

MUMPO TCC
AGENDA
March 3, 2011

- 1. Consideration of February Meeting Minutes** Bill Coxe
ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.

- 2. Charlotte Streetcar Project** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: No action is suggested at this time due to the public comment period being extended to February 28. The action that will be necessary if the TCC decides to recommend that the project advance is:
- a. Amend the 2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Program to place project funding for the 1.5 mile segment in FY 2011*
 - b. Amend the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan to place the 1.5 mile segment in the 2015 horizon year*
 - c. Make a conformity determination on the amended 2009-2015 TIP and amended 2035 LRTP.*

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHEMENT: Streetcar Memorandum, including public comments

- 3. CATS 2009-2015 TIP Amendment** (5 minutes) David McDonald
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO take action to amend the 2009-2015 TIP in order to utilize funds allocated for FY 2011, designated to CATS for the replacement of underground fuel tanks at the North Davidson Bus Maintenance Facility.

BACKGROUND: See attached memorandum.

ATTACHMENTS: CATS TIP Amendment Memorandum; CATS TIP Amendment Resolution

- 4. ARRA Rail Improvements** (5 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO adopt a resolution of continued support for high speed rail.

BACKGROUND: NCDOT was awarded \$545 million in American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds to fund 27 projects in 11 counties for track improvements necessary to advance the Southeast High Speed Rail corridor, which will ultimately run between Charlotte and Washington, D.C. Recently, the House of Representatives passed a continuing resolution bill that would eliminate spending on high speed rail. Due to recent discussion about action on a possible rescission of ARRA funding related to North Carolina's high speed rail project, it would be an appropriate time for the MPO to weigh in on the issue.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Resolution

- 5. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
- a. Draft TIP Status Update and Timeline** (10 minutes) Robert Cook
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the Draft 2012-2018 TIP.

ATTACHMENT: TIP Memorandum

b. I-77 Widening and HOT Lanes Conversion (20 minutes)

Barry Moose

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: At the February TCC meeting, a proposal was made by NCDOT regarding the I-77 widening and HOT lanes conversion project. The project proposal discussed consists of the following:

- Use funds currently programmed in the outer years of the TIP to widen I-77 to eight lanes in each direction to exit 28, including conversion of a HOV lane to a HOT lane;*
- Incorporate TIP project I-3311E to widen substandard lanes on I-77 to the proper width, as part of this project;*
- Complete the remaining portion of project I-3311B, to widen I-77 from I-485 to NC 73 by adding a general purpose lane in each direction, as part of this project.*

Several questions and concerns were raised at the February TCC meeting. At the March meeting, the TCC will need to continue its discussion of the proposal, and determine if enough information is available to make a recommendation to the MPO.

c. Prosperity Church Rd/I-485 Interchange (15 minutes)

Matt Magnasco

ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO reallocate STP-DA funds from Little Rock Road (U-5116) to Prosperity Church Road Northwest Arc, and recommend that the funding year be changed from FY 15 to FY 13.

BACKGROUND: The MPO allocated STP-DA funds in FY 15 for a project to realign a portion of Little Rock Road (U-5116) in conjunction with the City of Charlotte's Fred D. Alexander Boulevard projects. The City has already completed planning and design on the project, so using the funds in FY 15 would result in a substantial delay to the project. The City proposes to reallocate the \$4.8 million in DA funds from Little Rock Road to construct a segment of realigned Prosperity Church Road in the Prosperity Village/I-485 interchange. This segment must be open to traffic when I-485 is completed (currently scheduled for December 2014) for the interchange to function properly. The funding year is also requested to be changed from FY 15 to FY 13.

6. 601 South Connector Project (15 minutes)

Jim Loyd

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: This project will provide a link between the Monroe Connector/Bypass and US 601, south of Monroe. Four preliminary alignments are being presented to the TCC for comment.

7. Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model Update (10 minutes)

Anna Gallup

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the progress of the Metrolina Regional Travel Demand Model.

8. Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Process (15 minutes)

Lauren Blackburn

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: A subcommittee of the TCC was recently formed to continue the development of a methodology for ranking bicycle and pedestrian projects. Two meetings of the subcommittee have been completed; this is an update regarding the progress of the subcommittee and the status of the prioritization process.

- 9. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** (10 minutes)
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

Robert Cook

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the UPWP.

- 10. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)** (5 minutes)
ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

Anil Panicker

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of this project.

11. Adjourn

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 267
February 3, 2011

Voting Members: Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Norm Steinman – alt. for Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe) – phone, Leslie Rhodes (LUESA-Air Quality), David McDonald (CATS), Barry Moose (NCDOT-Div. 10), Jack Flaherty (NCDOT-Public Transportation Branch), Lauren Blackburn (Davidson), Tom Tasselli – alt. for Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Adam McLamb (Indian Trail), Bill Sherrill – alt. for Ralph Messera (Matthews), Kevin Icard (Pineville), Shannon Martel – alt. for Brian Matthews (Stallings), Joshua Langen (Wesley Chapel), Amy Helms (Union County)

Staff: Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Polimeni (MUMPO), John Rose (CATS), Richard Hancock (NCDOT-Div. 10), Trisha Henry (NCDOT-Dist. 3), Justin Carroll (Huntersville), Crissy Huffstickler (C-M Planning)

Guests: Carroll Gray (LNTC), Angela Schlottman (Centralina COG), Christy Shumate (NCTA) – phone, Todd Steiss (PB)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:10 AM.

