

a City Center Station

Nina Kamberos [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/1/2015 11:09 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Dear Friends,

Please consider a station at City Center. It would provide wonderful access to both a cultural and sporting center, not to mention the City Hall . . . This would be a perfect integration point . . .

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Nina Kamberos

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Hotel Accommodations near Light Rail

Chapel Hill DOS (Kristi Kaas) [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/14/2015 12:09 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Hi there:

I would love to discuss further with you any potential for hosting project crews here at the Aloft Chapel Hill.

When will construction start?

Warm Regards,

Kristi Kaas
Director of Sales

[REDACTED]



Durham Orange Light Rail Plan

Katz, Laurence M [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/25/2015 5:18 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Dear committee,

I am a citizen of the City of Durham. I am concerned about the safety of the proposed Durham Orange Light Rail Plan. It creates an unacceptable risk of collisions with vehicles and pedestrians and will impede response times for Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services. Delays in response times (even as little as 1-2 minutes) created by the light rail will have devastating consequences to patient survival and safety. Please do not move forward with this project as it is too high of a risk to individuals and the community.

Sincerely,

Laurence Katz, M.D. FACEP
Professor
Dept of Emergency Medicine, Exercise and Sports Science
Director, ICED (Induced Cooling to Eliminate Deficits) Program
Co-Director, Carolina Resuscitation Research Group
University of North Carolina School of Medicine

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Durham Orange Light Rail Plan

Katz, Laurence M [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/25/2015 5:40 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Dear committee,

I am a citizen of the City of Durham. I am concerned about the accuracy of the calculations for ridership being used to justify moving forward with the Durham Orange Light Rail Plan. The calculations are reportedly based on current ridership of the bus system along this line. I live along the corridor and the buses are grossly underutilized. There is no compelling evidence that a light rail system will have a significant increase in utilization compared to the bus system. Poor ridership plus the decision by the state to withdraw funds for the project will result in an increased tax burden to both communities. The substantial rise in taxes that will be required to sustain an underutilized and antiquated system will deplete funds that are needed for improvement in transportation infrastructure. Please do not allow this project to move forward.

Sincerely,

Laurence Katz, M.D. FACEP
Professor
Dept of Emergency Medicine, Exercise and Sports Science
Director, ICED (Induced Cooling to Eliminate Deficits) Program
Co-Director, Carolina Resuscitation Research Group
University of North Carolina School of Medicine

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

No Durham Orange Light Rail

Katz, Laurence M [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/4/2015 8:58 AM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Dear Committee,

Federal funding should not support the Durham Orange Light Rail Plan. The project will fail to meet the transportation needs of the community and exclude those (the poor) for which a mass transportation system is most needed. The current bus system is grossly underutilized and if the federal government wants to invest in an efficient and successful system, allocate funds to modernize buses (hybrids, no emission buses) so that all of Durham and Orange citizens can have access to mass transit. This strategy (modernize the bus system) will decrease the carbon footprint, provide for flexibility with development and will prevent destruction of wetlands along the proposed light rail route. Do not support the Durham Orange Light Rail-it will be a catastrophe and a misappropriation of federal funding. The ridership numbers to justify the light rail are fraudulent and the federal government should not be forced to make decisions on inaccurate information.

Sincerely

Laurence Katz, M.D. FACEP

Professor

Dept of Emergency Medicine, Exercise and Sports Science

Director, ICED (Induced Cooling to Eliminate Deficits) Program

Co-Director, Carolina Resuscitation Research Group

University of North Carolina School of Medicine

Thank you.

22 MR. JOYNER: Thank you, sir.

23 MR. LARRY KATZ: My name is Larry

24 Katz. I live at [REDACTED],

1 and I live along the 54 corridor.

2 I'd like to make two comments.

3 One comment is every single day at 7, 8,
4 9, 10, 11, and in the afternoon, I watch
5 the GoTriangle buses go by and I'm
6 fascinated but they're almost completely
7 empty. I think if GoTriangle wants to do
8 something helpful for improving traffic
9 flows, use the money and use this system
10 that's already in place and make it
11 efficient.

