

DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BOARD

September 9, 2015

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Board met on September 9, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Committee on the second floor of Durham City Hall. The following attended:

Mark Kleinschmidt (MPO Board Chair)	Town of Chapel Hill
Diane Catotti (MPO Board Vice-Chair)	City of Durham
Steve Schewel (Member)	City of Durham
Ellen Reckhow (Member)	Durham County
Bernadette Pelissier (Member)	GoTriangle
Barry Jacobs (Member)	Orange County
Damon Seils (Member)	Town of Carrboro
Lydia Lavelle (Alternate)	Town of Carrboro
Ed Harrison (Alternate)	Town of Chapel Hill
Joey Hopkins	NCDOT, Division 5
David Keilson	NCDOT, Division 5
Patrick Wilson	NCDOT, Division 7
Tom Altieri	Orange County
Bergen Watterson	Town of Carrboro
David Bonk	Town of Chapel Hill
John Hodges-Copple	Triangle J Council of Governments
Patrick McDonough	GoTriangle
Geoff Green	GoTriangle
Jeff Mann	GoTriangle
Brad Schulz	GoTriangle
Meghan Makoid	GoTriangle
Natalie Murdock	GoTriangle
Tammy Bouchelle	GoTriangle
Willie Noble	GoTriangle
Mark Ahrendsen	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Dale McKeel	City of Durham/DCHC MPO
Don Moffitt	City of Durham
Linda Thomas Wallace	Durham County
Felix Nwoko	DCHC MPO
Andy Henry	DCHC MPO
Meg Scully	DCHC MPO
Lindsay Smart	DCHC MPO
Dale McKeel	DCHC MPO
Lauren Horsch	Herald Sun
Lisa Brach	Culp Arbor
Anne D. Williams	Culp Arbor

47	Dick McAdam	Culp Arbor/Public Speaker
48	Linda Spallone	Citizen/Public Speaker
49	Rhonda Woodell	Citizen/Public Speaker
50	Travis Crayton	Citizen/Public Speaker
51	Stephen Hopkins	Citizen/Public Speaker
52	Charlotte Gilbert	Citizen/Public Speaker
53	Susan Pierce	Citizen/Public Speaker
54	Jared Martinson	Citizen/Public Speaker
55	Brian Russell	Citizen/Public Speaker
56	Molly DeMarco	Citizen/Public Speaker
57	Alex Cabarass	Citizen/Public Speaker
58	William Pitts	Citizen/Public Speaker
59	Matt Bailey	Citizen/Public Speaker
60	Greg Gangi	Citizen/Public Speaker
61	Eric Teagarden	Citizen/Public Speaker
62	Cathy Abernathy	Citizen/Public Speaker
63	John Kent	Citizen/Public Speaker
64	Charles Ritter	Citizen/Public Speaker
65	Michael Waldroup	Citizen/Public Speaker
66	Lucy Woodell	Citizen
67	Philip Woodell	Citizen
68	Elaine Holme	Citizen
69	Janice Welsh	Citizen
70	Shelley J. Masters	Citizen
71	Paula K. Russell	Citizen
72	Margaret Miller	Citizen
73	Alex Cabunes	Citizen
74	Tom Ed White	Citizen
75	Frances Freedman	Citizen
76	Rickie Hansel	Citizen
77	Tom Englund	Citizen
78	Charles Roser	Citizen
79	Adele Mittelstadt	Citizen
80	G. E. Mittelstadt	Citizen
81	David Freedman	Citizen
82	Dave Charters	Citizen
83	Dane Berglund	Citizen
84		
85	Quorum Count:	9 of 11 Voting Members
86		
87		
88	Chair Mark Kleinschmidt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A roll call was performed. The	
89	Voting Members and Alternate Voting Members of the DCHC MPO Board were identified and are	
90	indicated above. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt reminded everyone to sign-in using the sign-in sheet that was	
91	being circulated.	

92 **PRELIMINARIES:**

93 **Ethics Reminder**

94 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt read the Ethics Reminder and asked if there were any known conflicts of
95 interest with respect to matters coming before the Board and requested that if there were any identified
96 during the meeting for them to be announced.

97 There were no known conflicts identified by DCHC MPO Board members.

98 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

99 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there were any adjustments to the agenda. Mark Ahrendsen
100 stated that there were no adjustments. He stated handouts for review were placed on seats. Mark
101 Ahrendsen stated that the business portion of the meeting is 6: 00 P. M to 7: 00 P. M.; the Durham-
102 Orange Light Rail public discussion starts 7: 00 P. M.

103 **Public Comments**

104 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there were any members of the public signed up to speak.
105 Charles Ritter, a citizen, retired Aerospace engineering, stated there were issues concerning the old
106 winding country road of O'Kelly Chapel Road in Chatham County.

107 Charles Ritter stated that this year there was a near fatal accident on O'Kelly Chapel Road that
108 sent two people to the hospital with critical conditions. He stated in 2007 one mile away, there was
109 another fatal accident on O'Kelly Chapel Road that involved the death of two Cary high school students.
110 Charles Ritter stated he thought the problem was that immediately off the road there is a deep drainage
111 ditch; two and a half (2 ½) feet to four (4) feet deep, which was installed five years ago and is no longer
112 effective due to increased volume of traffic on the road.

113 Charles Ritter stated O'Kelly Chapel Road was the major connecting road to Chatham County for
114 Durham and Wake Counties. There is currently a tremendous amount of development in nearby Durham

and Wake Counties. Charles Ritter stated that 3,500 residential households and three developments with close to one million square feet of office and retail space were currently under construction.

Charles Ritter stated he had data to support his concerns. Charles Ritter cited stats from his data and the stats from the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) data. The data indicated that the traffic could double in the next two years on O’Kelly Chapel Road.

Charles Ritter stated they had a forum for his community concerning this issue. He stated that three Division 8 North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) members were present at the forum. Charles Ritter stated they had a petition with 548 signature and the only thing resulted from the meeting was a letter from the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). It stated: “Development remains low and does not warrant any significant changes.” Charles Ritter stated the totals were inconsistent with the data supplied by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). Charles Ritter stated he did not understand how the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) figured that out. Charles Ritter stated he believed that Division 8 (who handled the O’Kelly Chapel Road in Chatham County) was not looking at the information on Division 5 (who handled the O’Kelly Chapel Road in Durham and Wake Counties).

Charles Ritter stated improvements were needed at O’Kelly Chapel Road; similar changes were needed like what Wake County had with a road that received the same amount of traffic. Charles Ritter stated that improvement could start by eliminating the drainage ditch to avoid a head-on collision. Charles Ritter stated Chatham County needed to use the same designs as Wake County for road improvement. Charles Ritter requested the DCHC MPO Board to prioritize the project before someone else was killed.

Charles Ritter expressed his concerns to the DCHC MPO Board; Chair Mark Kleinschmidt thanked him. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated he would like to caution Charles Ritter that the DCHC MPO Board worked on long-range projects.

Charles Ritter stated that he understood.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated to Charles Ritter the DCHC MPO Board could direct the staff to come back with some responses of how they could incorporate his request into the process. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated to Charles Ritter to direct his concerns to Chatham County Commissioners and seek improvement funds.

