



RECORD OF MEETING

To: US 64 Stakeholder Workshop Participants

From: Peter Trencansky

Date: November 12, 2009

Revised: December 16, 2009

Subject: **Report of Meeting, US 64 Corridor Study Stakeholder Workshop, October 22, 2009**

A Stakeholder Workshop was held at the Apex Town Hall on October 22, 2009 from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. The attendees were as follows:

Stakeholders

Kevin Sergent	Apex High School
Steve Goodridge	CAMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Stakeholders Group
Wayne Clark	Bicycling Enthusiast
Kendall Maynard	Resident - Abbingdon
Daniel Martin	Resident - Castlewood
Edwin Yarter	Resident - Knollwood
Jeffrey Symm	Resident - Shepherd's Vineyard
Graham Wilson	Apex Planning Board/Resident - Shepherd's Vineyard
Dan Epstein	Save64.org/Resident - MacGregor West
Laura Cobb	Save64.org/Resident - MacGregor West
Barbara Vaughn	Save64.org/Resident - MacGregor West
Dave Frac	Resident - Normandie
Melissa Morauer	Resident - MacGregor Downs/HOA
Mike Franklin	Resident - MacGregor Downs
Phil Martin	Resident - MacGregor Downs
Howard Johnson	Cary Chamber of Commerce
Anthony Blackman	Cary Chamber of Commerce
David Lewis	Lord Corporation
Brenda Steen	Apex Chamber of Commerce
Christina Zadell	Bradley's Carpet
Mike Desmond	Hendrick Auto Group

Corridor Study Team Members

David Wasserman	North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) – Strategic Planning Office
Terry Arellano	NCDOT – Transportation Planning Branch
Wally Bowman	NCDOT – Division 5
Joey Hopkins	NCDOT – Division 5
James Dunlop	NCDOT – Congestion Management
Bob Mosher	NCDOT – Bicycle and Pedestrian Division
Shannon Sweitzer	North Carolina Turnpike Authority (NCTA)



Jennifer Harris	NCTA
Ed Johnson	Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)
Kenneth Withrow	CAMPO
Juliet Andes	Town of Cary
Lori Cove	Town of Cary
Eric Simpson	Town of Cary
Russell Dalton	Town of Apex
Reed Huegerich	Town of Apex
Melissa Guilbeau	Chatham County
Peter Trencansky	URS Corporation
Mark Freeman	Gibson Engineers

Other Participants

Joe Milazzo II	Regional Transportation Alliance
Dr. Joe Hummer	North Carolina State University
Brad Hibbs	Federal Highway Administration
Bradley Reynolds	HNTB (NCTA Consultant)
Kristen Maseman	HW Lochner (NCTA Consultant)
Donna Dancausse	Facilitator

Elected Officials (afternoon session)

Nelson Dollar	NC House of Representatives
Julie Robison	Mayor Pro-Tem/Cary Town Council
Gale Adcock	Cary Town Council
Keith Weatherly	Mayor of Apex
Mike Jones	Mayor Pro-Tem/Apex Town Council
Sally Kost	Chatham County Commissioners

Welcome and Introductions

Donna Dancausse began the meeting at 8:35 AM by distributing a copy of the agenda and introducing herself as the facilitator for the workshop. Ms. Dancausse explained that the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Discuss the comments received from the July 16th Community Meeting
- Discuss the results of the August 20th Corridor Study Team meeting to re-evaluate the plans
- Allow the stakeholders to provide feedback on revised recommendations
- Have a work session to discuss any concerns, ask questions, develop alternative ideas, and try to develop consensus on the solutions
- Discuss the results of the work session and determine where consensus was established

Ms. Dancausse then asked each of the stakeholders to introduce themselves, state why they were participating in the workshop, and to answer one or more of three questions. The three questions asked and a summary of the responses provided are as follows:

- What do you like about the current US 64?
 - Flexibility to get to many places (small businesses and home to work) (multiple people supported this comment)
 - Boulevard atmosphere
 - Easy for cyclists to cross
 - Quick, easy alternative to Cary Parkway
 - Center of the community – main street