12 The other comment I'd like to make
13 is that I'm an emergency -- thank you very
14 much. I'm apologizing that I'm not in red
15 today, which has a special meaning to us,
16 but an emergency medicine physician. I'm
17 also a paramedic that have worked in EMS
18 for over 30 years, and the way the current
19 system is designed, it's going to create
20 delays in emergency response. One minute
21 of delay can have a dramatic, disastrous
22 outcome on patient's lives, and I do not
23 support the build of this system, and I
24 ask for your support, as well, and thank

1 you for the opportunity.

2 MR. JOYNER: Thank you. And,
3 folks, I will ask that you please hold --
4 hold your applause during -- not -- during
5 the speaking so that the speakers can be
6 heard. It's important that you respect
7 their opportunity and you give everybody
8 that opportunity to speak, so please do
9 hold your applause. Thank you. Yes,
10 ma'am.

11

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project

Official Public Comment

Name: Antonio Kearney

Email: _____

Telephone: _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____

Zip Code: _____

How to Comment on the DEIS

1. Email us at info@ourtransitfuture.com
2. Submit a web-based comment form: ourtransitfuture.com/comment
3. Mail a letter to D-O LRT Project - DEIS, C/O GoTriangle, Post Office Box 530, Morrisville, NC 27560
4. Submit a written comment form at two public information sessions and two public hearings.
5. Sign-up to speak at a public hearing.

All methods of commenting will receive equal weight. All comments will be reviewed and considered as part of the development of the combined Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)/Record of Decision (ROD), which is expected in February 2016. A response to substantive comments will be included in the combined FEIS/ROD.

Be advised that your entire comment, including name, address, phone number, email address, or any other personal identifying information in your comment may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Act (N.C.G.S. § 132.1 et seq.).

Please leave your comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement:

the looks really nice im
kinda thinkin about riding i

Please Turn Over →

Light rail

Francis Keefe, Ph.D. [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/11/2015 8:50 AM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I am strongly in support of light rail

It's needed and will strengthen our infrastructure

Thanks

Francis Keefe

Sent from my iPhone

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Light Rail

Julie Kever [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/1/2015 1:00 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I am against the light rail
[REDACTED]

Julie Kever

Mortgage Processor

NMLS License # 1041576

Corporate Investors Mortgage Group, Inc.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

General Comments: Orange-Durham light rail plan

Paul Killough [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/14/2015 8:18 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

1. I think it's amazing that a totally new steel-wheel-on-steel-rail route is being seriously considered here. Very few have been constructed in this country after 1930. But I'm a big fan of public transportation and particularly of electric railroads. It's the only proven technology we have to move people without using fossil fuel. We're running out of that, and fossil fuel combustion is ruining our atmosphere.

2. In general, railroads in this country came first. Towns and cities grew up around stops and junctions. Financially and politically, it's enormously difficult to build a new rail line through a densely built up area.

3. It might make more sense to build our light rail line in a very rural area of, say, Caswell County, then build new towns, factories, universities, hospitals, around the stops. That's what happened in Durham in the 19th Century. The NC RR was built first. Everything else came later.

4. But if we're going to build a new light rail line here, it has to be done right. Stops have to be in easy walking distance of where people live, work, shop, go to school, visit the doctor.

5. The route has to be reasonably straight. Curves mean slower operation and more expense. A sharp curve to accommodate a special interest will mean a time tax on every rider on that line for many decades to come.

6. Grade crossings and street-running must be minimized. A modern light rail system has to be fast and safe. A light rail system that has to compete for space with cars and trucks is likely to be neither fast nor safe.