Charles Ritter stated they planned to attend the Chatham County Commissions meeting on September 21, 2015, with a more comprehensive presentation for short-term and emergency funding.

Ellen Reckhow stated that she wondered if the Division Engineer could review the accident data and assess the road. Ellen Reckhow stated the traffic situation may warrant a change in the posted speed limit, as a short term solution.

Barry Jacobs stated to Charles Ritter that there were Spot Safety dollars that each Division has to budget for improvements. Charles Ritter stated that he was aware of the Spot Safety funds. He stated the plan was to ask for them to utilize the funds for their location.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked the staff to look at the speed limit.

Directives to Staff

The Directives to Staff were included in the agenda packet for review.

CONSENT AGENDA:

6. Approval of August 12, 2015 Meeting Minutes

7. Amendment #25 to the FY2012-2018 MTIP

Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there was any discussion on August 12, 2015, meeting minutes and the Amendment #25 to the FY2012-2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). There were no questions or discussions. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to adopt

the Consent Agenda. Ellen Reckhow made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda and Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS:

8. Adoption of 2040 MTP Amendment, FY16-25 MTIP, and CDR

Lindsay Smart, LPA Staff

Lindsay Smart stated that the MPO FY2016-2025 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program was up for adoption as well as the Amendment to 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Amendment and the Amendment to the Conformity Determination Report.

Lindsay Smart stated that in June the DCHC MPO Board released three planning documents for public review and comment. The documents were open for public review and public comments from June 10, 2015, until July 31, 2015.

Lindsay Smart stated that on August 12, 2015, the DCHC MPO Board held a public hearing and reviewed the written comments, heard public comments and received public comments on the three planning documents. Lindsay Smart stated that the DCHC MPO staff had worked with the Technical Committee to generate responses to each comment received and work had been compiled and reviewed by the Technical Committee.

Lindsay Smart stated that the Technical Committee recommended that the DCHC MPO Board adopt the following three planning documents: (1) 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan amendment, (2) the FY2016-2025 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and (3) the Conformity Determination Report.

Lindsay Smart asked if there were any questions on the documents. Steve Schewel asked where the responses came from. Lindsay Smart stated that the responses came from the DCHC MPO Staff and help from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee.

Steve Schewel stated he thought the responses were great regarding the detail and seriousness that was given to each response.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that he would entertain a motion for the three resolutions for consideration and for the resolution of adopting the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to adopt 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) amendment. Damon Seils motioned to adopt the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) amendment and Steve Schewel seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to adopt the Conformity Determination Report (CDR). Steve Schewel motioned to adopt the Conformity Determination Report (CDR) and Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to adopt the FY16-25 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Damon Seils motioned to adopt the FY16-25 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and Ellen Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously.

9. 2014 Mobility Report Card

Andy Henry, LPA Staff

Kosok Chae, LPA Staff

Andy Henry stated that there was an action to conduct a public hearing and adopt the 2014 Mobility Report Card (MRC). Andy Henry stated during the last meeting he introduced the Mobility Report Card (MRC); there was quite a bit of discussion before releasing it to the public. Andy Henry stated that the Mobility Report Card (MRC) was released for a public comment period from August 12, 2015, and closed on September 4, 2015. Andy Henry noted that no public comments were

received. Andy Henry stated that two things stood out in the August Board meeting: citizens wanted a connection to policies (land use/transportation) within the region and see results.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that Ed Harrison had some changes to add the Mobility Report Card (MRC). Andy Henry asked Ed Harrison to provide him the changes, so they could be added into the motion. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt opened the floor for a public hearing for comments and discussion. There was no participation in the public hearing session.

Ellen Reckhow stated that she could not believe there was not any public comment. She had talked about this around town and to some of her colleagues. Ellen Reckhow stated that this was one of the better overviews to where we were in terms of mobility in our region. Ellen Reckhow stated that she would encourage citizens who are interested in transportation issues to read the publication.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to close the public hearing session. Damon Seils made a motion to close the public hearing and Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously to close the public hearing.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to adopt the 2014 Mobility Report Card (MRC) which included the amendments offered made by Ed Harrison. Ellen Reckhow motioned to adopt the 2014 Mobility Report Card (MRC) and Vice-Chair Diane Catotti seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Ellen Reckhow made a note to the public audience the information for the Mobility Report Card (MRC) can be found on the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO's website.

REPORTS:

10. Report from the DCHC MPO Board Chair

Mark Kleinschmidt, DCHC MPO Board Chair

There was no report from the DCHC MPO Board Chair.

11. Report from the DCHC MPO Technical Committee Chair

Mark Ahrendsen, DCHC MPO TC Chair

There was no report from the DCHC MPO TC Chair.

12. Reports from LPA Staff

Felix Nwoko, LPA Staff

There was no report from the LPA Staff.

13. NCDOT Reports:

Brandon Jones, NCDOT Division 5, stated that there was no report from NCDOT Division 5.

Ed Lewis, NCDOT Division 7, stated that there was no report from NCDOT Division 7.

There was no report from NCDOT Division 8.

Julie Bollinger, NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch. There was no report.

Kelly Becker, NCDOT Traffic Operations. There was no report.

14. Presentation on Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Public Comments

Patrick McDonough, GoTriangle

Tammy Bochelle, Go Triangle

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that since the first half of the meeting ended earlier, he would stand down until 7:00 P.M. to start the public comment session. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated this would be the correct thing to do since it was advertised to start at 7:00 P. M.

Ellen Reckhow stated that since it was not a public hearing, people could still go forward with comments and start GoTriangle presentation at 7:00 P. M.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that he wanted to make it clear citizens needed to go to GoTriangle meetings to submit comments such as suggesting a change in station locations, etc.

Ellen Reckhow agreed this meeting was not for making recorded changes, but the meeting was for the public comments for the DEIS, so people concerns were still germane. People started to clap.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt told the audience to not clap in these meetings.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that all views are welcome; we need to make everyone feel welcome in sharing their views. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that people need to follow the process. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated you can say whatever you want; however, your interest would not be legally protected if the process was not followed. He stated the DCHC MPO Board public comment period was not the place to express your concerns if you wanted them to be captured for recording in the official DEIS public comment period. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated those interested in being legally acknowledged and captured; their concerns needed to be put it in writing to GoTriangle or the person needed to attend the September 29, 2015, public hearing or the October 1, 2015, public hearing. He stated this was how you protect your interest and fight for it.

Bernadette Pelissier wanted to make it clear that comments at the official DEIS public hearing go to GoTriangle, so your responses can be submitted to the Federal Transit Administration. Bernadette Pelissier stated that this would not be the case for the meeting with DCHC MPO Board. Bernadette Pelissier stated that comments made in the DCHC MPO Board meeting will be received for the informational benefit of the DCHC MPO Board members.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked Lindsay Smart if she had any other way to describe the process. Lindsay Smart stated that there was legal representation from GoTriangle present that may offer additional guidance if necessary.

