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Station Planning

1. Corridor Fit
   - Community Features
   - Land Use
   - ROW
   - Utilities

   "The ultimate goal is to help build better and more successful communities!"

2. Station Function
   - Location / Setting
   - Users / Ridership
   - Intermodal Transfers
   - Pedestrian / Bicycle Access
   - Station Amenities
   - Public Art
   - ADA Requirements

3. Development Potential
   - Underutilized Land
   - Multi-Use Developments
   - Higher Densities
   - Activity Nodes / Centers

3 Key Ingredients
Transit Station Development
Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) Adoption:

- July 2011: Draft Alternatives Analysis Recommendation published for review and comment
- DCHC MPO holds public meetings and hearings
- February 2012: Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO Adoption of LPA
Locally Preferred Alternative:

- 10-minute peak hours; 20-minute off-peak hours headway
- End to end travel time 35 minutes
- Double-tracked throughout
- Primarily at-grade in a dedicated and shared right-of-way
- Elevated sections
- 17 stations - location refinements, layouts and designs will be determined during the PE/EIS phase
Project Footprint
Project Footprint
Project Footprint

*Outside travel lane is 16'-6" with bike lane
Project Footprint

LRT Center Platform (18’ - 24’ Wide)

3-Car Platform with 2 Ramps and Landings (2 x 30’ = 60’) = 330’

3-Car LRT Train

3-Car Platform = 270’

LRT Side Platforms (12’ Wide)

3-Car LRT Train

3-Car Platform with 2 Ramps and Landings (2 x 30’ = 60’) = 330’

3-Car Platform = 270’
Project Footprint

Station Area

Elements

LRT Station with a Double-Sided Center Platform

Bus Stop Bays Along Curb

Path Link to Athletic Complex (Due to Severe Grade Change, May Require Vertical Circulation With Elevators and Staircases)

LRT Aerial Alignment

Provision New Access Road (as per UNC Master Plan)

 Proposed New Signalized Intersection (as per UNC Master Plan)

Mason Farm Road LRT Station

Shared Park-and-Ride (300 Spaces) in Proposed UNC Parking Ramp

Provision New UNC Facilities (as per UNC Master Plan)
What will be studied?
What will be Studied?

The following is a list of topics/resources to be studied in the EIS:

- Land Use Plans, Zoning and Economic Development
- Population and Employment
- Environmental Justice
- Transportation
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Air Quality
- Visual and Aesthetic Impacts
- Noise and Vibration
- Wetlands
- Biological Resources and Endangered Species
- Water Resources
- Floodplains and Flooding
- Historic and Archaeological Resources and Parklands
- Parks and Recreational Sites
- Section 4(f) Resources
- Contamination / Hazardous Waste
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Construction Impacts
- Impacts of Railroad Operation
- Secondary and Cumulative Impacts
- Climate Change Adaptation Planning
Identified Environmental Features

The D-O LRT LPA alignment is uncertain in two areas where alignment options will be further evaluated in the DEIS:

1. Crossing of Little Creek between the Friday Center/Meadowmont Village area and the proposed Leigh Village development
2. Crossing of New Hope Creek and Sandy Creek between Patterson Place and South Square
Identified Environmental Features

Identified resources associated with Little Creek, New Hope Creek, Sandy Creek and other parts of the corridor:

- Wetlands
- Floodplains
- Streams
- Federal Lands
- Water Quality
- Parks and Recreation (Gamelands, State and County Recreation Areas)
- Biological Resources (Significant Natural Heritage Areas, Conservation Lands)
- Neighborhoods/Community
- Noise
- Transportation
- Cultural and Historic
- Relocations
How will stakeholders be involved?
Public & Agency Participation

- NOI: Published April 3rd, 2012
- Agency Scoping Meeting: May 2nd, 2012
- Public Meeting #1: May 2nd, 2012
- Public Meeting #2: May 3rd, 2012
- Elected Officials Meeting: May 3rd, 2012
- Scoping Comments Due: June 18th, 2012
- Agency Follow-Up Meeting: Summer 2012
Public & Agency Participation