7. I was on the Chapel Hill Transportation Board in the 1990s and early versions of this plan were presented to us then. I have no academic or professional background in rail transportation but I'm something of a train nut. I know a little about how railroads work. Some of the details presented to us then by Parsons-Brinckerhoff were clearly unworkable -- a street-running sharp right turn in the middle of the Meadowmont-Raleigh Rd intersection for example. I kept my mouth shut. P-B certainly knows how to build passenger rail lines, but they were well aware that it would be decades before rail would be laid, and meanwhile they needed to present palatable plans to unsophisticated politicians and citizens such that they could keep getting consulting contracts. If they told the truth about how tough it would be to build a practical light rail line, and where it would have to go, there would be too many loud objections and P-B might cease getting contracts. Perhaps they were right to start us off easy. The planning process is still in place and plans are getting more realistic. I think it will be more decades before we have an electric light rail to Durham but I think it needs to be built --- and we also need a passenger rail line to RDU and Raleigh.

Paul Killough, [REDACTED]

Orange/Durham Light Rail proposal - DOLRT (NO BUILD)

Ed Kinnaird [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/24/2015 2:44 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Greetings.

I'm sending this message to voice my concerns over the Light Rail Proposal (DOLRT). While transportation is an important issue now and as the community grows, as a resident of Durham County, I stand firmly behind the NO BUILD option and think that light rail project will have grave consequences for our area if it is supported and approved.

After reviewing the information, I reach the following conclusions:

- The economic cost for this project will vastly eclipse any enhancement in tax revenue formation. Even the most optimistic ridership forecasts do not offer a positive cost-benefit outcome
- The proposed light rail corridor is not congruent with the areas that are being principally developed. Robust single-family household formation and the associated tax revenue creation is NOT happening in the transit area
- The installation of rail lines provide no flexibility for future augmentation should the areas transportation needs change
- Establishing crossing areas do not reduce the concern over public safety. The areas proposed to be served will have a heightened risk of catastrophic accidents
- The parking areas that will need to be erected will only serve to increase traffic congestion which the light rail project is purported to be alleviating

As a citizen of Durham County, we simply cannot take the financial risk associated with such a project when vital revenue needs to be directed to more mission-critical needs for the city and county. Our community leaders need to take a stand against this project and support the citizens of the community that they are advocating for.

I thank you for your sincere consideration.

Respectfully,

Ed Kinnaird
[REDACTED]

Durham Human Relations Commission Resolution re Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Line

Kipp, Ian]

Sent: 10/13/2015 9:53 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Hello,

I sent this via the comment section of your website but wanted to have a record of it to share with the Commission:

Relating to the current plan of the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Line, the City of Durham Human Relation Commission encourages the City Council, Go Triangle and the Federal Transit Administration to give close consideration to the race and income demographics of those harmed and those served (or not served) by the light rail. In particular, 1) the current plan, ending at Alston Avenue, does not go far enough east and 2) does not serve North Carolina Central University or Durham Technical College. Thank you, Durham Human Relations Commission.

Ian Kipp
For the Durham Human Relations Commission

Sent from my iPhone

Oppose Light Rail – federally protected wetlands

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:15 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it will cross federally protected wetlands 140 times per day. The Army Corps of Engineers maintains this land. Building it will destroy the habitat and it will never be able to recover because of the constant crossing of the train. The Army Corps of Engineers should never have approved this route. They were led to believe that Downing Creek residents wanted the Woodmont station and this is not true. A survey shows that 90% of Downing Creek residents do NOT want the rail.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – Cost

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:15 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because the construction will cost at least \$1.8 billion. This does not include cost overruns. Based on accurate data, this rail will not even come close to solving traffic problems that could justify such an initial and on-going expense.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – antiquated mode of transportation

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:16 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because rail has become an antiquated mode of transportation for the 21st century. It is totally incompatible with up and coming technology.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – unusable by the aging population

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:17 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it will not serve the aging population in this area. We have a very large aging population and transportation is becoming a huge issue for them and this population is getting larger every day. Seniors will need to ride buses that can take them to places they need to go and get closer to their doorstep for pick-up and drop-off. The financial resources used for this rail will use up any resources that could help seniors.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – Route

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:18 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because the proposed route of the rail travels through low-density areas. And in addition, the entire region does not have a dense enough population for such a monster of transportation. This train does not service areas that would use it, nor does it take riders places that are needed, such as the Research Triangle Park, shopping, or the airport.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – unusable by the aging population