Lindsay Smart stated that this was not the normal public comment process for the DCHC MPO Board. Lindsay Smart stated to the public that public comments that were given tonight were only for the DCHC MPO Board and only for their consideration while considering the endorsement of the project. Lindsay Smart stated that the comments that came before the DCHC MPO Board during the September 9, 2015 meeting would not get forwarded to GoTriangle. Lindsay Smart stated that the DCHC MPO Board was not a pass-thru for any public comments shared that evening. She stated any comments received tonight were just for consideration for the DCHC MPO Board and that was it. Lindsay Smart stated there

280 were no additional paper trails or records. She stated anyone who would like their comments to be
281 recorded for the FTA DEIS review had to directly submit them to GoTriangle.

282 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if there were any comments and questions from the public that
283 had nothing to do with the upcoming presentation from GoTriangle.

284 John Kent, citizen, stated that he wanted to know the technical differences between the four
285 types of meetings. John Kent stated there were two meetings for a public hearing and two of them were
286 something else. John Kent stated that he understood the DCHC MPO Board had been advised not to
287 push the forward button. John Kent stated that he understood that people thought they were
288 submitting comments tonight. He stated if they did not follow the rules and go through the process of
289 how to submit comments through GoTriangle, they could not sue.

290 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that there were differences between the four meetings. Chair
291 Mark Kleinschmidt invited John Kent to attend the public informational meetings on September 15, 2015,
292 and September 19, 2015, to learn more about the project. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked the audience
293 to participate in the live public hearing on September 29, 2015, and October 1, 2015, where they could
294 make their public comments or submit them in writing.

295 Stephen Hopkins, a citizen, addressed himself as a Durhamite. Stephen Hopkins stated anytime
296 he can get an opportunity to speak to his elected officials about anything it was worth the time. Stephen
297 Hopkins made comments on the Light Rail and the DCHC MPO Board. Stephen Hopkins stated to the
298 DCHC MPO Board that if he had not attended a meeting earlier today; he would not have known they
299 existed. Stephen Hopkins stated that he was everywhere in Durham and did not know what the DCHC
300 MPO Board did. Stephen Hopkins stated he knew others that look like him did not know what they did or
301 that they existed. Stephen Hopkins stated he felt that they should do a better job publicizing their
302 meetings, also letting the people know about the major projects in their area. Stephen Hopkins stated

that he was informed by Natalie Murdock about the public meeting; therefore, he felt it was necessary to make his public comments.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt thanked Stephen Hopkins for his comments and informed him there was never a time that he should not stop to talk with any public officials about his thoughts and concerns.

William Pitts, a citizen of Farrington Road, stated that the Light Rail project could largely affect the area. William Pitts asked if the DCHC MPO Board would vote on the issue that night. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated no they were not. William Pitts then agreed that his comments would be better spent elsewhere. William Pitts stated that many letters on the Light Rail project were submitted to many people; he planned to continue to send them. William Pitts stated that he would attend all of the meetings and make his opinion count.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that he thought this was a great idea. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated to William Pitts that he should get those letters to GoTriangle within the 45-day window, which was happening right now.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated the DCHC MPO Board would vote on the plan on November 13, 2015. Ellen Reckhow stated the meeting date was November 11, 2015. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated the DCHC MPO Board was in the information stage of the process.

Bernadette Pelissier provided clarification on the Public Information and Public Hearing sessions. She stated that at the information session next week you could submit your comments in writing, also verbal messages would be accepted and recorded.

Ellen Reckhow stated that the 45-day public comments period date had been changed to October 13, 2015, and this was the last day for comments.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt opened the floor for public comments as long as it did not rely on the GoTriangle presentation. He stated that the DCHC MPO Board public comments would end at 7:00 P.M.; each citizen had three minutes to present.

327 Dr. Susan Pierce, a citizen, stated that she lived, voted and paid taxes in Durham. Dr. Susan
328 Pierce stated that she was very supportive of the Light Rail project. Dr. Susan Pierce stated that she had
329 major safety concerns about the Durham-Orange Rail as currently proposed. Dr. Susan Pierce stated that
330 nationwide fatalities at at-grade crossings were three times more likely to occur than automobile
331 accidental fatalities. Dr. Susan Pierce stated that the Durham-Orange Rail had more than 20 vehicle at-
332 grade crossings and 80 pedestrian and bicycle at-grade crossings. Dr. Susan Pierce stated that she did
333 not feel this was a safety rail, along with over hundred at-grade crossings in a seventeen-mile stretch. Dr.
334 Susan Pierce asked the DCHC MPO Board to consider her information as they thought about endorsing
335 the proposal as stated. Dr. Susan Pierce stated she was concerned about its safety at one grade crossing
336 at Farrington Road. Dr. Susan Pierce stated right near the crossing was a senior citizen residence,
337 Creekside Elementary on the north side, and the first responders on the south side. Dr. Susan Pierce
338 stated that at peak time the train traveled both directions which during that time blockage occurred to
339 Farrington Road every five minutes. Dr. Susan Pierce stated that with the two-lane highway road lanes
340 backed up first responders would be unable to get their patients. Additionally, Dr. Susan Pierce stated other
341 safety concerns about the ROMF; north of the crossing where firemen, policemen, and first responders
342 could be delayed; and
343 south of the crossing at any given time hazardous hazmat accidents or fires could occur. She asked the
344 DCHC MPO Board to consider these concerns as they decided their vote on November 11, 2015. Dr.
345 Susan Pierce stated a letter had been submitted to GoTriangle with these concerns.

346 Dick McAdams, a citizen, new to the area and a resident of Culp Arbor, stated that he strongly
347 supported Regional Public Transportation and believed that there were better alternatives. Dick
348 McAdams stated that he did not have all the data, but asked if it was reasonable that potentially reliable
349 passengers would walk a long distance across busy highways, streets with no sidewalks and no lighting
350 in order to catch a train ride? Dick McAdams stated that then once you exited the train and walked

another significant distance to your destination; driving your car or riding the bus would be more convenient and a shorter time.

Dick McAdam asked would it be reasonable to think that traffic was going to decrease if you had to drive your car to a park, ride to a lot to catch a ride. Dick McAdams stated you still had traffic congestion to deal with.

Dick McAdams asked if it would be reasonable to decrease the safety for residents, senior communities, elementary schools and other residents along the Light Rail system instead of hazardous pollutants, increased traffic and destruction of the environment.

Dick McAdams asked was it reasonable for taxpayers to pay a huge price for the Light Rail system , while knowing that the cost would definitely raise with cost overruns , taken years to pay off and would the average taxpayer benefit from this? Dick McAdams stated that in his opinion the Light Rail was not a reasonable solution.

Dick McAdams stated that the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) would be more reasonable, served the greater good more efficiently and with less cost. Dick McAdams stated that it seemed that our neighboring county also thought that there was a better solution.

Jared Martinson stated that he was at the meeting to represent the Durham Area Designers. Jared Martinson stated Durham Area Designers was committed and supported the proposed Light Rail Transit project, and commended GoTriangle on their efforts. He stated the Durham Area Designers was supportive of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). He explained the details of the five key decisions that were identified with the entry to the project development phase; how they were to better the LRT System. Jared Martinson stated that the decisions were to choose the Trent Flower location near Duke and VA hospitals; to locate the ROMF at the Farrington Site and use the C2A alignment near Little Creek.