- Wide paved shoulders
- How much people care about it
- What about US 64 would you not want to change?
 - Nothing
 - Don't lose flexibility
 - Don't encourage more through traffic
 - No control of access (maintain access)
 - Cross street access
 - Greenery and aesthetic quality
 - Access to businesses
 - Keep it a place where our children can live
- If you could change one thing about US 64, what would you change?
 - Safety – truly sharing the road with all users
 - Increase safety at Apex High School (multiple people supported this comment)
 - Relieve congestion at Laura Duncan Road
 - Discourage school traffic from using Knollwood
 - Grade separation at Lake Pine and Laura Duncan to address congestion
 - Not waiting at traffic lights
 - Make all lights able to be tripped by a bicycle
 - Prepare for future growth and traffic
 - Build a bypass and rename section from US 1 to NC 540 as Tryon Road
 - Improve service for bicycle and pedestrian crossing
 - Discourage truck through traffic
 - Lower speed limit
 - Provide traffic signal at Fern Valley
 - Use NC 540 as a bypass and remove toll
 - Improve Lake Pine crossing to park, especially for bicyclists
 - Improve safety of access to the library
 - Prohibit compression braking to reduce noise

Following the introductions the Study Team members introduced themselves and Ms. Dancausse reviewed the ground rules for the workshop and introduced David Wasserman, who presented an overview of the project study process and the current status.

Project Study Process and Status Presentation

Mr. Wasserman made a presentation that included the scope and intent of the study; the study process; the purpose of the short and long range plans; the study timeline, and the focus of today's work session.

The presentation was interactive with the stakeholders and included several comments and questions including the following:

- Stakeholders wanted to know what was considered regional traffic and what was considered local traffic. Mr. Johnson stated that for discussion purposes the local traffic was that generated in the Cary and Apex area and that regional traffic was generated within the triangle region.
- Stakeholders inquired how long the public comment period would be and if there would be more than one comment period. Mr. Wasserman responded that the details regarding comment periods were still being worked out and that the hope was to combine the Capital Area MPO comment period and the comment period for the study into a single 30-day review. Ed Johnson stated that it would include at least one 30-day comment period, but

may require additional review periods and that we would let the stakeholders know when it was determined.

Regional and Corridor Perspective

Mr. Johnson made a presentation on the future growth in the region and the effects of the growth of the US 64 corridor. Mr. Johnson stated that the current projections for growth show the triangle region increasing by 1.2 million people in the next 25 years. Mr. Johnson also reviewed maps that showed existing and future projections for households and employment that illustrated how the density in the area would be substantially greater in the future. Mr. Johnson then discussed the effects of NC 540 on the US 64 corridor, stating that 90% of the traffic on US 64 was generated or destined for a location within a 15-mile radius. Questions and comments were made by participants about the future growth projections and how they were generated. Many stakeholders didn't feel that the future growth matched the character of their communities. Mr. Johnson stated that the projections were based on the land use plans provided by the local municipalities.

Wally Bowman discussed the US 64 corridor from an NCDOT perspective. Mr. Bowman discussed his experience working along the corridor and noted that based on past experience the traffic projections for US 64 and other projects in the region have been low and that the 20-year projection is typically met within 12-17 years.

Following Mr. Bowman's presentation, Shannon Sweitzer discussed the plans for the Triangle Expressway (NC 540). Mr. Sweitzer stated that NCTA had a construction contract for the Western Wake section and that construction would begin in December 2009 with a completion date of 2013. Mr. Sweitzer also stated that NCTA had initiated the environmental studies on the remainder of NC 540 that would connect to US 64 near Knightdale. Mr. Sweitzer presented the design that will be constructed initially for NC 540 and discussed how the design would likely need to be modified in the future to accommodate the growth in traffic volumes including providing a collector-distributor lane. Mr. Sweitzer also showed simulations of the traffic at the interchanges at NC 540 and Kelly Road.

Primer on Intersection Types and Options

Peter Trencansky gave a presentation on the menu of potential intersection improvements, including those for signalized intersections and expressway and freeway treatments. The goal of the presentation was to provide the stakeholders with a background education into the reason for considering unconventional intersection designs and allow them to see the menu of options available. The presentation described how each solution would operate and provided a list of potential benefits and liabilities along with a qualitative star rating for various elements of the design. Several stakeholders inquired on how the star ratings were developed and it was explained by Mr. Trencansky that he developed the initial ratings based on engineering studies and literature and that the ratings were reviewed by the Corridor Study Team. Mr. Trencansky stressed that the concepts had flexibility and that some of the ratings were somewhat subjective, but that they provided a good relative comparison between each of the options for consideration when developing the solutions.