**Tools and Techniques**

- Public Workshops and Open Houses
- Public Meetings and Traveling Exhibits
- Call-in line, postal mailing address, and email
- Public Presentations
- Opinion Surveys
- Project Website – [www.ourtransitfuture.com](http://www.ourtransitfuture.com)
- Agency Coordination Meetings
- Steering Committee Meetings
- Email Updates
- Project Videos
- Social Media

Many ways to be engaged and comment - Input will be recorded and managed in a database throughout the process.
What is the project schedule?
The document provides a project schedule with various milestones and phases. Key phases include:

- **2010**
  - Alternatives Analysis

- **2011**
  - Locally Preferred Alternative

- **2012**
  - Scoping / New Starts Application
  - We Are Here

- **2013**
  - Authorization for Preliminary Engineering

- **2014**
  - Preliminary Engineering

- **2015**
  - NEPA Preferred Alternative

- **2016**
  - Draft EIS

- **2017**
  - Final EIS and ROD

- **2018**
  - Authorization for Final Engineering

- **2019**
  - Final Engineering

- **2020**
  - Initiate Construction (5 Years)

- **2021**

**Public & Agency Involvement**

- Scoping
- Draft EIS

**Continued Public Involvement**
Next Steps

- 45-day Scoping Comment Period – June 18, 2012
- Prepare Scoping Document
- Agency Follow-up Scoping Meeting
- Submit New Starts Application
- Request FTA permission to begin Preliminary Engineering and NEPA process
- EIS Kickoff
Corridor Review
Comments
How will the project be funded?

Local:
- Durham County approved ½ cent sales tax for transit approximately $19 M in 2013
- If Orange County approves ½ cent sales tax approximately $5 M in 2013

State:
- Future Appropriation

Federal:
- New Starts funding
Conceptual Transit Oriented Development near Durham Station
Rail and Bus Integration

- Rail is a long term investment
- All successful rail systems have strong, complementary bus systems
- Current County Transit Plans include both bus and rail investments
- AA process focussed on feeder bus service
- Near term (5 years) bus system is primary mode
- Longer term (10+ years) bus system shaped to complete and complement rail system
An Alternatives Analysis is:

• A focused look at alternatives at the “corridor” level
  – A “corridor” is the area that encompasses the origins, destinations, and primary paths of the majority of trips contributing to and/or affected by the identified transportation problem or need

• A means of reaching decisions on the investment strategy to pursue in a particular corridor
  – Public involvement
  – Federal, state and local agency coordination

• A requirement for federally funded transit corridor projects

• The AA for the Durham-Orange Corridor was completed Sep 2010 – July 2011. Documentation is available under the D-O LRT project page on www.ourtransitfuture.com
MEETING MINUTES

Date Distributed:  June 6, 2012
Prepared by:   Luann Polissaint
Meeting Date/Time:  May 3, 2012 / 10:00am – 12:00 noon
Place:  Durham Armory
        212 Foster Street
        Durham, NC  27701