Jared Martinson stated that although they supported the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project as a group; they continued to have major concerns with the changes of the proposed Light Rail configuration through downtown Durham. He stated these concerns occurred when the LRT was required to have a greater separation from the freight passenger rail track. Jared Martinson stated that their concerns centered on four issues that were not a part of the five key decisions, because they occurred after the entry of the LRT project. He stated they edited the project development phase, and the LRT alignment was shifted further away.

Jared Martinson stated that the Durham Area Designers asked that tonight the following four points be included as part of the DEIS process; and they submitted them now for consideration during this information gathering period: (1) The first were to include the City center station and the block between Blackwell Street and Mangum Street; (2) The second was to restore downtown center transit station sites to the triangle parcel already owned by GoTriangle; (3) The third was to restore the Alston Avenue station to the site on the east side of Alston Avenue that was already owned by the GoTriangle as well, (4) The fourth was to locate the Buchanan station as close to Buchanan Boulevard as possible.

Jared Martinson stated that based on the understanding of the process that was presented by GoTriangle their understanding was the agency must adhere to a strict schedule in order to make the Federal Funding requirements. Jared Martinson stated that they understood that for certain changes; once the record decision process was completed GoTriangle would be able to re-examine and incorporate changes. After Jared Martinson's three (3) minutes were up, he closed with stating that they would like to ask for consideration of their four key points.

Damon Seils stated to Linda Spollone a letter was received by her father.

Linda Spollone, a citizen and a resident of Culp Arbor, stated that she would be out of town for portions of the Light Rail reviews, but strongly felt it was important for her to step out of her comfort

zone. Linda Spollone stated that she had been a longtime supporter of public transit. She had used the Ride Share Program and had ridden the TAA buses and the ACCESS van during foot surgery.

Linda Spollone stated that she was an initial supporter of Light Rail because of Charlotte, and how Light Rail turned depressed areas into thriving commercial, retail and residential areas. She stated but after Wake County opted out then she educated herself further on the pros and cons of Light Rail. Linda Spollone stated that she is now not convinced the Light Rail belonged in their area, now nor in the future. Linda Spollone stated that they did not have the density that was needed to support the project.

Linda Spollone stated that her vision of public transport was assured if she had read the Mobility Report Card (MRC) Program, it would align with it. She stated she would read it now. Linda Spollone would like to see more regions included for example Mebane, Hillsborough, Northern Wake County and Northern Durham. Linda Spollone stated that she would also like to see the following: more express routes that picked up people at large parking lots and church lots, delivered them to their workplace, and more ability to add or change routes as needed, carpool lanes and bus lanes to speed traffic along the highway. Linda Spollone stated that she would like these things incorporated into any future building that DCHC MPO did. Linda Spollone stated that she was at the meeting to ask the MPO Board to listen to the comments and put a face to them. Linda Spollone did not want more clear-cut low-density areas and designated wetlands and waterfowl areas without providing serve to a very limited group of people

Rhonda Woodell, a citizen, stated that she was from Durham. Rhonda Woodell stated that she had trouble with the plan because she felt Durham had not done its research and its independent study. Rhonda Woodell stated GoTriangle was used for the study, and it was not really thorough. Rhonda Woodell stated that more study was needed. She stated that this was like going to Honda stating I am interested in a minivan; then you provided me with all the details of all the minivans out there. She did not feel the homework was done. Rhonda Woodell stated that she did not believe that Durham was moving forward with this project.

421 Bill Pitts, a citizen, stated that he would make his comments on November 11th.

422 Stephen Hopkins, a citizen, stated that it was a good project. Stephen Hopkins applauded the
423 two surrounding counties for doing this project. Stephen Hopkins stated that this was the second link to
424 North Carolina and eventually goes statewide. He stated that it was well overdue and needed. Stephen
425 Hopkins stated they would add another link and around Durham in the near future. Stephen Hopkins
426 stated that the black communities who were not being served needed it. He stated that it needed to take
427 place, and this was where the bus improvement and sidewalks would be crucial. Stephen Hopkins stated
428 welcome to the 21th century because Light Rail was coming.

429 Alex Cabanas , a citizen , stated that he would like to point out a couple of things regarding Light
430 Rail ; although , a lot of things were stated about safety. Alex Cabanas stated that safety continued to be
431 their concerns with the Downing Creek area which was not reflected on the DEIS. He stated that they
432 would continue to point them out to GoTriangle during the comment period. Alex Cabanas asked DCHC
433 MPO Board to take a much more critical eye toward DEIS. He stated there were factual information
434 omissions in it. Alex Cabanas stated that the ridership estimates were greatly inflated. He stated that an
435 example if you did a back on the envelope calculation and looked at the operating budget of \$16 million
436 and worked backwards with 20% fair recovery and go through and do an estimate on the number of
437 riders that works out to be about 1 .2 million in the course of a year . Alex Cabanas stated that when
438 working it all the way through it; there would be about 5,000 people a day. He stated it was a far cry
439 from the 23,000 projected in the 2040 estimate. The 2040 estimated for 23,000 people boarding was
440 originally for 2035. The 700 parking spots had been eliminated.

441 Alex Cabanas stated that the ridership commute time moved from 34 minutes to 44 minutes, and
442 it had no impact with the number of boardings. Alex Cabanas stated that they would be more than happy
443 to walk the DCHC MPO Board through the details. He stated that the inconsistencies were documented

on the website under www.smarttransitfuture.org. Alex Cabanas stated that all of them submitted their comments to GoTriangle during the comment period.

Lindsay Smart introduced Natalie Murdock from GoTriangle.

Natalie Murdock, GoTriangle, delivered an overview presentation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project. Natalie Murdock stated she would read from a script that evening; however, a recorded version of the presentation would be available very shortly and a shorter version would be shown that night. Natalie Murdock stated a longer version was available with more details of its entire document, but to keep the messages consistent a recorded version of the presentation would be read from a script tonight. Natalie Murdock welcomed everyone to the overview presentation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project. Natalie Murdock stated in this video you would learn about the contents of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and how you could comment. Natalie Murdock stated the National Environmental Policy Act (or NEPA for short) required federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions.

Natalie Murdock stated compliance with NEPA required a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (or DEIS) to be prepared to disclose the environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed project. She stated as the project sponsor, GoTriangle was the primary preparer of the DEIS. She stated because the project may be funded by the Federal Transit Administration (or FTA); the FTA was the lead federal agency supervising preparation of the document. Natalie Murdock explained there were three federal cooperating agencies assisting in the review of the project. The DEIS had almost 700 pages, and its appendices, close to 7,000 pages, described the process used to evaluate the project alternatives. The analysis covered a broad range of topics including (1) The purpose and need for the project; (2) The alternatives considered; (3) The process used to evaluate the project alternatives; (4) The impacts and

benefits of those alternatives and (5) The alternative GoTriangle was recommending moving forward with into Engineering - the NEPA Preferred Alternative.

The current 45-day comment period provided the public with the opportunity to review and comment on the document. Comments can be expressions of support, concerns, suggestions, or factual corrections. Commenting was not a form of “voting “for an alternative. Substantive comments received will be addressed to the combined Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision, or ROD. The ROD stated what the decision was identified and the alternatives considered; and discussed mitigation plans, including any monitoring commitments.