Review of Short-term and Long-term Solutions

Mr. Wasserman presented the short-term and long-term solutions for each intersection along the corridor, moving from the US 1 interchange west to Jenks Road. The presentation was based on the revised recommendations that were established at the August 20, 2009 Corridor Study Team Meeting. Mr. Wasserman stressed in the beginning that the elevated expressway option from east

of Lake Pine Drive to US 1 was no longer being recommended. The presentation included slides showing the original recommendation shown at Workshop #2, the options considered by the Corridor Study Team and the recommended solution. A summary of each intersection is as follows:

- US 1 Interchange: Short-term: No change in existing design
 Long-term: No change in existing design except possible additional ramp lanes
- Edinburgh Drive: Short-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (4-Lane US 64)
 Note: Town of Cary will add additional eastbound lane on US 64
 Long-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (6-Lane US 64)
- Gregson Drive: Short-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (4-Lane US 64)
 Long-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (6-Lane US 64)
- Mackenan/Chalon: Short-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (4-Lane US 64)
 Long-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn (6-Lane US 64)
- Autopark Boulevard: Short-term: Right-in/Right-out with Direct Major Street Left (4-Lane US 64)
 Long-term: Right-in/Right-out with Direct Major Street Left (6-Lane US 64)
- Lake Pine Drive: Short-term: Median U-turn Crossover
 Long-term: Tight Interchange (Modern Roundabout Design Preferred)
- Knollwood Drive: Short-term: Right-in/Right-out with Direct Major Street Left Turn
 Long-term: Right-in/Right-out
- Laura Duncan Road: Short-term: Tight Interchange (Modern Roundabout Design Preferred)
 Note: Interim solution may include Median U-turn Crossover
 Long-term: No change from Short-term
- Davis Drive: Short-term: No change in existing design
 Long-term: Davis Drive upgrades to provide more through and turning lanes
- Fern Valley Lane: Short-term: No change in existing design
 Long-term: Connection Closed and new Roadway to NC 55
- NC 55: Short-term: No change in existing design
 Long-term: NC 55 upgrades to provide more lanes and Collector-Distributor along westbound US 64
- Green Level Church: Short-term: No change from NC 540 design
 Long-term: Ties to Collector-Distributor instead of US 64
- NC 540: Short-term: No change from NC 540 design
 Long-term: Ties to Collector-Distributor instead of US 64
- Kelly Road: Short-term: No change from NC 540 design
 Long-term: Ties to Collector-Distributor instead of US 64

Kellyridge Road: Short-term: Right-in/Right-out with Direct Major Street Left Turn
Long-term: Right-in/Right-out onto Collector-Distributor

Jenks Road: Short-term: Superstreet with Direct Major Street Left Turn
Long-term: Partial Cloverleaf interchange

Throughout the presentation Mr. Wasserman provided clarification to the design and answered questions from the stakeholders.

Breakout Work Session on Corridor Designs

The workshop participants broke into four smaller groups to allow the stakeholders to discuss the design of the corridor with individual study team members. Each group was led by a facilitator and Corridor Study Team members circulated among the groups to provide insight and guidance when requested. Each group was given a corridor map with the recommended short-term and long-term solutions listed on the maps, a set of intersection aerial photographs to mark solutions on and a flip chart to document ideas. The stakeholders were encouraged to discuss the recommended designs and make suggestions on how the recommendations could be improved. The goal of the session was for the stakeholders to come to a consensus on what solutions would be most appropriate for the corridor for both the short-term and long-term options. Each group selected a spokesperson that would record and present the findings of the group during the report out session. The groups worked for approximately one and a half hours developing recommendations and discussing the corridor. Groups were encouraged to discuss specific concerns with the proposed recommendations at individual intersections.