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:18 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it will not serve the aging population in this area. We have a very large aging population and transportation is becoming a huge issue for them and this population is getting larger every day. Seniors will need to ride buses that can take them to places they need to go and get closer to their doorstep for pick-up and drop-off. The financial resources used for this rail will use up any resources that could help seniors.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – Voters never voted on light rail

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:19 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because the ballot that had the tax increase for transportation was only about “transportation systems” not rail. Rail was never mentioned on the ballot nor was it ever voted on. To say the people want light rail because they voted for it is a lie, or at the best, it is ignorance. Do not consider the .05% tax increase a mandate for the rail; it is a mandate for improving transportation.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – no parking at stations

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:21 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because there will be little additional parking at most of the stations and several stations will have no parking at all, including the Woodmont station. Duke is not adding parking and neither is UNC. Most stations will be walk-up only and this will further minimize ridership, which, by the way, is extremely overstated by GoTriangle.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – maintenance facility

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:22 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because the proposed maintenance facility is in a rural but populated area with a school close by. The originally proposed facility was to be in an area of Durham where most of the workers would reside and could walk to work and was close to the end of the line. This area is in the middle of the line so empty trains will have to come to it from either end of the line which means trains will be running empty deliberately and frequently. This is additional expense, pollution and noise. It is my understanding the original site for the facility was dropped because the land there is contaminated with chemical waste from a prior chemical plant and this would have to be cleaned-up in order to build the maintenance facility and GoTriangle did not want to spend that money. As a note, the residents in this poorer area of town still have to live with the toxicity and will not have the jobs they were promised.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – does not serve the poorest of the population

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:23 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it does not serve the poorest members of the population who need transportation and jobs more than Duke, UNC and the developers.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – does not solve the traffic issues

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:25 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because is not a complete solution to our traffic issues. Studies have shown that drivers will continue to drive cars on a daily basis and LRT riders will be the same ones currently using buses.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – why MUST it be a train

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:25 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because there are other forms of transportation and technology being developed that will solve the transportation needs in a much more efficient and flexible way. Why spend \$1.8 billion on a system that cannot be moved as ridership needs change, is dangerous and will be obsolete before it's complete. I'd prefer my tax dollars to be spent more wisely and less frivolously.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – it's simply a waste of taxpayer dollars

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:26 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because with citizens budgets so tight there is no need to spend such an extravagant amount of money on this project when there are other forms of transportation and technology being developed that will solve the transportation needs in a much more efficient and flexible way. Why spend \$1.8 billion on a system that cannot be moved as ridership needs change, is dangerous and will be obsolete before it's complete. I'd prefer my tax dollars to be spent more wisely and less frivolously.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – will not sustain itself

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:27 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it will not sustain itself and become a financial burden to the taxpayers for years to come. There is no need to spend such an extravagant amount of money on this project when there are other forms of transportation and technology being developed that will solve the transportation needs in a much more efficient and flexible way. Why spend \$1.8 billion on a system that cannot be moved as ridership needs change, is dangerous and will be obsolete before it's complete. I'd prefer my tax dollars to be spent more wisely and less frivolously.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

Oppose Light Rail – does not serve “the people”

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:27 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because it will not serve “the people”. When a significant amount of taxpayer dollars are being spent for the people, I think of a project that would serve a large number of people. This project will run along a small and very specific area and serve a very small percentage of the population. As folks in the area are crying for transit to take them to RTP and the airport, we are spending \$1.8 billion to help people commute between UNC and Duke. If you look at traffic numbers, there is a much greater need in many areas along I-40 than in this small and less traveled corridor along NC 54 and 15/501. There is rapid growth going towards Burlington and Carrboro as well. Let’s really help “the people” and look into safer, flexible and less expensive forms of transportation that can be expanded and get folks to the areas that they really want to travel to. I’d prefer my tax dollars to be spent more wisely and less frivolously.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

Oppose light rail due to dangerous intersection for our residents

Diana Knechtel [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:13 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I oppose the proposed Durham – Orange Light Rail because there will be no traffic light at the Downing Creek Parkway and Hwy 54 intersection and it will be an at-grade crossing. Hwy 54 is a very busy highway and cars will run the real risk of the gate coming down behind the car that will have to be stopped on the tracks in order to get onto Hwy 54. The car will be trapped between the gate and cars on Hwy 54 and will get hit by the train. Please flag and investigate this intersection.