Natalie Murdock stated that the transportation solution must address the needs of the Durham-Orange Corridor (or D-O Corridor for short). She stated the needs were: (1) improving mobility within the corridor (2) increasing connectivity through expanded transit options that serve major activity and employment centers (3) and supporting local land use plans that call for compact development to (4) manage and channel future growth along the transportation corridors that can sustainably support growth, (5) promote economic development, and (6) preserve the region’s high quality of life.

Natalie Murdock stated that the alternatives considered in the DEIS were a result of years of planning and a number of studies within the Durham-Orange corridor. Public and stakeholder coordination has occurred throughout this process. Public input had helped to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives presented in this DEIS. She stated these alternatives support the project’s purpose and need. Natalie Murdock stated as part of the Alternatives Analysis (or AA) process, 2010 through 2012, a range of transit technologies was evaluated to determine how well each technology would meet the project’s Purpose and Need: (1) Streetcar and commuter rail were eliminated from further consideration because they do not serve the length of trips were typically taken in the D-O Corridor and (2) Bus Rapid Transit was eliminated due to lower ridership and lower potential

to attract and shape new development in the region. Full details of the transit technology analysis were detailed in chapter 5 of the AA Final Report and chapter 2 of the DEIS, on ourtransitfuture.com.

Natalie Murdock stated Light Rail was ultimately selected because of its ability to: connect residential, educational, and major employment centers throughout the corridor, serve the people in the D-O Corridor more cost-effectively, long term, than other transportation options, efficiently serve a corridor with some of the highest projected trips per acre in the Triangle region, support land use patterns that require closely spaced stops, best served by vehicles that are able to accelerate quickly, provide solid anchors needed to shape land use along this critical corridor, and provide high-frequency rail service shown to support transit-oriented development . Natalie Murdock stated that the proposed D-O LRT Project is a light rail transit line proposed to run between UNC Hospitals in Chapel Hill and Alston Avenue in east Durham. It is proposed to be a 17-mile line with 17 stations connecting major destinations as well as areas identified for future development.

Natalie Murdock explained that the Light rail transit is an electrically powered system with overhead wires. The D-O LRT Project will run in an exclusive guideway, separate from regular traffic, with one set of tracks for each direction of travel. She stated most of the line will be located at street or ground level, with some sections of elevated tracks that will be on bridges to avoid or minimize impacts to the surrounding environment, properties, or the traffic network.

Natalie Murdock stated that the service is planned to run about 18 hours a day, seven days a week. During peak commuting times, the train will come every ten minutes in each direction; the midday, evenings, and on weekends the train will run every 20 minutes. The train will average 25 to 27 miles per hour, but can go as fast as 55 mph. Most trains will be one or two car trains. Most trips on the system will be between about 5 and 25 minutes. The longest possible trip from Alston Avenue all the way to UNC Hospitals will take 42 minutes.

513 Natalie Murdock explained the image shown on the screen showed a conceptual rendering of a
514 light rail crossing in downtown Durham, which was proposed to be at-grade with the road. At crossings
515 throughout the system, signals or gate arms will stop traffic for 30-40 seconds to allow for the train to
516 pass through the intersection. Traffic returns to normal operations when the train has passed the
517 intersection. The total wait time for vehicles would be shorter than the duration of a cycle at a stop light.

518 Natalie Murdock stated that the DEIS evaluates the No-Build Alternative and the Build
519 Alternative. Through the Alternatives Analysis and project Scoping, which initiated the NEPA process and
520 this DEIS, the majority of the proposed Build Alternative was identified. However, in a few areas different
521 alternatives were retained for further evaluation, including the crossing of Little Creek and New Hope
522 Creek, as well as the location of the station at Duke/VA Medical Centers, and the location of a Rail
523 Operations Maintenance Facility (also known as a ROMF).

524 Natalie Murdock stated that all information is presented in the DEIS, including the data for the
525 other project element alternatives that were studied, but ultimately not recommended. Federal
526 regulations require that a No Build Alternative be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Statement.

527 Natalie Murdock stated that the No Build Alternative represents the future conditions in the D-
528 O Corridor without the D-O LRT Project. It includes the existing and planned transportation programs and
529 projects scheduled to be built and implemented by 2040 and contained in the 2040 Metropolitan
530 Transportation Plan, excluding only the proposed rail transit improvements and related feeder bus
531 changes. The No Build Alternative was considered in the DEIS and serves as the baseline for establishing
532 the environmental impacts of the NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives.

533 Natalie Murdock explained the colors used in the presentation. Natalie Murdock states that The
534 NEPA Preferred Alternative, shown in blue, includes a recommendation for each of the areas where
535 alignment or station alternatives were studied, including Little Creek, New Hope Creek, and the Duke /
536 VA Medical Centers, as well as a recommendation for one of the Rail Operations and Maintenance

Facility sites. Natalie Murdock states that The Project Element Alternatives include alternative concepts considered for the crossing of Little Creek and New Hope Creek as well as an alternative station location at the Duke/VA Medical Center and alternative sites for the location of the rail operations and maintenance facility.

Natalie Murdock stated the four alternatives were studied through the Little Creek area near the border of Chapel Hill and Durham and two of the alignments, C1, and C1A would travel over NC 54 near the Friday Center and pass through Meadowmont. The other two alignments, C2, and C2A would run along the south side of NC 54, cross over NC 54 just west of Little Creek, and proceed north along the George King Road alignment. C2A was selected for inclusion as part of the NEPA Preferred Alternative.

Natalie Murdock stated three alternatives were studied through the New Hope Creek area in Durham between Patterson Place and South Square. The NHC LPA would run through the New Hope Creek Bottomlands between Southwest Durham Drive and University Drive. NHC 1 would run along U.S. 15-501 from east of Southwest Durham Drive to Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway. NHC 2 would run along the NHC 1 alignment to Garrett Road, and then turn southeast toward University Drive. NHC 2 was selected for inclusion as part of the NEPA Preferred Alternative.

Natalie Murdock stated that two alternatives were studied for the Duke / VA Medical Centers Station along the same alignment in the median of Erwin Road west of NC 147. She stated one alternative at the Duke Eye Center and a second alternative between Trent and Flowers Drive, which is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative.

Natalie Murdock stated five alternatives for the Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility were evaluated. One at the east end of the project east of Alston Avenue, one near Cornwallis Road along U.S. 15-501, one adjacent to U.S. 15-501 near Patterson Place, and two along Farrington Road adjacent to I-40 referred to as Leigh Village and Farrington Road. The Leigh Village and Farrington Road sites overlap, with

the Farrington Road site located farther north to avoid the Walter-Curtis-Hudson Farm which is on the south end of the Leigh Village site. The Farrington Road site is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative.

Natalie Murdock explained that since the beginning of the environmental review process in 2012, GoTriangle has held 24 public meetings, open houses, and workshops about transit improvements and held over 300 meetings with stakeholders and community groups about the light rail project.

Natalie Murdock stated that comments that they have received over this process have helped them shape the scope of our studies and impacted the project in many ways. Alternatives have been added or retained for further study, the project design was refined to avoid or minimize many concerns, and enhancements or design commitments were made in other cases to increase the benefits of the project.