Report Out on Breakout Sessions

The Stakeholders and Corridor Study Team were joined by the elected officials in the afternoon and came back together as a group to review the findings of the small group breakout sessions. The spokesperson for each group was invited to share a summary of the items that were discussed, as well as present any solutions that were developed. The following is a summary of the results of the breakout sessions:

Group 1 (Steve Goodridge – Spokesperson / Lori Cove – Facilitator)

General/Corridor-wide Issues:

- Desire to maintain east-west Corridor for bicycle traffic, request that US 64 not be made a controlled access facility
- Ensure improved pedestrian walkability for crossing US 64, especially to businesses
- Request that the Study Team not focus on through mobility at the expense of local access
- Request for more strategic land use planning to help address the access concerns
- Better and more consideration of side streets for multi-modal use
- Like maintaining medians for safety and aesthetics
- Better use of collector streets to enhance connectivity

Intersection Specific Comments:

- Liked the recommended design for both the short-term and long-term at Laura Duncan and Lake Pine
- Request to re-open Fern Valley access point as full movement intersection

- Some members of group felt that adding additional through lanes to US 64 in the median from Autopark Boulevard to US 1 and having traditional intersections was better than superstreet
- Did not like superstreet at Edinburgh but didn't have a recommended solution

Group 2 (Dan Epstein – Spokesperson / Terry Arellano – Facilitator)

General/Corridor-wide Issues:

- Desire to sign US 64 along US 1 and NC 540 and rename existing route as US 64 Business/Tryon Boulevard
- Lower speed limit to 45 miles per hour east of railroad bridges
- Like maintaining medians for safety and aesthetics
- Still concerns with superstreet – group wanted to hold off implementing them as long as possible

Intersection Specific Comments:

- Liked the recommended design for the tight interchange for Laura Duncan and both the short-term and long-term at Lake Pine
- Willing to wait for interchange at Laura Duncan but there is a need to address safety now
- Wanted consideration for pedestrian bridge at Laura Duncan prior to construction of tight interchange
- Recommended a ramp from US 1 directly into the back side of the office park

Group 3 (Joe Millazzo – Spokesperson/Facilitator)

General/Corridor-wide Issues:

- Some general concerns with the superstreet and aesthetics as it relates to community feel and look
- Some concern about traffic projections, but they feel study is worthwhile

Intersection Specific Comments:

- Liked the recommended design for both the short-term and long-term at Laura Duncan and Lake Pine
- Recommended pedestrian bridge at Laura Duncan Road for short-term
- Had some concerns with Laura Duncan Road interchange related to cost if it required replacing the railroad bridge

Group 4 (Brad Hibbs – Spokesperson/Facilitator)

General/Corridor-wide Issues:

- Felt that there was not a need for the short-term, except at Laura Duncan and Lake Pine
- Requested that nothing be done from US 1 to east of Lake Pine until NC 540 and additional lane on US 64 is in place and operating so that effects can be measured.
- Public interaction needed to be earlier and go beyond just those along the corridor
- Structures for Long-term solution should be aesthetic
- Further consider transit and other options for Long-term solution
- Safety should be the #1 concern and is more important than mobility
- Look at parallel routes to US 64 and improve them to increase safety
- Request to sign US 64 along US 1 and NC 540 and convert existing roadway to US 64 Business/Tryon Road

- Lower speed limit to 45 mile per hour east of Kellyridge Road. Include design features that signal to the driver that the context of the corridor has changed.
- Rename US 64 to divert truck traffic

Intersection Specific Comments:

- Liked the recommended design for both the short-term and long-term at Laura Duncan and Lake Pine
- Recommended delaying the conversion of Kellyridge Road to right-in/right-out and consider a signal due to access concerns
- Recommendation to purchase land in southeast quadrant of Laura Duncan intersection and see if it could be used to improve the intersection

Group Discussion of Recommendations

Following the reporting by the individual groups, Ms. Dancausse led a group discussion based on the information reported. The goal of the discussion was to determine if there were areas where we could reach a consensus on the solutions along the corridor. The following items were discussed by the overall group:

- It appeared that there was consensus around the short-term and long-term solutions at Lake Pine Drive. The stakeholders and Study Team members agreed that this was the best option for this location
- It appeared that there was consensus on the tight interchange at Laura Duncan Road as the short-term solution, with the Modern Roundabout design (Carmel, IN) as the preferred configuration, and both the stakeholders and Study Team agreed this was the best solution at this location. A discussion about the timing of the construction of the interchange took place, because it was not likely to be implemented in the very near future. Ms. Dancausse inquired if the interchange could not be built soon, whether the stakeholders would support a Median U-turn Crossover as an interim measure. The stakeholders felt that if any money were to be spent in the near term that it should be for a pedestrian overpass even if it was required to be removed when the interchange was constructed, instead of any operational improvements. The stakeholders also felt immediate measures to improve safety should be taken. It was agreed by the stakeholders and Study Team that the desire was to wait for the interchange as it was the best solution.
- The stakeholders felt strongly that a new ramp off of US 1 directly into the office park would solve a lot of the problems along US 64 between the US 1 interchange and Autopark Boulevard. The Corridor Study Team noted that there were engineering challenges to making the ramp feasible due to the distance between the US 64/Tryon Road interchange and the interchange at Ten-Ten Road. It was also noted that NCDOT typically does not include interchanges unless all movements (ramps providing full access to and from US 1) are provided because it causes drive confusion if the driver cannot return on the same route they entered on.
- The Edinburgh intersection was discussed extensively and there appeared to be agreement from the stakeholders that the superstreet was problematic. The stakeholders had a very strong desire to maintain the existing cross access and to preserve the ability to turn left, especially because the superstreet does not include a u-turn movement to accomplish the left turn due to the location of the US 1 ramps. Mr. Goodridge noted that the lack of an efficient crossing for advanced cyclists was an unfortunate effect of the superstreet at Edinburgh; however he noted that large groups of riders could avoid the intersection and that an individual cyclist could act as a pedestrian to cross US 64. There was no clear consensus from the stakeholders on what the recommended solution should be at this

location, as the constraints imposed by the US 1 interchange did not allow for a solution that would meet enough of the desires for this location.

- The superstreet corridor from east of Lake Pine to US 1 was also discussed with the overall group. There were still concerns with the superstreet concept due to the loss of convenience and access. The stakeholders also had concerns that the superstreet would not be needed and felt that implementation of the superstreet should not happen until NC 540 is completed and the additional eastbound lane is constructed on US 64 in order to determine if the need still exists. The stakeholders strongly encouraged the Corridor Study Team to take a very measured approach to implementing the superstreet and that they would prefer it not be done until all other options had been exhausted. Mr. Wasserman explained that any planned improvements in the study area, including the implementation of NC540, would be closely monitored. Their impacts to the US 64 corridor would be assessed and the study recommendations could be modified as deemed necessary at that time. Mr. Wasserman asked the stakeholders if the traffic in the area grew as projected, and there was a problem along this section of US 64, if they could live with the superstreet in this area. About one-third of the stakeholders still felt they could not live with the superstreet under any circumstances.
- Mr. Johnson then posed a question to the stakeholders asking if they had a preference regarding balancing the number of u-turn locations with the aesthetics and green space in the median. Mr. Johnson explained that providing fewer u-turn locations would allow for more green space in the median but would require longer travel distances to make u-turns and increase the volumes at the u-turn locations. Following some discussion no clear consensus was reached as to how to best balance these effects.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Following the group discussion, Mr. Wasserman gave a summary of the next steps in the process, which would include the following:

- Corridor Study Team will hold a meeting to discuss the input provided during the stakeholder workshop and determine the recommended solution for the short-term and long-term plans
- Developing the Draft Corridor Study Report, that will be provided to the public for a minimum 30-day period for review and comment
- Corridor Study Team will then consider the public comments and make any revisions needed, finalize the report, and seek endorsement from the Capital Area MPO
- Develop a Memorandum of Understanding that Study Partners would continue to coordinate planning efforts along the corridor

The stakeholders inquired when they would know the results of the meeting that would be held to determine the recommended solutions. Mr. Johnson raised the possibility of having a follow-up meeting with the stakeholder group to review the recommendations that would be included in the Corridor Study Report. Mr. Wasserman had some concerns about including the additional meeting due to concerns with the amount of effort and cost associated with the meeting. Ms. Robison, Cary Mayor Pro-tem and Town Councilor strongly encouraged the Corridor Study Team to have the follow-up meeting and stated that the Town of Cary could host the meeting and that she was open to having discussions on providing financial support to holding the meeting.

Actions: The study team will provide minutes from the workshop to all workshop participants
David Wasserman will provide participants information on a time-frame for a follow-up meeting.



At the end of the meeting Mr. Wasserman passed out a comment form that asked the stakeholders their opinions of the meeting and requested that they provide input into how effective the meeting was.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:10 PM.