1. Consideration of January Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if there were any changes needed to the January minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Coxe asked for a motion. Mr. Tasselli moved to approve the January minutes. Ms. Blackburn seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

2. JARC Project Selection

Presenter: Angela Schlottman, Centralina COG

Summary/Action Requested:

Ms. Schlottman noted that there had previously been two calls for projects to submit applications for JARC and New Freedom grant funds, and that there was still approximately \$130K of JARC funding available so CATS subcontracted with Centralina COG to facilitate a third call for projects. There was a one week turnaround for applications to be submitted and two applications were received – one from CATS and one from Aminah Ministries. Ms. Schlottman indicated that the application from Aminah Ministries was incomplete so the selection committee chose to award the CATS project – which is an extension of the existing Gold Rush Red Line – with the remaining JARC funds. Mr. Coxe suggested that an outreach opportunity prior to the next round of JARC and New Freedom funding to provide potential applicants with information about the programs and the application process would be useful.

Motion:

Mr. Flaherty made a motion to approve the JARC application submitted by CATS, as recommended by the selection committee. Mr. Berger seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3. CMAQ Follow Up

Presenter: Nicholas Polimeni

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Polimeni stated that this item was on the January TCC agenda, and at that time it was recommended that further discussion take place at a transportation staff meeting. He noted that the item was discussed at the January 19 staff meeting, and outlined the results of that meeting. Finally, he suggested that based on the discussions and input regarding the CMAQ process to date, the only action before the TCC is to recommend that the MPO endorse clarifications to the CMAQ criteria and not open the CMAQ criteria for discussion at this time. Mr. Steinman stated that he would like to see more points assigned to the Pollutant Reduction category in the criteria, that innovation should be considered in the criteria, that a list of project nominations be submitted long before the next CMAQ call for projects, and that a panel of outside experts provide the emission reduction calculations for all applications submitted. Mr. Polimeni responded that these issues were discussed at the transportation staff meeting on January 19, except the issue of providing a list of project nominations before the next CMAQ call for projects. He stated that those represented at the staff meeting, including several CMAQ subcommittee members, believed the point structure to be sound, that innovation is difficult to evaluate so should not be included and that involving a panel of outside experts to provide calculations would be time consuming and costly and was not recommended. Ms. Rhodes added that members of the LUESA air quality staff not involved with the TCC are asked to review the applications for correctness and are available to help make calculations for all applicants, if requested. Mr. Coxe suggested that the criteria could be looked at in the future, if necessary, but for the time being asked if the TCC was comfortable making a recommendation to the MPO to endorse the clarifications.

Motion:

Mr. McDonald made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed clarifications to the CMAQ ranking criteria as presented. Ms. Rhodes seconded the motion. The motion passed with 14 votes in favor and two votes opposed.

4. CATS 2009-2015 TIP Amendment

Presenter: David McDonald, CATS

Summary/FYI:

Mr. McDonald informed the TCC about an amendment regarding TIP project number U-5210, described in the TIP as "Flex STP funding to CATS" to be used for a capital project – replacement of the fuel tank farm at the N. Davidson Street bus garage – as agreed upon previously by the TCC and MPO, to be included in the 2012-2018 TIP. The funds are designated for fiscal year 2011, so an amendment to the current 2009-2015 TIP will be required also. Mr. McDonald indicated that the TCC will be asked to take action on the amendment at its March meeting.

5. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook informed the TCC that the MPO, at its January meeting, endorsed the project list as recommended by the TCC with the exception of the Rea Road project. He stated that the MPO received information at its meeting that compelled it to extend the decision on the Rea Road project for 60 days (to the March MPO meeting). Mr. Coxe asked if the TCC would receive information prior to its March meeting, and Mr. Moose

stated that those involved with the project are aware of the sensitivity of the deadline and will be providing information as soon as possible. Mr. Cook also noted that the MPO will have a special meeting in April to release the documents related to air quality conformity for public comment. He also announced that the public meeting for the Streetcar TIP amendment is scheduled for February 16. He then stated that Barry Moose, with NCDOT's Division 10 had an announcement related to the draft TIP.

Mr. Moose stated that funding had become available to advance the proposed I-77 HOT lanes project, and also allow other I-77 projects currently in the TIP to be included as part of the HOT lanes project. He apologized for the short notice, but indicated that he just became aware of this possibility and wants the input of the TCC before he proceeds. The proposal, as well as comments and questions regarding the proposal are summarized as follows:

- Use funds currently programmed in the outer years of the TIP to widen I-77 to eight lanes in each direction, including conversion of a HOV lane to a HOT lane, to exit 28
 - Incorporate TIP project I-3311E to widen substandard lanes on I-77 to the proper width, as part of this project
 - Complete the remaining portion of project I-3311B, to widen I-77 from I-485 to NC 73 by adding a general purpose lane in each direction, as part of this project
- Total project cost would be about \$100 million
- One concern relates to a Feasibility Study that was completed regarding the HOT lane and whether the demand for the HOT lane would be as high with this proposed concept; one solution is to build the infrastructure for eight lanes, but only open six lanes until the demand is there
- The NCTA will help with the environmental review for the I-77 project(s)
- The funding for the project could be moved to fiscal year 2014, with construction possibly beginning in October 2013
- Ms. Blackburn asked how the environmental review could be expedited as part of this proposal, and stated concerns about the proposed project stopping at Exit 28 which will impact traffic at the causeway across Lake Norman
 - Mr. Moose responded that a consultant has already been procured, which would help speed up the process, but that the scope for project I-4750 would change
 - He also stated that including the causeway across Lake Norman as part of the environmental review for this proposal would affect the timeline, and that a bottleneck is inevitable regardless of where the proposed project stops
- Mr. Steinman suggested that if new funds are available, perhaps other projects should be considered for funding – such as Independence Blvd
 - Mr. Moose responded that most of the funding for the I-77 proposal is existing money programmed in the TIP for future year I-77 projects, and that those funds would be shifted to accelerate the proposed project – about \$30 million of the total cost are new funds
- Mr. McDonald asked if overspending now would impact the region's ability to fund future year projects
 - Mr. Moose indicated that he did not envision that happening unless there were some unforeseen budget impacts
- Mr. Langen asked if discussions led to a determination of no HOT lanes being included in the I-77 project, would that free up funds
 - Mr. Moose stated that it was possible that about \$30 million in equity funds could be available, but that he has other priorities in his division that he would have to consider for application of those funds
- Mr. Coxe concluded the discussion by stating that he would like to have a subcommittee meet to discuss the proposal presented and report back to the TCC prior to a final decision on the matter – the following people were identified to participate on the subcommittee: David McDonald,

Norm Steinman, Lauren Blackburn, a Cornelius representative, a MUMPO staff representative, Jack Flaherty and Bill Coxe. Mr. Moose would also be included in the meeting.

Mr. Moose also stated that TIP project R-4902, to widen the south leg of I-485 from I-77 to US 521 to six lanes, could be advanced too. Mr. Cook added that changes to the timeline of project R-4902 and Airport Road (which will now be a city funded project) would require amendments to the LRTP. It was also noted that modeling will be a concern regarding the timeline of the TIP.

6. Draft 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook provided an update regarding the draft 2012 UPWP, stating that no information has yet been provided by FHWA regarding the amount of funds to be allocated. He provided a spreadsheet that included information about Planning (PL) fund local project allotments from previous fiscal years. Ms. Helms provided an update on the Union County projects proposed for UPWP funding. She stated that those involved are leaning toward the Highway 74 revitalization project, and if it is feasible, breaking the project into two phases. Ms. Helms noted that discussions with local boards in Union County had begun and that the scope of the project would be discussed at a February transportation staff meeting. Ms. Stiwinter indicated that Monroe's Board supports the project.

7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker was not present at the meeting, so no update was provided.

8. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 AM.



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE
CORNELIUS
DAVIDSON
HUNTERSVILLE
INDIAN TRAIL
MATTHEWS
MECKLENBURG
COUNTY
MINT HILL
MONROE
NCDOT
PINEVILLE
STALLINGS
UNION
COUNTY
WAXHAW
WEDDINGTON
WESLEY CHAPEL
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary
DATE: February 24, 2011
SUBJECT: **Charlotte Streetcar LRTP & TIP Amendments and Conformity Determinations**

BACKGROUND

The City of Charlotte has received a \$24.99 million grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) that will permit construction of a 1.5 mile segment of a proposed streetcar line. The segment in question runs from the Charlotte Transportation Center to the intersection of Elizabeth Avenue and Hawthorne Lane. (The entire project runs from the Rosa Parks Transit Center (near the I-85/Beatties Ford Road interchange) to the former Eastland Mall.)

The project requires \$12 million in matching funds. The Charlotte City Council voted in July 2010 to commit \$12 million in City funds to the required match.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Receipt of the grant requires the following actions to permit the project to proceed:

- 1. Amend the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**
This action is required because the LRTP shows the entire project in the 2035 horizon year. If approved, the proposed amendment will place the 1.5 mile segment in the 2015 horizon year, with the balance of the project remaining in the LRTP in 2035.
- 2. Amend the 2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
This action is required because the current TIP does not show funding for the project.
- 3. Make conformity determinations on the amended LRTP and TIP**
This action is required because MPOs must make conformity determinations not only on newly adopted LRTPs and TIPs, but on amended versions of the same documents.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The following public outreach efforts were conducted:

- A public comment period was held from January 24 through February 23*
- Ads were published in the Mecklenburg Times, Que Pasa and Charlotte Post
- Documents were posted for public review in the main branch of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Library and at the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
- A media advisory distributed via e-mail on January 24
 - The media advisory was resent February 14
- Notification was sent to all MUMPO distribution lists

- MUMPO staff participated in two Charlotte Transportation Action Plan (TAP) update meetings (Feb 9 & 10) and provided the appropriate documents for public review
- MUMPO's website was updated with all pertinent information
- E-mail sent to the Gov Delivery list
- Public meeting held on Wednesday, February 16

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD EXTENDED

MUMPO's website went down early on Wednesday, February 23 and was not fully restored until the afternoon of Thursday, February 24. This resulted in a lack of access to the streetcar project-related documents posted for public review. For this reason, the public comment period has been extended to 5:00 PM, Monday, February 28.