Natalie Murdock stated that in accordance with federal regulations and guidance, chapters 3 through 7 cover a comprehensive range of resources areas including transportation, the natural, built and human environment, equity and environmental justice, and costs.

Natalie Murdock stated four alternative alignments were considered in the vicinity of Little Creek. The alignment included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative is C2A, which runs along the south side of NC 54 from Finley Golf Course Road to the east of Downing Creek Parkway. The C2A Alternative is consistent with local land use plans and policies, minimizes impacts to public parklands, and avoids fragmentation of the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage Area, and moderates property acquisitions and displacements compared to the other alternatives.

Natalie Murdock stated three alternative alignments were considered in the vicinity of New Hope Creek. The alignment included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative is NHC 2, which runs along U.S. 15-501 and turns southeast at Garrett Road to join University Drive. The NHC 2 Alternative minimizes total impacts to natural resources, public parklands, and moderates impacts to water resources, visual impacts, and property acquisitions and displacements as compared to the other alternatives.

584 Natalie Murdock stated two alternatives were considered for the location of the Duke/VA
585 Medical Centers Station. The NEPA Preferred Alternative includes the Trent/Flowers Drive Alternative.

586 These alternatives performed essentially the same across all resource areas evaluated. Both Duke
587 University and the Durham VA Medical Center have expressed support for the Trent/Flowers Drive
588 Station Alternative. Five alternative locations were studied for the Rail Operations and Maintenance
589 Facility.

590 Natalie Murdock stated the Leigh Village ROMF Alternative was not recommended for
591 consideration as the NEPA Preferred Alternative. This alternative would permanently use National
592 Register of Historic Places-eligible Walter-Curtis-Hudson Farm, and there is another viable alternative
593 that would avoid this resource.

594 Natalie Murdock stated the Patterson Place ROMF Alternative was not recommended for
595 consideration as the NEPA Preferred Alternative. The selection of NHC 2 as a component of the NEPA
596 Preferred Alternative precludes the selection of this an alternative.

597 Natalie Murdock explained that the Alston Avenue ROMF Alternative is not recommended for
598 consideration as the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Although this alternative would not require rezoning, it
599 would introduce several risks to both the project schedule and budget, associated with the potential of
600 hazardous materials remediation and relocation of businesses. It also has the potential to result in net
601 loss of employment within the D-O Corridor, if the existing businesses that would be displaced could not
602 be relocated within the D-O Corridor, and is located in an area with high low-income and minority
603 populations. This alternative has the highest capital cost of all of the alternatives considered in this DEIS
604 and is not supported by the businesses on the site or the North Carolina Railroad which serves one of the
605 businesses on the site.

606 Natalie Murdock stated the Cornwallis Road ROMF Alternative is not recommended for
607 consideration as the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Access to and use of the Judea Reform Congregation,

Levin Jewish Community Center, Carter Community Charter School, and Lerner School Campus may be impacted. The Cornwallis Road Alternative would require operational compromises and higher operations and maintenance costs than other alternatives due to the physical constraints of the property that would prevent an efficient yard layout. A number of comments received encourage the selection of another alternative. However, the Farrington Road Alternative is the least environmentally damaging, practicable alternative and is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Natalie Murdock stated that although this site would require rezoning and an amendment to the comprehensive plan, it avoids, minimizes, or moderates impacts to many natural and human environmental resource areas compared to the other alternatives and is a large enough site to incorporate mitigation measures such as vegetation and walls to provide visual screening as well as stormwater management best practices to mitigate the effects of impervious surfaces on the site.

Natalie Murdock stated The NEPA Preferred and Project Element Alternatives would improve accessibility for all communities, including low-income and minority populations. Overall, the potential impacts would be minimal compared with the proposed project's benefits. Approximately 51 percent of the population in the study area is minority and 43 percent is low-income, so it is to be expected that effects of the project would be experienced by EJ populations. The adverse effects of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would be distributed proportionately between EJ and non-EJ areas.

Natalie Murdock explained that with respect to the rail operations and maintenance facility, the NEPA Preferred Alternative (Farrington Road) is not located in an EJ area. The Patterson Place and Alston Avenue alternatives are located within EJ areas. The Alston Avenue alternative is the only one expected to result in a net loss of jobs due to a displacement of existing jobs on the site.

Natalie Murdock stated The Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation provides notification of FTA's intent to pursue de minimis impacts determinations for six parks and recreation properties. A determination of de minimis impacts can be made only if the project will not adversely affect the features, attributes or

activities that make the Section 4(f) property significant. The proposed de minimis impacts determinations are based on coordination with the officials with jurisdiction over the respective properties.

Natalie Murdock explained that in the No Build Alternative, there are expected to be approximately 20,000 buses boarding on an average weekday in 2040. Under the NEPA Preferred Alternative, there would be approximately 17,000 bus boarding and 23,000 light rail boarding. In other words, transit trips in the Corridor are projected to double with the implementation of the NEPA Preferred Alternative. The estimated capital cost for the project is between approximately \$1.5 and \$1.6 Billion in 2015 dollars. This estimate provides an approximation of total project capital costs, excluding inflation and finance costs. The estimated annual cost to operate and maintain the system is approximate \$18 Million in 2015 dollars.

Natalie Murdock stated that it is anticipated that the Federal Transit Administration will provide approximately 50 percent of the proposed D-O LRT Project's capital cost. Costs not covered by the federal funding share 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.

Natalie Murdock stated that they encourage people to review the DEIS, which contains detailed supporting information on each of the topics covered in this presentation. Come to a public information session if you need help finding or understanding something. Submit your comments. Comments can be expressions of support, concerns, or suggestions. If you would like to submit your comment verbally, come to one of the two public hearings.

Natalie Murdock stated that if you want to comment right now you can go to ourtransitfuture.com/comment or email info@ourtransitfuture.com. You can also fill out a comment

card at a public meeting, send a letter to the address on the screen or give verbal comments at the public hearing.

Natalie Murdock stated that all comments received during the comment period would receive equal consideration, regardless of how they are submitted. At the public hearings, you would have to sign-up to speak. You must arrive between the hours of 4:00 P. M. to 7:00 P.M. to sign-up. Speakers will be called in order of sign-up, and each speaker would have 2 minutes. Speakers would not be able to cede their time to subsequent speakers. Questions would not be responded to at the hearing. Written comments would also be accepted at the hearings.

Natalie Murdock thanked everyone for their interest in the D-O LRT Project.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt re-opened the floor for public comments regarding the GoTriangle presentation.

