

Destination 2055 Goals and Objectives Survey Compilation

| | |
|---|----|
| Goal: Connect People and Places | 2 |
| Goal: Promote and Expand Multimodal and Affordable Transportation Choices (CAMPO); Ensure that All People have Access to Multimodal and Affordable Transportation Choices (DCHC MPO) | 7 |
| Goal: Manage Congestion and System Reliability | 12 |
| Goal: Promote Safety, Health and Well-being | 19 |
| Goal: Stimulate Economic Vitality and Opportunity (CAMPO); Stimulate Inclusive Economic Vitality (DCHC MPO) | 24 |
| Goal: Ensure Equity and Participation | 28 |
| Goal: Improve Infrastructure Condition and Resilience | 32 |
| Goal: Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change | 37 |

Goal: Connect People and Places

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect people to jobs, education and other important destinations using all modes. • Ensure transportation needs are met for all populations, especially the aging and youth, economically disadvantaged, mobility impaired, and minorities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase mobility options for all communities – particularly communities of concern. • Achieve zero disparity of access to jobs, education, and other important destinations by race, income or other marginalized groups. |

The goal of "**Connect People & Places**" is strongly supported by the comments received. Many of the suggestions and concerns expressed in the comments align closely with the objectives of improving connectivity, promoting alternative modes of transportation, and enhancing accessibility to various destinations. There is a clear emphasis on prioritizing public transit, creating walkable and bike-friendly environments, and rethinking land use to facilitate better connectivity between communities and destinations. Additionally, there is recognition of the importance of addressing issues such as traffic congestion, safety concerns, and equitable access to transportation options. Overall, the comments demonstrate a strong endorsement of the goal and highlight the urgency of investing in measures to enhance connectivity and mobility within the region.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Better land use is critical -- we need to build for walkable / transit oriented modes |
| 2 | This should be the primary goal. |
| 3 | Promoting land-use that efficiently and most effectively uses a compact, multi-modal transportation network is the highest priority. Continuing to prioritize the development of low-density, single family houses with excessive setbacks and no allowances for ADUs is contributing to climate change, longer commutes, less affordable housing, and increased demand on our transportation network with more and longer trips. Vast neighborhoods of single family homes on a quarter acre with an HOA doesn't make sense in the Triangle anymore. |
| 4 | It is very important to consider all residents possible use of public transport instead of catering totally to UNC/UNC Hospitals. For instance I'd like to travel to Franklin Street and have an option to return via public transportation after dinner time. It's just not scheduled for that service. |
| 5 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 6 | Telework / hybrid work make this less important than it was in the past. |
| 7 | Please increase bus service, even if it means charging a fee for those that can afford it. Riding a bike for every day errands isn't feasible for most. We have two old cars and can't afford to replace either one at the moment. We want to be a one-car family, but it just isn't possible where we live. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 8 | Public transportation that is faster than car travel will increase ridership and decrease traffic on roads and highways. We need FREQUENT and RELIABLE bus and train service. We need dedicated bus lanes. Having fast and efficient rail between Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill would make living and working in the triangle feasible for the future! |
| 9 | We need commuter train service from Apex to downtown Raleigh and Durham |
| 10 | Very important to connect people and places by modes other than car |
| 11 | car traffic congestion is not a priority the other things listed are though. |
| 12 | I would love a rail system connecting the triangle; I think that would garner the most widespread public use. Given that has been a contentious undertaking, however, a dense network of busses--both local and express--that cover a lot of ground/neighborhoods is critical. |
| 13 | People need to get to places for the needs they need. Jump on and off buses is a option as mentioned in previous section. |
| 14 | Isn't this the key and critical thing behind exploring travel and destination within the Triangle? |
| 15 | I drive a car and the last time I looked, fuel tax funded roads. Fix capacity issues and limit the politics. It is clear this survey is written to achieve predetermined responses. Questions about race seem more important than questions that might actually help (such as do you ride a bike as a primary means of travel) |
| 16 | We have to increase the things people actually use and are effective. Please stop with the bikes. I only ever see city staff using them. |
| 17 | As an older citizen, I find the ability to travel from place to place in the triangle area more difficult and frightening than all of the 50 years that I have been in this area. Safety on the highways is out of control and one reason is that people have to travel so far to get to where they work. Hillsborough is a good example. This town and Orange County have turned down offer after offer of industries interested in establishing business in this area. Businesses that would offer local workers good paying jobs and require local residents to drastically reduce the distances that they would have to travel to reach places where they might work. Even if northern Orange county where there is an abundance of land that can handle expansion, people traveling from that area to get on I 85 or I 40 would encounter an enormous bottleneck in Hillsborough. Surrounding towns like Mebane, Graham and Burlington, all along the I 40/85 corridor have welcomed growth and have established infrastructure in their towns to ensure adequate and safe roads for travel. To plan for the future is one thing, but requirements in funding for the future are necessary in order to move into the future. And where does some of that funding come from, taxes from citizens like myself and from businesses in the areas. Hillsborough is the only town in all of the triangle area that is actually stifling rather than embracing growth in the triangle. |
| 18 | connecting people from where they live to where they need to go without the need for a car is extremely important. |
| 19 | With our area among the fastest-growing in the nation, we have limited time to plan effectively around where people will live and work, and nothing is more important to the long-term viability of our area than transit. |
| 20 | I rank this goal as #2 in importance. The plan should put far less money into enabling cars to go fast. Instead, it should put far more money into enabling *people* to go fast, especially when using |