The public comments received through the morning of February 24 are attached to this memorandum. Additional comments received after February 24 will be provided on March 1.



**Charlotte Streetcar Project
Public Comments
2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment
2035 Long Range Transportation Plan Amendment
Air Quality Conformity Determination**

The following comments concerning the required MUMPO actions on the Charlotte Streetcar project were received during the public comment period-January 25, 2011 through February 23, 2011.

Comments Received by E-Mail

Comment 1

When are you bureaucrats going to stop wasting taxpayer to increase your hat size? Why don't you all become day traders and waste your own money to increase your egos? The USA should do what they do to Middle Easterners who steal, cut off their hands. I guess someone forget to tell the public about the additional 12 million dollars coming from the city's General Fund of 12 million. 36 million dollars would go a long way to feed the homeless or to educate the uneducated or doesn't it matter that 22% of the population in Mecklenburg county is illiterate. I guess if they reduced that percentage then the Jack Asses wouldn't control the county huh?
Edward Bock [tong_92@yahoo.com]

Comment 2

We are broke!
AUSTINM1@nationwide.com

Comment 3

Dear Mr. Cook,
Sorry I can't make the meeting this afternoon - I've got a dental appointment.

Regarding the streetcar, I don't think it is worth all the money that has already been poured into it. It just doesn't serve as many people as it should, nor does it take them far enough. If this was needed, it could be done with Gold Rush vehicles and not have all the infrastructure costs.

Please discontinue this project.

I see that the website mentions a \$25 million federal grant. Why doesn't it also mention the \$12 million General Fund money pledged by Charlotte?

Thank you,

Tim Wallace
1051-A Churchill Downs Court
Charlotte, NC 28211
704-442-8658
Tim Wallace [timwgov@yahoo.com]

Comment 4

If we are doing this with the private support of others, we need a streetcar...why?

dej57@aol.com

(This e-mail correspondence included as an attachment a recent Charlotte Observer article about the extension of CATS's Gold Rush service to the campuses of Johnson C. Smith University and Central Piedmont Community College.)

Comment 5

<http://mumpo.org/CharlotteStreetcarProject.htm>

There is no mention of the \$12m the city has to come up with, nor the operation costs the city will pay, on this webpage.

Why?

If you are asking for comments from the public don't you think the costs should be accurately reported? Why mention the \$25 mil grant but not the other cost to the taxpayers of the city?

Dale Johnson
Charlotte
dej57@aol.com

Comment 6

I understand you are the person to talk to right now for those of us who are pro fiscal responsibility and against the street car project. If there had been a reasonable ridership study.. If funding was available for this and future segments.. If the city streets were wide enough to accommodate the tracks without disrupting traffic.. and if tax payers were not already stretched to the max and facing a property revvluation I might consider supporting this project. As it is however this is going to be another in a long line of money losing projects. Please do your part to not put us on the hook for another multi million dollar boondoggle.

See also, whitewater center, NASCAR hall of fame, light rail, numerous museuems etc.

Thanks,
Jared
jared@jaredwatkins.com

Comment 7

Dear Mr. Cook and members of the MUMPO Board,

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar.

The logic behind my request is as follows:

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

In these difficult economic times, with no end in sight for local, state and federal government budget issues, I believe it is fiscally unwise to advance special spending projects, such as MUMPO, outside their allotted schedule, especially when future funding is highly uncertain (this last point being especially important because the unemployment is and will continue to be stubbornly high for many years and our state government is running a multi-BILLION dollar deficit). Certainly, the very, very small percentage of Mecklenburg county citizens that would benefit from the Street Car project advancement can utilize the current means of transportation available to them for the foreseeable future - there is no such thing as a 'Street Car project emergency.' Compared to the widening of 485 which would not only benefit ALL Mecklenburg county constituents but would benefit ALL peoples traveling the highway in the Charlotte area, the MUMPO project would affect such a minute percentage of the population that it is laughable that the MUMPO project would even be considered before the 485 widening project. Your insistence and sense of urgency to begin this project makes me seriously wonder WHY this 'Street Car project' is such a priority in your minds. What information am I missing? Is there some sort of benefit you, personally, stand to gain from expediting this project?

Please help restore fiscal sanity in this age of irresponsible spending and corruption.

Kind regards,
Melissa McGinnis
221 Village Glen Way
Mount Holly, NC 28120
704-820-6479

Comment 8

I cannot understand why the city wants to build a streetcar we don't need. It is a bad idea in good times, and an insane idea in bad times. We are broke. Why are we doing this?
Jay Privette [njjay@yahoo.com]

Comment 9

Hello,

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar. Please also consider the following points;

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

I do not live in Mecklenburg County however, I frequent often. If this passes, I personally refuse to pay ANY additional taxes (outside of the transit tax) to support this and will do everything in my power to **avoid** spending money in Mecklenburg County. This project looks like a money pit that will take a long time to complete, cost 4X as much as initially proposed, and will not be used/ become a popular mode of transportation.

I hope you will consider my email.