Travis Crayton, a citizen, stated that he wanted to call attention to a statement made by the Surgeon General. He stated that the Surgeon General released a call to promote walkable communities. Travis Crayton wanted to bring up this subject in order to make a connection to the Light Rail project. Travis Crayton stated that the Light Rail Project was more than just moving people , it was creating an infrastructure that was going to shape how our community was built in the next fifty to hundred years . He stated there was a great opportunity if the Light Rail Line was built today to set the stage to build a truly great walkable Durham-Chapel Hill Metropolitan Area. Travis Crayton stated that the Light Rail was the way and that other forms of transit did it. Travis Crayton stated that it would provide Durham with a certainty for the private sector and communicate that this line was going to be here. He stated density would be seen and the kind of walkable development that this region really needed. Travis Crayton stated that he would really like to encourage the DCHC MPO Board to positively support the Draft Environment Impact Statement and on November 11, 2015. He hoped that they would endorse the project

679 Brian Russell, a citizen, stated that he lived in Old West Durham in the City of Durham, and there
680 were a lot of good reasons to love the Light Rail proposal. Brian Russell stated that he was there in full
681 support of the Light Rail proposal. Brian Russell stated that he wanted to bring up one little point. Brian
682 Russell dared to speak for his six-year-old, who by the time the Light Rail would be completed; his son
683 would be of driving age. Brian Russell stated that being a parent , and he was sure that many others were
684 , they would rather for their child to ride a safe Light Rail than drive ; especially with the growth and
685 changes happening here . Brian Russell stated that when he attended public meetings, very often people
686 there were his age or older in full attendance. Brian Russell stated that not very often did people
687 considered people that do not know about this process or who was not old enough to participate in this
688 process. Brian Russell stated that he would like to encourage the DCHC MPO Board to think about
689 everything when deciding their vote.

690 Molly DeMarco, on the Board of Orange County Justice United, stated that she was for those that
691 were from Durham; it was the sister to Durham. Molly DeMarco stated that she was starting a new
692 organization called Orange County Transit Advocates.

693 Molly DeMarco stated that she was at the meeting that day just as herself, a frequent transit
694 rider, and a social justice advocate. She had been a long time transit rider and had the very good fortune
695 of being able to take transit easily every day in Chapel Hill to work. Molly DeMarco would like for more
696 people to be able to do this, especially people that depended on public transit because they could not
697 afford a car. Molly DeMarco stated that she had worked in support of the Light Rail Project for our two
698 surrounding counties. She stated it was good for all of our neighbors. Molly DeMarco stated that the
699 Light Rail Project was a social justice tool. Molly DeMarco stated it would assist our lower income
700 neighbors to getting to and from work much faster than they are currently able to with buses. She
701 stated, for example, a commute from Alston Avenue in Durham to Patterson Place Avenue, where many
702 lower income folks worked, and commute time would be cut nearly in half from 51 minutes to 27

minutes with Light Rail Transit. Molly DeMarco stated the importance of this decreased commute time would not be overstated. She stated that the decreased commute time will give residents more free time to spend with family, to get more education, to be physically active and to participate in the civic life of their community, such as to be at hearings. Molly DeMarco stated that even if people chose to drive, the Light Rail Transit would benefit people to have shorter commute times, because fewer people would be on the road in single vehicles. She stated that beyond these benefits; the Light Rail was good for the environment because of the reduced number of cars on the road and the accompanying emissions. She stated that moving forward with the Orange County Durham Light Rail Project was good for our community. Molly DeMarco stated that she urged the DCHC MPO Board to approve the DEIS on November 11, 2015.

Michael Waldrop, a citizen of 5324 McFarland, Durham, stated that his comments were prompted by his attendance to the Durham-Chapel Hill Work Group that day. Michael Waldrop wanted to provide a voice that expressed support for the project without the “buts” followed by a long list of reasons why it should not move forward on a very crippled basis. Michael Waldrop stated Durham was growing up; Chapel Hill was growing up; the Triangle was growing up and needed a diversified transportation system so it would continue to evolve. Michael Waldrop stated that the Surgeon General's report was absolutely spot on. He stated that if you looked at the health statistics for a city like Copenhagen, somewhere like that. He stated that you would get multiple tens of minutes of bicycle ridership per week; you get longevity figures that put ours to shame. Michael Waldrop told the DCHC MPO Board that they were in the hot seat of the next couple of months. He stated they would need to remember why they were elected. Michael Waldrop stated that they were not here to protect small minorities from change; they were here to make far-sighted and pragmatic decisions for our future. Michael Waldrop stated that he had a little bit of experience in the political process that expressed opposition to development. Michael Waldrop stated that people should imagine how amused he was

727 when he heard the opponents of Patterson Place. Michael Waldrop stated that if this system was here
728 today, he warranted that a high number of people that you would hear from of about the next couple of
729 months would be riders.

730 Matt Bailey, a citizen of Chapel Hill stated that he was there to thank the DCHC MPO Board for
731 the work that they had already done on the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Line. He asked for their
732 continued support for this important project. Matt Bailey stated that there were many reasons why the
733 Light Rail was a good idea, in fact, the best idea for the corridor. He stated that the Light Rail was the
734 right choice when a lot of people were going to the same concentrated areas like UNC, Duke, the VA
735 Hospital, and downtown Durham. Matt Bailey stated all this criteria fit; the Light Rail was the right choice
736 when residents already love transit. He stated the Durham-Chapel Hill Metro Area might not feel like a
737 big city, liked ditching our cars when you give reliable and attractive alternatives, people sure act like
738 one. He stated Light Rail was the right choice when up against stiff competition with other cities across
739 the country for today's top talent and tomorrow's top employers. Matt Bailey stated that he had a more
740 selfish reason why he was in support of the Durham-Orange County Light Rail Line. He stated personally
741 he cannot wait to ride it. Matt Bailey's family lived within walking distance from the proposed gateway
742 station on the Chapel Hill-Durham border. Matt Bailey loved the idea of getting on the train to go to a
743 Durham Bulls game or go to a show at the DPAC. He stated if he started a business; he planned to look
744 for office space along the Light Rail Line for himself and his employees. Matt Bailey stated that you could
745 call him a YIMBY (Yes in My Back Yard). Finally, Matt Bailey wanted to speak about the people that would
746 not be at the meeting, whose life would be better because of the train. He stated that they were the
747 nurses and housekeepers who were working second shifts right now. He stated there were students that
748 were busy studying, there were working parents who were putting their kids to bed, young professionals
749 at a bar meeting with their soul mates instead of being at the DCHC MPO meeting. He stated that these
750 citizens could not be here to speak tonight, but they had spoken loud and clear at the ballot box when

751 they chose to raise their own sales taxes to pay for improved transit including the train. Matt Bailey
752 stated that for them, himself and generations to come whose lives would be better because of it being
753 built. Matt Bailey thanked them for the foresight that was shown in helping the Durham Light Rail Transit
754 line move forward. Matt Bailey stated that he would personally appreciate the DCHC MPO Board
755 continued support of the project.

756 Charlotte Gilbert, a citizen, stated that she understood that GoTriangle would answer all
757 questions submitted to them via the web, but they had not answered her questions, as of yet.

758 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated to Charlotte Gilbert that GoTriangle had not answered anyone's
759 questions yet. He stated they were still compiling data. Charlotte Gilbert asked what the timeframe was.

760 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked if someone could clarify the timeframe for responses to
761 comments and questions. Tammy Bouchelle stated that questions submitted specifically to GoTriangle
762 had a two-week turnaround time. She stated that all direct questions presented to GoTriangle were
763 posted on the most frequently asked question section of their web page.