Attendees:
John Edwards – john.edwards@nscorp.com
Pam Karriker – pkarriker@durhamcountync.gov
Matt Gernand – Matthew.gernand@nscorp.com
Bernadette Pelissier – bpe1@ncu.edu
Ed Harrison – ed.harrison@mindspring.com
Diane Catotti
James Lim – Lim@rti.org
Tim McMullen – tmcmullen@nccu.edu
Jeff Brubaker – jbrubaker@townofcarrboro.org
Hannah Jacobson – Hannah.jacobson@durhamnc.gov
Brian Williams – bpw3@duke.edu
Carolyn Elford – cwe@aux-services.unc.edu
Melanie Wilson – unc.edu
Bill Holm – bill.holm@duke.edu
Nick Tennyson – nick@hbadoc.com
David Anderson – Danberson@townofcarrboro.org
Matthew Payne – mmpayne@louisberger.com
Tom Smith – Tasmith@unch.unc.edu
Alice Gordon
Mike Arandroup – mikearand@ mindspring.com
Darcy Zorio – dzorio@ncu.edu
Meg Scully – mscully@durhamcountync.gov
Bo Howes – Rhowes@triangleland.org
Mike Shiflett – mwshiflett@hotmail.com
Nick Pittman – npittman@townofchapelhill.com
Brian Litchfield – blitchfield@townofchapelhill.com
Penny Rich – pennyrich@gmail.com
Greg Northcutt – Gnorthcutt@triangletransit.org
Juanita Shearer-Swink – Jshearer@triangletransit.org
Jonathan Parker – Jparker@triangletransit.org
Patrick McDonough – Pmcdonough@triangletransit.org
Brad Schulz – Bschulz@triangletransit.org
Damien Graham – Dgraham@triangletransit.org
Bill Houppermans – bill.houppermans@urs.com
Jeff Weisner – Jeff.weisner@urs.com
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Gavin Poindexter – Gavin.poindexter@urs.com
Cyndy Yu Robinson – Cyndy.yu.robinson@urs.com
Paul Himberger – Paul Himberger@urs.com
Kurt Neuflag – Kurt.neufang@urs.com
Rhiannon Kincaid – Rhiannon.kincaid@urs.com
Luann Polissaint – Luann.polissasint@urs.com
Lindsay Maurer – lmaurer@planningcommunities.com

Subject: Minutes of Elected Officials Scoping Meeting for DO LRT May 3, 2012

Purpose of Meeting: To provide information to project stakeholders and to receive input on the scope of the federal environmental review process in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Agenda
Introductions
Opening Remarks – Damien Graham – Triangle Transit
PowerPoint Presentation – Jeff Weisner – URS
Questions / Comments – all participants

Introductions
Each attendee introduced themselves by name and organization.

Opening Remarks
Damien Graham of Triangle Transit welcomed all participants and made some general opening remarks and turned the meeting to Jeff Weisner of URS for the PowerPoint presentation.

PowerPoint Presentation
Jeff Weisner identified the agency roles and responsibilities, outlined the Scoping process, identified the Draft Purpose and Need, and presented a brief history of the Durham-Orange LRT Project to date. During the presentation he also described the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) identified through the Alternatives Analysis (AA) process and adopted by the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), presented the current project schedule, and described the public and agency involvement and coordination process for the project. The presentation included a demonstration of the U-pointer device that would be used during the scoping meetings as an interactive digital tool to show information and project mapping and collect comments from stakeholders on the project.

After the presentation concluded, meeting attendees were provided the opportunity to ask questions and provide input on the environmental scope of the project.
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Questions / Comments
The participants raised several questions and comments are summarized below.

Comment: Regarding federal funds availability
Response: FTA funding is anticipated during final design.

Comment: Regarding the extent of project impacts to wetland and other resources
Response: Preliminary engineering will determine the amount of right of way needed and the footprint of the project. Extensive data collection will also be conducted to determine the extent and location of environmental resources. From this information, impacts of the project can be determined.

Comment: Regarding follow-up meetings and keeping the public officials informed of progress
Response: A Scoping document will be prepared, which will include the information and materials presented at the scoping meeting as well as a record of the comments received during the scoping process. This document will be available on the project website or by specific request from Triangle Transit. Periodic meetings will be held and project updates will be distributed to public officials informing them of progress. The project website will also be updated regularly with the latest project information.

Comment: Regarding previous public comments and the project responses to them
Response: Comments received to date and applicable responses have been documented. Electronic and hardcopies of previous comments are available upon request and are part of the project record.