Thank you,
Jessica Campbell
Mooresville, NC
704-657-1151

Comment 10

This does not make sense to spend money on a street car and Bus line in the same area. I do not know who had to do what to work this out, but this city needs to stop wasting money. Finish half done projects and get their finances in order. As residence we are expected to do that so how about you folks doing the same. Please start being good stewards of the money you have taken from us.

Sharon Stoneburner
ALLEN STONEBURNER [astoneburner@bellsouth.net]

Comment 11

Hi, As a residents of Charlotte, we'd like to express our opinion regarding the Streetcar project that's being proposed. With the other options for public transportation, we don't believe that this project warrants public funds and we certainly think that this is a very bad time fiscally to be approving spending public funds (even Federal) for this project that will have little impact on Charlotte residents and taxpayers. Other forms of transportation (ie lightrail & 485 completion/expansions) would serve more residents for the dollars spent.

This is just our opinion.

Thanks for your service!

W. Nelson & Kathy Blackburn

6506 Park Road

Charlotte, NC 28210

Nelson Blackburn [wnbklb@bellsouth.net]

Comment 12

"I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar." If following in the footsteps of other "bankrupt" city means world-class, let's just can it.

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. the community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

This is not Washington and it's not California. We don't have to follow them by going broke. I just wish you people would handle "our taxpayer money" the way you handle your own. So many of us are disappointed with the poor money management and judgement our city leaders are using.

Ruth Coffey

(704) 553-0617

Ruth Coffey [rsteffe@bellsouth.net]

Comment 13

To whom it may concern:

I urge you not to put changes into the LRTP by advancing and putting ahead on the list the streetcar. This will prioritize this mode of transportation at the expense of more worthy transit items. The widening of major roads will, by default, be put further down the list of priorities.

At over 1 million in operating cost per year for a street line of just over a mile, this project does not seem economically feasible in these tough economic times. It is estimated only 400 plus riders per day, and the bus line already serves that area.

Sincerely,

Dru S. Robson
Dru Robson [drurobson@hotmail.com]

Comment 14

We are very strongly against the Elizabeth streetcar!!! Why spend that kind of money on something that will benefit so few people and is so expensive? Especially when monies are short and we don't "need" this service. Thank you very much.

Ron and Cathy Walker
3517 Providence Manor Road, Clt, NC
Ron & Cathy [catronwalk@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 15

Mr. Cook,

We are writing to request that plans for the uptown trolley be tabled for now. If the streetcar is placed on MUMPO's priority list, it will compete for State and NCDOT money against more important projects such as the Light Rail Expansion, 458 widening, and other road projects. The streetcar does not make good economic sense in today's strained economy.

Chuck & Darie Lapp
6515 Chestnut Grove Lane
Charlotte, NC 28210
Tel 704 553 9692
CWL Cell: 704 621 0247
DCL Cell: 704 589 8422
Charles W. Lapp [cwlapp@drlapp.net]

Comment 16

Dear Robert and Fellow Board Members,

"I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar."

Three good reasons to oppose the Streetcar on MUMPO:

1. If the Streetcar gets on MUMPO's Priority list, it can compete for State and NCDOT money against the Light Rail Expansion, 458 widening and other road projects. That means some road widening projects will be delayed.
2. The Streetcar is a City of Charlotte Project, CATS refuses to deal with it. MUMPO is supposed to work on regional transportation solutions for Mecklenburg and Union Counties, not political pet projects.

3. The Streetcar does not make economic sense during these tight budget years. The 1.5 mile line will cost \$1.5 million tax payer dollars to operate per year and is only expecting 475 round trip rides per day. And CATS said it will still operate a Bus Line down Elizabeth Avenue. Do we need a bus line and a street car on the same short route??

Please note the following points:

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. the community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Thank you for your support with this serious matter of stopping this wasteful use of taxpayers dollars!

Craig Walser

CraigWalser@aol.com

Comment 16

Dear Mr. Cook:

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program to advance construction of the proposed streetcar. Even though I love streetcars (they have a certain nostalgic charm), I do not approve of public projects when there is no means of funding such. I understand there is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. In addition, the proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines.

Even though I would like to see this done at an appropriate time, this is not that time. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. When I was a student at Central High School in the 50's, I WALKED that corridor many times. When necessary, that is certainly doable for most people.

I understand that the federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources

possible to build out the corridor. Tell the Federal Transit Administration to return their unused funds to the federal government to help pay down our federal debt. NO ONE should start projects for which they do not have adequate funding.

Sincerely,

Jean B. Whipple
Nelson Whipple [nandjwhip@earthlink.net]

Comment 17

Dear Mr. Cook,

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar.

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,
Sandra Moravec
Charlotte resident
frank & sandra moravec [fs.moravec@yahoo.com]

Comment 18

"I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar."

In order to communicate effectively this position, please note the following points:

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may

become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.

2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.

3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.

4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.

5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Chris Nosko [chrisnosko@gmail.com]

Comment 19

Robert W. Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary

Dear Mr. Cook:

I urge you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar. My primary concern is the issue of funding for the streetcar. Please maintain the existing regional transit plan at this time. I appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Thank you for your service to the community.