764 Greg Gangi, a citizen, stated that he would like to urge the DCHC MPO Board to continue to
765 support the Light Rail Transit project. Greg Gangi was actually one of the original lobbyists back in 1990
766 when the Sierra Club pushed for a Light Rail Project in the Triangle. Greg Gangi stated that he would
767 never forget a comment that was made when he was lobbying; a powerful member of the North Carolina
768 House, lobbying for more money to go into the Highway Trust fund for public transit. He stated the
769 powerful member of the North Carolina House stated "I will not allow another penny of my money to go
770 into transit so that those people can ride around in buses." Greg Gangi stated that this was certainly a
771 social justice issue. He stated that not just for minorities, but for elderly people and young people who
772 were constrained in their mobility. Greg Gangi stated that it was a very important issue and asked the
773 DCHC MPO Board to please not be confused by initial ridership numbers. He stated that this was an
774 infrastructure tool that would play a very important role in building the future of the Triangle; we did not

775 want to keep sprawling out. He stated that this had the potential for becoming an important spine in
776 which the Triangle could develop. Greg Gangi stated that he urged the DCHC MPO Board to keep in mind
777 that if they want to be a world-class region and wanted to compete with Silicon Valley, connectivity was
778 very important. He stated that the Triangle Region was at the risk of being choked off by just constant
779 gridlock. Greg Gangi stated this was an important move for the future. Greg Gangi urged the DCHC MPO
780 Board to keep up their courage and continue to support the project.

781 Eric Teagarden, a citizen, stated that he would like to thank Ms. Murdock for telling him exactly
782 how many meetings that he had attended over 300 meetings in ten years. Eric Teagarden stated that he
783 was going to make two assumptions that were potentially fallacious and if they were, please stop
784 listening to what he was saying. He stated that the first were that they were not going to go with the No
785 Build option. Eric Teagarden stated that the second assumption was they were not going to go with the
786 BRT, but with the Light Rail. He stated that the train was really leaving the station. Eric Teagarden stated
787 he would like to speak of two elements and the preferred alternatives that he thought were important.
788 The first were the C2A and the also the New Hope crossing were the best environmentally and financially
789 right decision. Eric Teagarden stated that he had read every page and piece of document that the
790 GoTriangle had put out over the years. Eric Teagarden stated that he wanted to point out one more thing
791 that had never been mentioned as an advantage of co-locating Light Rail in the New Hope and Little
792 Creek area. He stated that with the roads it would make it easier to bring in the necessary materials to be
793 used. Eric Teagarden stated he supported C2A, the New Hope Crossing and there had been sensitivity
794 shown to the environmental areas. Eric Teagarden stated that Mr. Harrison would be happy to walk you
795 around that wonderful area. Eric Teagarden ended by saying he thanked them very much for keeping it
796 safe.

797 Cathy Abernathy, a citizen and lived at 233 Culp Hill Drive since 2012. Cathy Abernathy stated
798 that for the last two years she had been in Nebraska with family. Cathy Abernathy stated she had been

799 trying to catch up on everything regarding the new Light Rail proposal. She was aware that the original
800 vision of the Light Rail was changed. Cathy Abernathy stated that she had to take her hat off to the DCHC
801 MPO Board for the changes made. Cathy Abernathy stated that she thanked everyone involved in their
802 expertise and experience. She stated after she realized that this had been going on for a long, long time,
803 she was concerned about the neighborhoods, the environment, and other items involved. Cathy
804 Abernathy stated she wanted to thank the DCHC MPO Board for making the hard decisions, concerning
805 Farrington ROMF. Cathy Abernathy stated that she supported the Light Rail Project.

806 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that this concluded the end of the speakers who signed up to participate
807 in the public comment session. He asked if there were any additional questions or comments to the
808 DCHC MPO Board members. Vice-Chair Diane Catotti stated that she just wanted to thank everyone for
809 coming out to share their thoughts with the DCHC MPO Board. She stated that she had a question to
810 staff, which she knew that the DCHC MPO staff compiled the comments. She asked for clarification on
811 how the process, the compiled comments, and data would get back to the DCHC MPO Board.

812 Mark Ahrendsen stated that this issue could be taken up at the next DCHC MPO Technical
813 Committee meeting as to how the process should be handled, and as to how to bring back comments to
814 the Board.

815 Ellen Reckhow stated that she wanted to get clarification of the process and timing because if they
816 were going to vote by November 11 , 2015 , then she was struggling with would the staff at TTA finalize
817 the DEIS a month later in December. Ellen Reckhow asked if the DCHC MPO Board would know how
818 comments were addressed by the time they vote in November.

819 Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that it depended on how they handled their schedule. He stated
820 that tonight they had heard a two week turn around, the ending date of October 13, 2015, which was
821 about a month before the DCHC MPO Board voted. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt stated that he would

822 imagine the DCHC MPO Board would have some type of information by then, but not sure how complete
823 it would be. Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked GoTriangle for an answer.

824 Patrick McDonough stated that the proposed mitigation in the DEIS were on the website and
825 available that night for reading. He stated that the time period was for the citizens to read about the
826 proposed mitigation, and to see if they thought this was appropriate or if there were other suggestions
827 that they might have.

828 Ellen Reckhow stated that she wanted to know why the Board needed to vote by November as
829 opposed to December. Patrick McDonough stated that they were trying to complete the process of the
830 24 months prescribed by MAP 21 of the Federal Transportation law that governs all of the work. He
831 stated they needed it completed in order for the Federal Transit Administration to be able to review the
832 final document. He stated that they looked at the DCHC MPO Board's calendar, and November was the
833 last day they could vote. Patrick McDonough stated that this allowed FTA an appropriate amount of time
834 to review and to meet their schedule.

835 Ellen Reckhow stated she wanted to know what day the document would be submitted to the FTA.
836 Patrick McDonough asked Tammy Bouchelle to help answer that question. Tammy Bouchelle stated that
837 there would be a lot of back and forth correspondence between the submitted documents. She stated
838 that there would be a draft submitted to the FTA on December 1, 2015; it was the scheduled date
839 provided for them for a draft of the document. Ellen Reckhow stated that she wanted to know if
840 GoTriangle would respond to all the comments by December 1, 2015. Tammy Bouchelle stated yes and in
841 conjunction with the FTA.

842 Ellen Reckhow stated that she would like to recommend having the meeting later in November.
843 Tammy Bouchelle stated that she could have drafts prepared for the comments sent to the DCHC MPO
844 Board to review for the process. Ellen Reckhow stated that she would like for the DCHC MPO staff to
845 work with GoTriangle on how these items would be submitted to the DCHC MPO Board.

Mark Ahrendsen stated that he asked the DCHC MPO staff to work on it and give the DCHC MPO Board more information on the process.

Steve Schewel stated that he appreciated the public comments and that the Board would take them into serious consideration. He stated that the decision that they make may not make everyone happy, but he appreciated everyone for coming out and participating and sharing their views.

Chair Mark Kleinschmidt asked for a motion to receive the presentation from GoTriangle on Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and to receive public comments. Vice-Chair Diane Catotti made a motion to receive the presentation from GoTriangle on Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and receive the public comments. Ellen Reckhow seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously

.INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

15. Recent News, Articles, and Updates

All handouts are available on the website.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the DCHC MPO Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.