Comment: Regarding the MPO vote and the identification of the C2 alternative being preferred over C1
Response: On February 8, 2012 the DCHC MPO passed a resolution adopting the Locally Preferred Alternative. The resolution identified both C1 and C2 options to be advanced for further study in the environmental review phase of the project development. The resolution also indicated a preference for C2.

Comment: Regarding the timing of Orange County passing the tax referendum affecting the project
Response: Although a referendum has not been scheduled, it doesn't have to be in place prior to submitting the New Start application. If passed it will demonstrate the region's solidarity and will provide a better chance that the project will be approved by the FTA.

Comment: Regarding approval process of agreements with other parties/stakeholders.
Response: Agreements will have to be coordinated with other agencies such as NCDOT and North Carolina Railroad for right-of-way use. The process for the development of these types of agreements often takes considerable coordination over a long period of time. Therefore it is important that coordination begin early. Triangle Transit has engaged NCDOT and NCRR throughout the early planning phase and will continue to work toward developing agreements during Preliminary Engineering (PE) and environment review phases of project development.
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Each agency will require an additional level of project design during PE for agency review prior to executing final agreements.

Comment: Regarding the professional experience of the project, what are the greatest project-specific challenges for this project and are they in keeping with what is experienced on similar projects?
Response: Balancing of project affects between human and natural environments; agreement and negotiations with other railroads; obtaining local consensus. All of these are on a similar level as other projects, and are not foreseen as insurmountable challenges.

Comment: regarding the process of recording public comments and responses to the elected officials
Response: A Scoping document will be prepared at the end of the comment period (June 18, 2012) which will summarize all comments received and associated responses. This document will be shared with the elected officials. Each comment received and the response will be tracked and recorded in a database as was the procedure for previous public comments for the Alternatives Analysis phase.

Comment: Regarding station location input opportunities
Response: Several station planning workshops will be held throughout the PE/EIS phase to receive input on station locations and design.

Comment: Regarding the possibility of relocating a proposed station location, and if the process would have to begin again
Response: There will be ongoing public workshops as the process develops. Input will be solicited. Currently identified station locations can move. Locations will be finalized through the PE/EIS process.

Comment: Regarding the location of maintenance facilities
Response: The same process will be followed as for the station locations. Input from the public will be solicited. All options remain open at this time, and the options will be evaluated during the PE phase.

Comment: Regarding concern over noise of the maintenance facilities
Response: Noise studies will be performed for the project including station and maintenance facilities.

Comment: Regarding side access platform vs. center access platform
Response: Station configuration is evaluated on a case by case basis in addition to concentrating on maximum pedestrian safety at track crossings.

Comment: Regarding the economic features of Alston Ave station location as a link to NCCU
Response: The development around stations will be focused to connect neighborhoods and integrated with the city planning departments. Station area development will consider connections to NCCU as well as demographic and economic characteristics of the surrounding community.
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Comment: Citizen comment regarding potential parking lot which would negatively impact small business
Response: No property decisions have been determined yet. Please submit a comment card for the record. The property acquisition process will not occur until after the EIS process is complete and will comply with Uniform Relocation Act.

Comment: Regarding the methodology of the comments
Response: Once gathered, they are tracked, recorded, and will include the following data: commentator (citizen, federal, state, or local agency), date, category (e.g. Purpose and Need, alternatives, environmental process, natural resources, community impacts, traffic, etc.) and will be cross referenced.

Comment: Regarding timing requirements to notify property owners of possible impact
Response: The properties will be identified early in the EIS, and the EIS will take approximately 3 to 4 years. The project cannot purchase any property before Final EIS, and all property owners will be formally notified during Final Engineering prior to construction.

*Meeting Adjourned*

*The above Meeting Minutes are the author's synopsis of what was stated. The program will rely on these minutes as the record of all matters discussed and conclusions reached during this meeting unless written changes are sent to the author within seven calendar days of receipt of these Minutes.*

JW/lp

cc: Attendees
    PMC@TriangleTransit.org
    URS File

Attachment: PowerPoint presentation
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