Catherine Jeffrey
10620 Andiron Drive
Matthews, NC
Catherine L. Jeffrey [CJeffrey@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 20

Robert W. Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary

Dear Mr. Cook:

I urge you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar. My primary concern is the issue of funding for the streetcar. Please maintain the existing regional transit plan at this time. I appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Thank you for your service to the community.

Alice Mayer
3325 Tilley Morris Rd.
Alice Mayer [amayer@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 21

Mecklenburg Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO)

Dear Mr. Robert W. Cook, MUMPO Secretary and Members of the MUMPO Board:

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed Charlotte streetcar.

There is no funding for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does not address this matter. Moving the streetcar project may actually promote future extension for the streetcar instead of other more necessary projects on the LRTP. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley. Advancing the construction of this project is just not necessary.

Members outside the City of Charlotte, please consider that if the Streetcar gets on MUMPO's priority list, it can then compete for State and NCDOT money against the Light Rail Expansion, I-485 widening, and other road projects. Many projects of interest in areas like Huntersville, Matthews, and Mint Hill will be delayed.

Please DO NOT change the Long Range Transportation Plan to advance the construction of the Charlotte streetcar.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Judy McMillan
3149 Winding Trail
Matthews, NC 28105
Judy McMillan [jmcmillan2301@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 22

Mr. Cook:

I will try to attend the meeting...In advance of that, I think we should keep our spending down on the streetcar itself because too much has already been spent in advance especially via payments to planners....I am on the Streetcar Neighborhood Cmte and didn't really digest this until the end when the cost was mentioned (I am sure I was told earlier...) We were given money by the Fed Govt but only a limited amount. The streetcar in New Orleans I have seen is very basic, with no shelters, etc. in the part where I have visited. The new one I saw photographs of last week looked expensive to me. Maybe it's not. We are closing schools and whether that is related or not, it will appear to be in the minds of the unknowing....I am a very big proponent of mass transit but I believe in tough economic times and given the ways citizens might think (perhaps), we should be careful to get the job done but in an inexpensive and basic manner. The Lynx is fancy and a fairly new purchase.....the streetcar might need to not create such a flair. Also, I SAID FROM THE BEGINNING THAT I DID NOT THINK IT SHOULD RUN STRAIGHT THROUGH THE SQUARE. Maybe I am wrong. It will be congested with buses,

streetcar, cars, taxis, and the Bobcats Arena just down the block...These comments may not be relevant to your open period...they are just what's on my own mind.

Lisa Rudisill Bradley
rebelfine@yahoo.com

Comment 23

Dear Members of the MUMPO Board,

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar."

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Thank you for your hard work and consideration of my viewpoints.

Sincerely,
William P. Anderson
William Anderson [wpanderson01@gmail.com]

Comment 24

Dear Mr. Cook,

My name is Jason Kitchel. I live in the Plaza Midwood area of Charlotte and have an office in Ballantyne. I also have sales responsibility for the Carolinas and surrounding states. I deal first hand with the travel bottlenecks around the city on a daily basis. It is for this reason and the excessive cost that I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar.

Thank you for doing the right thing.

Thanks,
Jason

Jason Kitchel
kitchejm@hotmail.com
765-404-5966

Support:

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. the community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Comment 25

"I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar." Here the reasons.

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. the community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

I hope you listen to voice of the people and do the right thing.

Sincerely

Suba Hirschler

Realtor/Broker NC/SC Suba Hirschler [shirschler1@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 26

I implore all of you to hold up on the streetcar proposal until a full plan and funding for a full plan is available for this project. I also ask that you not change the Long Range Transportation Plan or the Transportation Improvement Program. I don't feel that we the taxpayers should be burdened with additional taxes or fees for a mile and a half line that would only affect the people in the corridor involved. We the people who live in Mecklenburg county and surrounding towns do not need another Whitewater park type deal that drains money from the county that could be used for school teachers or facilities. With the National, State, and local economies in a downward spiral we should not be spending money on the Streetcar project.

I thank you all for your support on this concern and pray that you will hold up on the Streetcar project until the full plan and funding is clear to all of us who live in this area.

Best regards,
Edward T Allred
Charlotte, NC
Tom Allred [tomaunc1@bellsouth.net]

Comment 27

Mr. Cook,

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar.

If the Streetcar gets on **Mecklenburg Union Metropolitan Planning Organization** priority list, it can compete for State and NCDOT money against the Light Rail Expansion, I-485 widening and other road projects. That means some road widening projects will be delayed.

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar at the expense of other higher priority, more necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. The Streetcar does not make economic sense during these tight budget years. The 1.5 mile line will cost \$1.5 million tax payer dollars to operate per year and is only expecting 475 round trip rides per day. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley. Do we need a bus line and a street car on the same short route?
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar. You, of course, are aware of this. Is it fiscally responsible and prudent to build something out of sequence without a solid plan to pay for the entire project?
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, interesting enough, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, however, not the streetcar as a separate project.

5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure on Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible to build out the corridor. Something would have to give and it would most likely be on the back of the taxpayers in one form or another.

The Streetcar is a City of Charlotte Project, CATS refuses to deal with it. MUMPO is supposed to work on regional transportation solutions for Mecklenburg and Union Counties, not political pet projects.