Sincerely,
Diana Knechtel

[REDACTED]

No Subject

Meg Koc [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/11/2015 9:46 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

I understand there was rail between Roxboro and Durham some if it is still there , can't you (please) build it back and take thousands of drivers off the road who current commute 15-501 to 147 to 40?

Please consider .

Thanks,

Meg (Rougemont)

Sent from my iPhone

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

October 3, 2015

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation (DEIS)
Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project**

We wish to oppose the proposed NEPA preferred alternative Farrington Road Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility (ROMF). As nearby residents of this proposed location, we believe the Farrington Road ROMF will adversely affect the quality of life in our community. This location is currently zoned suburban residential consistent with the housing and vegetative characteristics of the area – it is not light industrial which would be more appropriate for a ROMF, such as the Charlotte ROMF and the proposed Alston Avenue location.

A significant concern is proximity of the Farrington Road ROMF to nearby Creekside Elementary School. There is no mention in the DEIS of the preferred alternative site being so close to an elementary school with over 900 children. The Farrington Road ROMF would add traffic (especially problematic would be the extra traffic associated with shift changes at the facility during the already very busy school morning arrival and afternoon departure times). Also, it would introduce the handling and usage of potentially dangerous and hazardous cleaning/maintenance chemicals, as well as add noise and air pollution to this currently quiet, clean neighborhood.

The DEIS notes that this location is “the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, and has the most stakeholder support...”. Concerning it being the least environmentally damaging, the DEIS clearly notes that the Farrington Road location “has the largest impact to streams, stream buffers, wetland and riparian zones.” In addition, the DEIS notes that this location would pose visual impacts to residences. As for having the most stakeholder support, aside from support by the largest land owner (Curtis Booker), there is NOT support from the vast majority of other residents in nearby subdivisions, as evident from the large turnout a couple months ago at the meeting held at Creekside Elementary. Those in attendance were overwhelming opposed to the Farrington Road ROMF.

Other reasons cited for preferring the Farrington Road location are larger available land area (although there is no explanation why a 25-acre site is needed when the Charlotte ROMF is only 14 acres), and lower costs (although the Farrington Road costs were identified as being comparable to those for the Leigh Village and the Alston Avenue sites in a November 2-14 handout from Ourtransitfuture).

Finally, the DEIS fails to identify any significant remediation steps for siting the ROMF in this clearly quiet, suburban light residential area, such as elimination of on-site parking for the many ROMF employees, minimization of lighting (e.g., no elevated light towers), and providing sufficiently high (and dense) vegetative buffers and sound barriers.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Ann H Koerber

Michael Koerber

Ann and Michael Koerber



Light Rail Route Opposition

Megan Kovac [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 7:00 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Cc: "Megan Kovac" [REDACTED]

To: Federal Transportation Administration

Subject: Oppose Light Rail – Route

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to the light rail project. Although I am generally a proponent of public transit, the community has not been provided with enough detail regarding the specific plans or scope of the project. Consequently, none of my concerns regarding danger, planning, environmental impact, or cost efficiency have been assuaged. As a homeowner and taxpayer I strongly oppose this project at this time.

Sincerely,

Name
Megan L Kovac

Address
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

cornwallis site - please do not place a ROMF there

Jeff Koweek [REDACTED]

Sent: 9/25/2015 11:42 AM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Hi,

As a Jewish Federation donor, Jewish Community Center member, and a Lerner Day School Parent, I am writing to express concerns about the possible placement of the ROMF at the Cornwallis site. Year round, there are children on campus of both the Lerner school and the JCC year round, and religious services being conducted at Judea Reform. Increasing traffic flow and potential nuisances is not in the best interest of the community at large. Furthermore, the Jewish Federation has a grant of land of at least 2.5 acres that would be negatively affected by any ROMF facility.