| | |
|----|--|
| | transportation mechanisms other than cars. Reliable and speedy interconnection between modes or route segments will be key. |
| 21 | While this is an important goal, I do not believe investing in commuter rail is the solution. It is a waste to continue studying a rail service that the Federal government has been clear that it will not fund in this area. Instead, resources should prioritize more planning, design and construction of rapid surface transit to connect people to destinations and to improve existing passenger rail service. |
| 22 | Re-orienting land use and investing in public transportation are both crucial to preventing sprawl in our region and empowering families to make transportation choices that work best for their pocketbook and schedule. |
| 23 | not all travel modes should be equal ('all travel modes'), preference should be given to bike-ped-transit-roll over cars (even self-driving as they are still cars), I'm not for prioritizing cutting down congestion for cars....congestion may lead to mode shift. YES to better land use to allow connectivity without cars! |
| 24 | We need more pedestrian friendly options! |
| 25 | Increased funding devoted to public transportation services and infrastructure. Promoting land-use that efficiently uses the existing transportation network |
| 26 | With emphasis on public transit, bike and walkability (i guess micro-mobility?), sidewalks, ADA accessibility within these networks over car-centric networks. |
| 27 | Public transportation does not work in the suburbs. Do not spend money on these areas, it is a waste of money. |
| 28 | 100% as long as it's reducing car dependency |
| 29 | Public transpo is not reliable and we don't have enough options. When I rode the bus from the Woodcroft area to downtown, it took over an hour to go 7 miles and that excludes the time I spent walking from/to bus stops |
| 30 | Increase opportunities for alternative modes of transportation for commuters along US1 and NC 55 bypass. |
| 31 | This should be done with a multi-modal approach, generally decreasing personal auto prioritization. |
| 32 | This is what we need! Fill in network gaps, like to the airport. Build more sidewalks and paths and prioritize their maintenance. There is a sidewalk near me that has been unusable for over a month (Englewood between Broad and Clarendon). |
| 33 | The world is moving away from face to face interactions... do not fight the inevitable future |
| 34 | This needs to include removing "Sunday" services. All days should have the same, if not better than current, public transportation service. Just because it's Sunday or a Holiday does not mean that the people who rely on public transit won't need it that day. In fact, they are probably still very likely to need public transit. Additionally, there should be increased service on certain days when we know travel will be higher or we don't want people driving (like New Years Eve or Brewgaloo) - encourage people who would either drink and drive or pay for an Uber/Taxi to use the bus instead. |
| 35 | One caveat to this is that network gaps for single occupancy vehicles can actually improve overall network efficiency. We should be laser focused on improving public transit, especially in under-served communities. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 36 | This is hugely important. Our state needs to focus on moving people, not cars. |
| 37 | Need to make alternate transportation options desirable to all classes of people, not just the poor |
| 38 | I support existing motor vehicle congestion in order that more people will use alternative transportation or travel at different times of the day. Instead of widening roads and building new highways, funding should be devoted to more sidewalks and bike trails. |
| 39 | Increase support for non-single occupancy vehicle transportation options. In particular, a *network* of bike routes, greenways and sidewalks. The triangle is filled with comical "sidewalks to nowhere". |
| 40 | Yes, the point of a transportation network is connectivity. No more roads for the sake of building roads. |
| 41 | The most important goal and purpose of transportation is moving people from point A to point B. Everyone, regardless of income, ability, or skill should be able to utilize our transportation systems to their fullest extent. |
| 42 | We need to have infrastructure improved before developing any more land. |
| 43 | Very Important |
| 44 | This goal is vitally important. So untapped bus ridership exists in the Triangle because they do not come very frequently (even 30 minutes is *very slow* from a global perspective!) and are always slower than driving. Additionally, the tracking systems are not consistent across all agencies (including Wolfline), making transfers difficult. BRT will of course help, but I think frequency and low-effort speed improvements would go a long way for the traditional bus network. Additionally, I think getting a regional rail system up and running with supportive land uses around station locations is of upmost importance to the region's sustainability. Quality bike infrastructure will also go a long way as a first/last-mile solution. Some of our most important bike corridors (e.g., Hillsborough St. in front of NC State) are downright dangerous and feel like complete afterthoughts. |
| 45 | There is a need to redesign transit routes, mostly away from hub and spoke, to enable easy/timely transfers to express and long haul routes. |
| 46 | support for zero deaths or serious injuries from traffic crashes, zero carbon emissions, and zero disparity of access based on race |
| 47 | This is somewhat important, however we notice that our local bus service is underutilized. In fact, the buses are very often empty. |
| 48 | Growing larger quickly! Time for integrated (working together with shared stations and coordinated transfer times) mass transit. |
| 49 | I would like to see the development of a light rail system or bus system that can connect Zebulon to Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill, Cary, and Wake Forest. A system that I can reliability take to work (6am-6pm service is a must) and use on the weekends to visit friends and go to events. Right now if you do not have a car you have very few choices on how to travel. If I could take the bus or go to reliability work on a bus or train I would probably sell my car. That should include multiple stops in a town or at least having a park-and-ride to help out with traffic. Pricing transparency is important as well and should be widely available with multiple options of how to pay (i.e. in advance, cash, or card). |
| 50 | Improving public transit via buses and trains is the most critical investment. The region is decades behind on public transit investment and needs critical investment now to prevent further sprawl that would result from road and highway investment. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 51 | Better connectivity for Transit, and dense development along transit lines is the most important to me. |
|----|---|