We all want what is right and fiscally prudent for the citizens of Mecklenburg and Union Counties. As a taxpaying citizen of Mecklenburg County, once again I strongly urge you to refrain from changing the LRTP to advance construction of an unfunded liability during increasingly negative economic times.

Best regards,

Mark Redlich
Redlich [redlmjho@att.net]

Comment 28

Mr. Cook,

As a former Charlotte resident, I would regard a streetcar on Elizabeth Avenue as a costly and superfluous expense – especially in these tight times. Now that I live in nearby Harrisburg, I would oppose it even more on the grounds that progress on more pressing regional needs would suffer as a consequence. As the president of the Bradfield Farms Homeowners Association at the time the I-485 interchange was being considered at our entrance area, I attended MUMPO meetings and appreciated the extensive efforts that go into planning. However, this doesn't appear to be an actual need at all. Thank you for sharing my opinion with the MUMPO members – even if I am “just a number.”

Phil Clutts
7664 Cotton Street
Harrisburg, NC
Phil Clutts [pclutts@earthlink.net]

Comment 29

Build a streetcar during a deep recession? Estimated under 500 riders/day? Millions to build? BAD IDEA.
Refrain.

TJ Profera
Charlotte NC
Tony Profera [tprofera@hotmail.com]

Comment 30

Mr. Cook: I am opposed to funding a streetcar in Charlotte, in the economic recession. Most residents use cars, not street cars. Already about 1 in 5 tax dollars go to service our debt (perhaps that's county,) but still- in hard economic times, the last thing we need is more frivolity such as this streetcar. What a waste of tax dollars. Our local government has spent a lot of money these last years in the field of entertainment, which I don't think is the role of government.

Deborah Presson

Deborah Presson [dpre71@bellsouth.net]

Comment 31

Robert W. Cook, AICP

MUMPO Secretary

600 E. Fourth St.

Charlotte, NC 28202

Mr. Cook:

I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar. We can't pay for this program!

There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.

The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.

Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.

The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. the last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. the community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.

The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

In Liberty,

Kathryn Reilly

Katie Reilly [kaydee728@yahoo.com]

Comment 32

"I strongly encourage you NOT to change the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to advance construction of the proposed streetcar."

1. There is no identified funding plan for the full streetcar corridor. Moving the date of the streetcar in the LRTP does nothing to address this point. In fact, moving the project may become a reason to promote future extension of the streetcar, at the expense of other necessary projects on the LRTP.
2. The proposed streetcar project does not meet any transportation need. The mile and a half corridor proposed for construction is currently served in its entirety by two bus lines. Five other transit lines serve part of the corridor, including the free-to-ride Gold Rush trolley.
3. Advancing the streetcar violates the regional transit plan adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The regional vision for transit focuses on the Blue Line Extension and the Red Line before the streetcar.
4. The streetcar does not have consensus support within Charlotte. The last vote by the Charlotte City Council on the streetcar was 6 to 5. Furthermore, the vast majority of supporters of the streetcar live or work in the corridor itself. In contrast, a majority of voters in all but two precincts in Mecklenburg County supported the transit tax in 2007. The community supports the transit tax and the transit plan, not the streetcar as a separate project.
5. The federal grant for the streetcar is not from a regularly-funded program. Instead, the money came from a discretionary pool of one-time unused funds controlled by the Federal Transit Administration. Without a funding plan in place, construction of a portion of the streetcar line creates future pressure for Charlotte to find money from whatever sources possible, to build out the corridor.

Thank you for your time.

Concerned Mecklenburg City Resident,
Elizabeth Thompson
Elizabeth [elizabetht@carolina.rr.com]

Comment 33

Scrap it! I cannot believe this beyond-ridiculous project is even up for consideration. It's a dumb, no, it's a stupid project which will cost taxpayers millions of dollars we don't have. The State and Char-Meck are broke! Please stop this nonsensical spending. Thank you.
Patricia Salazar [salazarpe@bellsouth.net]

Comments Received at the Public Meeting

Comment 1

This is not a challenge, but can the project be started or completed much sooner . . . just a thought. To accelerate the project sooner, better than later has my attention. I support the amendment.

Aaron Sanders (Oaklawn Park Community Improvement Organization)
1414 Orvis St.
704-334-2048
Aarons.55@hotmail.com



MEMORANDUM

TO: TCC

FROM: E. David McDonald, II

SUBJECT: TIP Amendments for March 3, 2011

DATE: February 23, 2011

The Charlotte Area Transit System has been awarded capital funding for the replacement of underground fuel tanks at the North Davidson Bus Maintenance Facility. The funding for this project is currently in the FY12-18 STIP as U-5210 with funding shown in FY11. In order to utilize these funds, the Public Transportation Division of the NCDOT must assign a Transit TIP number (TD-4703B). The TIP amendment will add TD-4703B to the FY09-15 TIP so that these funds can be utilized for the North Davidson Project this fiscal year.

This \$1,500,000 in federal STP funding will be utilized to replace the nearly 30-year old underground fuel tanks and provide extra fuel storage capacity for the newly renovated North Davidson Bus Maintenance Campus.

The attached resolution adds the necessary TIP project to enable the approval and programming of the grant for this work.