The plot of land west of the Jewish Federation, the site of the ex-Pepsi factory, is also a prime location close to Duke and UNC. This land has potentially great economic value to the city of Durham and the region if it were to be used for purposed that could produce greater financial resources if developed strategically. This could include retail and housing that would produce tax benefits to the city and region. Please know that I personally believe a light rail stop at the Cornwallis location would benefit the city and region and all three Jewish institutions mentioned in the first paragraph, if light rail becomes a reality.

Thank you for taking comments on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Jeff Koweek

19 MS. ANNETTE KRONMILLER: My name
20 is Annette Kronmiller. I live at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

22 So as an alternative to light
23 rail, we think that bus rapid transit on
24 existing roads is more flexible and less

1 expensive than a new fixed right-of-way
2 for new tracks.

3 Also, you know, we've seen how
4 technology changes with the rising Uber,
5 driverless vehicles, and people working
6 from home. The extreme traffic congestion
7 so feared by elected officials is not
8 likely to materialize, and, in fact, this
9 light rail, as it's been stated, will be
10 made worse by all these at-grade crossings
11 where every vehicle will have to hit its
12 brakes umpteen times a transit to -- to
13 make way.

14 Also now that Raleigh has opted
15 out of light rail, this problematic,
16 costly mode of transportation doesn't even
17 provide access to RDU and RTP.

18 Some of us would like to offer an
19 alternative to the Farrington ROMF site,
20 not the Lee Village option in the DES
21 [sic] which simply slides the Farrington
22 site a few yards south, but the yet-to-be
23 created Lee Village compact neighborhood
24 surrounding the proposed Lee Village

1 Transit Station near NC-54 and Farrington.
2 There the expected land use, the sell-out
3 plan for the property owners, the quantity
4 of impervious surface and the density of
5 proposed development make an industrial
6 facility appropriate.

7 The Lee Village Transit Station
8 area is going to become the paved dumping
9 ground, literally a parking lot, for over
10 900 vehicles for Chapel Hill, specifically
11 for UNC Hospital.

12 Why Durham's elected officials
13 embrace this second-class treatment, we
14 don't know, nor do we know why they
15 allowed Chapel Hill's Meadowmont to dump
16 the rail line into Durham's Downing Creek,
17 but residents from the portion of
18 Farrington Road in southwest would like to
19 preserve this as the North Carolina we
20 came to and that we love. And we do know
21 that it makes sense to include an
22 industrial ROMF somewhere else where it
23 will become southwest Durham's New Jersey
24 jungle of asphalt and rail lines and

1 high-density apartments.

2 MR. JOHN MARTIN: Good afternoon.

3 My name is John Martin. I live at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

5 I strongly support public
6 transportation, but I do not support this
7 project, and the reason I say that is
8 because my first guiding principle for
9 public transportation is it ought to be
10 aimed at those people who have no other
11 alternative first of all but to use public
12 transportation.

13 And the irony of this project is
14 it most serves neighborhoods where public
15 transportation is less -- least used and
16 will ignore neighborhoods like east Durham
17 where public transportation is most
18 desperately needed.

19 I have lived east of Roxboro for
20 the last five years. I know something
21 about those neighborhoods.

22 But the question I want to have
23 GoTriangle answer very simply is, where is
24 the money going to come from? Forget the

DEIS for DOLRT

Annette Kronmiller [REDACTED]

Sent: 10/12/2015 6:28 PM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com, [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

I am a citizen of Durham County North Carolina, commenting on the DEIS for the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project (DOLRT). My concerns about the environmental impact of DOLRT fall into three categories:

- 1) Increased (yes!) traffic congestion
- 2) "Indirect and cumulative effects" on southwestern Durham county
- 3) Siting of the ROMF

1) Increased traffic congestion

Usually one expects mass transit to reduce traffic congestion and associated pollution. But DOLRT creates 43 at-grade crossings in 17 miles, many on already overcrowded NC54 and other busy commuter routes. By stopping traffic every 10 minutes for 18 hours a day on these busy roads, it will likely increase traffic congestion, gasoline use, and pollution. GoTriangle assumes a high percentage of residents will use the light rail instead of their cars on these routes, but since the proposed DOLRT route serves neither RDU airport nor the major RTP commuter destination, this is highly unlikely. An examination of ridership rates for existing bus services along the proposed route does not support GoTriangle's ridership figures.