RESOLUTION

**ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MECKLENBURG-UNION URBAN AREA
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR
FY2009-FY2015**

A motion was made by _____ and seconded by MPO Member _____ for the adoption of the resolution, and upon being put to a vote was duly adopted.

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has approved the 2030 Corridor System Plan previously adopted by the Metropolitan Transit Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization has reviewed the FY2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and found the need to amend it to be consistent with the 2030 Corridor System Plan; and

WHEREAS, the funding source for this project is Surface Transportation Program and local transit funds; and

WHEREAS, the following amendment has been proposed:

Add

<u>ID No.</u>	<u>System</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funding</u>	<u>FFY</u>
TD-4703B	Charlotte	INSTALLATION OF FUEL TANKS AT N. DAVIDSON ST. BUS GARAGE	STP \$ 1,500,000 STAT \$ 187,500 LOCAL \$ 187,500 TOTAL \$ 1,875,000	2011

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Planning Organization finds that the proposed amendment is for a stated project that is exempt from the requirements to determine air quality conformity; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendment is consistent with the amended *2035 Long Range Transportation Plan* (which has a planning horizon year of 2035), and meets all the requirements in 23 CFR 450.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Mecklenburg-Union Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization that the FY2009-FY2015 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program dated June, 2008, for the Mecklenburg-Union Urban Area is amended as listed above on this the 16st day of March, 2011.

Signature of MPO Chairman

MPO Secretary Signature

**Resolution of Support
Regarding Funding for Rail Improvements
in North Carolina and the Piedmont**

A motion was made by _____ and seconded by _____ for the adoption of the following resolution and upon being put to a vote, was duly adopted.

WHEREAS, the rail corridor running between Raleigh and Charlotte, North Carolina provides a vital connection for freight movement and passengers in the Piedmont and Southeastern United States; and

WHEREAS, this corridor has been identified as part of the Southeast High Speed Rail Corridor connecting New York to Washington, D. C., Charlotte and Atlanta; and

WHEREAS, in order for high-speed service to become viable along this corridor, numerous safety and modernization improvements must be implemented; and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation sought and received a commitment of more than \$545 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds to implement these improvements; and

WHEREAS, these funds are a critical investment in the future of rail service in North Carolina and the Southeastern United States;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization supports the allocation of ARRA funds for these North Carolina rail projects, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization strongly opposes the rescinding or reallocation of these funds by Congress to other projects.

I, Ted Biggers, Chairman of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of an excerpt from the minutes of a meeting of the Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization, duly held on this the 16th day of March, 2011.

Ted Biggers, Chairman

Robert W. Cook, Secretary



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE
CORNELIUS
DAVIDSON
HUNTERSVILLE
INDIAN TRAIL
MATTHEWS
MECKLENBURG
COUNTY
MINT HILL
MONROE
NCDOT
PINEVILLE
STALLINGS
UNION
COUNTY
WAXHAW
WEDDINGTON
WESLEY CHAPEL
WINGATE

TO: Technical Coordinating Committee
FROM: Robert W. Cook, AICP
MUMPO Secretary
DATE: February 24, 2011
SUBJECT: **Draft 2012-2018 Transportation Improvement Program**

Since February's meeting, several issues have emerged that require input from the TCC.

1. I-77

At their January meetings, the TCC and MPO supported converting the existing HOV lanes to HOT (high occupancy toll) lanes and to extend them to exit 28. NCDOT Division 10 Engineer Barry Moose presented an alternate proposal at the February TCC meeting that, in addition to the HOV lane conversion and extension, would result in the addition of a general purpose lane in each direction to exit 28. The alternate proposal would also result in completion of TIP project I-3311E, the widening of southbound I-77 lanes from I-85 to the Brookshire Freeway.

A meeting with NCDOT officials to further discuss the alternate proposal is scheduled for March 2 in Raleigh.

2. TIP Project R-4902, I-485 widening from I-77 to Johnston Road

NCDOT recently announced that this project has been accelerated. Construction is currently programmed to start in FY 2015. The proposed start is FY 2013. The accelerated start date will require an LRTP amendment.

3. TIP Project U-203, Airport Entrance Road

This project was originally the responsibility of NCDOT; however, Charlotte-Douglas International Airport has elected to build it. Because it is classified as regionally significant, it must be included in MUMPO's TIP and LRTP.

4. TIP Project U-5116

STP-DA funds were originally applied to this project to realign Little Rock Road in northwest Charlotte. The City of Charlotte, which is administering the project, now proposes to use the funds to construct a portion of the I-485/Prosperity Church Road interchange in northeast Charlotte. A separate presentation on this topic will be provided at the meeting.

5. NC 27/Freedom Drive Improvements, Edgewood Road to Toddville Road

This project is funded by the City of Charlotte. Because NC 27 is classified as regionally significant, the project must be included in MUMPO's TIP.

6. TIP CMAQ Project

The City of Charlotte would like to shift funding for its Harburn Forest Connectivity Improvements project from FY 2013 to FY 2014.

OTHER OUTSTANDING ISSUES

The MPO delayed action on the Rea Road Extension project (U-3467) until its March meeting. Local officials requested additional time to work on a proposal that will allow the project to proceed. No additional information on this project has been received.

ACTION REQUESTED

No formal action is requested at this time; however, guidance on the above listed projects will be sought.