2) "Indirect and cumulative effects" on southwestern Durham county

From DEIS section 4(f) p.4-288, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) requires an assessment of indirect and cumulative impacts per 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500–1508. Regulations included in the appendix to the Planning Assistance and Standards, Title 23 C.F.R. Part 450, indicate that the indirect and cumulative effects analysis should be sufficiently detailed such that consequences of different alternatives can be readily identified, based on current data and reasonable assumptions, and based on reliable and defensible analytical methods. Furthermore, courts have mandated that federal agencies take a reasonably "hard look" at their projects with regard to available information and analysis of appropriate issues (including indirect and cumulative effects).

The indirect and cumulative impacts of the project are not fully addressed, specifically in regard to the Farrington Road section of the project corridor (from US15/501 to NC54), which the DOLRT would transform from present-day farm land and low density residential land use, to intense high density, mixed use development approaching 100 units per acre. The rail ridership numbers assume this high density residential development (60 to 100 units to the acre); in fact, the project requires that level of development to justify itself. Such development includes large amounts of impervious surface area, for example, a 900+ car park-and-ride lot at Leigh Village Compact Neighborhood near NC54 and Farrington Road, and 26 impervious acres at the proposed ROMF site on Farrington Road. But that section of the proposed rail corridor sits on a narrow peninsula of land bounded by New Hope Creek to the east, Little Creek to the west, and Jordan Lake to the south -- which would be severely impacted by the addition of so much impervious surface. The DEIS should address -- in specific, quantifiable, scientific terms -- the indirect and cumulative impacts to the environment in this area due to storm water runoff and silt run off vastly increased by transit-driven development, including the likelihood that storm water runoff would be laced with grease, solvents, and detergents from the Farrington ROMF. In particular, the DEIS should address the impact on Leigh Farm Park, an 86-acre nature preserve with wetlands, bottomland hardwood forest, steep slopes, and alluvial soil that filters water flowing into the New Hope River Waterfowl Impoundment and ultimately, into Jordan Lake. Leigh Farm Park is also the home of the Piedmont Wildlife Center and nature camps for children.

3) Siting of the ROMF

Five alternatives were considered before selecting the Farrington ROMF site. (One of them, the Leigh Village site, substantially overlaps the Farrington site.) According to the DEIS, the Farrington site is the worst option environmentally, with the highest total of estimated stream impacts (638 linear feet), the greatest impact on wetlands, and the largest riparian buffer impacts, requiring 193,790 riparian buffer credits. (See Appendix K-22,

Water Resources Technical Report, Sections 5.2.2.1, 5.2.2.2 and 5.2.2.3 and Tables 4, 5, and 6). This ROMF site negatively impacts Leigh Farm Park, described in the previous paragraph.

The Farrington ROMF site will impact Trenton Road and the approximately 60 homes for which Trenton is the only access. Currently, in heavy rains, storm water runoff causes the stream designated NN (in the DEIS Water Resources Appendix K-22) to overflow its banks and cover Trenton Road, making the road impassable. This occurs with the current low-density development, where the main impervious surface is from 6 lanes of I-40 pavement alone. With the addition of 26 acres of impervious surface at the ROMF – not to mention additional high-density development nearby – Trenton Road would have to be rebuilt with a larger culvert underneath, an expense not considered as part of the ROMF site comparisons. In addition, there is serious risk of well water contamination for Trenton Road residents from polluted runoff from the Farrington ROMF. City water would need to be provided to these residents – another expense not taken into account. And what if this pollution reaches Jordan Lake, which is fed by watershed all around the Farrington ROMF?

The EPCON / Culp Arbor sewer easement traverses the entire Farrington ROMF site. That easement is supposed to remain undisturbed and fully accessible for long-term maintenance – not likely if the ROMF is built.

Also, Creekside Elementary School, with over 900 children, is right across the street from the Farrington ROMF. With all the hazardous chemicals, what if there is an accident and a need to evacuate? (When asked this question at a neighborhood meeting, GoTriangle representatives had not even thought about a plan.) Even without an accident, Creekside's young children, as well as various neighborhoods, would be negatively impacted by light and noise 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

In addition to my environmental concerns stated above, the DEIS contains untrue statements about transparency and communication of its planning process, which calls into question the accuracy and thoroughness of the entire report. In section 9.3.2, GoTriangle states that in 2013 and 2014, it assembled a list of 300 agencies (including neighborhood associations) in and around the D-O corridor, contacted each and offered to participate in meetings with them. In DEIS Table 9.3.3 (pages 9-16 through 9-24), the "Small Group, Neighborhoods, Agency and Stakeholder Meeting List" does not include Creekside school nor ANY of the following neighborhoods within ½ mile of the Farrington Road (or nearly identical Leigh Village) ROMF sites: Culp Arbor, Glenview Park, The Enclave, Five Oaks, Chicopee Trail, Prescott Place, Trenton, Weston Downs, Maida Vale, Marena Place, Blenheim Woods, and The Oaks III.

But this is not just an omission in a list in a DEIS table. My Trenton neighborhood is part of the Farrington Homeowners Allied for Residential Preservation (HARP), founded in 1987 and registered with the Durham Planning Dept. It has had the same president that whole time, who has received numerous notifications over the years and alerted the neighborhood to them. (I have lived here since 1993, so I have been involved in many such alerts.) But she – and heads of other neighborhood associations – knew NOTHING about the Farrington Road ROMF site until June 18, 2015, the date GoTriangle CLOSED the scoping period for the DOLRT project. Despite the DEIS statement that all stakeholders had been heavily involved, during the scoping period there were no phone calls, no direct mailings, no emails received by any representatives of the affected neighborhoods (or the school) surrounding the Farrington ROMF site. It appears the Farrington ROMF was unveiled to those directly affected only when GoTriangle knew it was too late for them to participate in the selection process. This includes NOT notifying families whose homes would be leveled for the Farrington ROMF, including an African-American family living on land they owned since 1888, and another family consisting of a woman with breast cancer, a disabled veteran spouse, and a live-in adult child with full care special needs. (This woman spoke movingly at a meeting I attended on June 24, where she was quickly escorted out of the room by GoTriangle representatives.)

Perhaps as a result of the "coincidental" timing I just referred to, the GoTriangle website and the DEIS public comment and media sections fail to mention the intense opposition to the Farrington ROMF site that has erupted since the site became known to residents on June 18. During July, August and September, a large number of residents responded, including some well-researched arguments against the Farrington site. Many of those arguments were shared in writing at a meeting at Creekside School on Aug. 18, attended by more than 200 residents. GoTriangle collected those comments, but where are they today? Not on the website or in the DEIS. Were they shared with the FTA and with local elected officials?

GoTriangle also resisted for months sharing information such as how it determined ridership figures, despite several expert citizens trying to get those figures for an impartial outside analysis. GoTriangle finally released a great deal of technical detail about the DOLRT project, less than a week before the end of the DEIS comment period. This is another interesting coincidence of late timing which suggests that – far from what GoTriangle

claims about its desire for “education, inclusion, transparency, accountability and responsiveness” – GoTriangle is making every effort to respond slowly, hide information, block our education, and exclude our voices.

I believe many citizens and leaders support DOLRT from a commendable desire to foster the area’s healthy long-term growth. I also want a healthy and vibrant area, but I do not believe this DOLRT proposal will move us in that direction.

Annette Kronmiller

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]