Goal: Promote and Expand Multimodal and Affordable Transportation Choices (CAMPO); Ensure that All People have Access to Multimodal and Affordable Transportation Choices (DCHC MPO)

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities. Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance transit services, amenities and facilities. Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Increase utilization of affordable non-auto travel modes. |

The comments generally support the goal of "**Promote and Expand Access to Multimodal and Affordable Transportation Choices**" by advocating for various measures to improve transportation options and accessibility. There is strong support for expanding public transit services, including buses and trains, and making them more affordable or even fare-free to encourage higher ridership. Suggestions include improving infrastructure for biking and walking, such as adding more sidewalks and bike lanes, and enhancing safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists. Some comments also highlight the need for better connectivity and reliability of transportation services, as well as addressing issues of equity and environmental sustainability. Overall, the comments demonstrate a consensus on the importance of providing diverse and accessible transportation choices to accommodate the needs of all residents in the region.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Public transit: absolutely needs massive expansion. Multimodal and promotion of biking seems to miss the fact that this is the south, it is way, way too hot and humid to bike anywhere that you need to arrive presentable (i.e. work) for half the year, and raining for the other half. Is it great for a couple months out of the year? Sure, but it's really impractical for most of the year. |
| 2 | Transit fares should be eliminated to encourage highest use. Overall, this keeps traffic congestion as low as possible, improves accessibility to affordable housing, and lowers community barriers to employment. |
| 3 | This should include scooters and other non-traditional modes. Improving bike, scooter, and shared ride services (bus, lyft/uber, etc) at natural congregation points, such as schools. |
| 4 | focus on ways to use public transportation that does not require individual to purchase special equipment (bikes) for equity. Focus on busses and etc. |
| 5 | Crucial. |
| 6 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 7 | Maintaining existing sidewalks is critical and ensuring funds for regular maintenance. Currently too many sidewalks are difficult to use for anyone who is not steady on their feet due to tree roots raising the pavement, snow in the winter, big puddles in the rain. It's just not enough to build new sidewalks and greenways if there are not sufficient funds to keep them useable and safe. |
| 8 | Increasing bus service and adding sidewalks to major roads (like Greensboro St. near South Green and the Carrboro end of Estes) should be the priority. |
| 9 | People will always choose the easiest mode of transportation. Making walking, biking, and riding public transit faster and easier than driving should be a priority for the triangle area in order to improve the health of the people and the environment. |
| 10 | Bike lanes need to be safer. Biking needs to be safer. It's not reasonable for bicyclists to travel on Etsy Rd in Chapel Hill/Carrboro for example. And biking between towns is insane -- Hillsborough is close to Chapel Hill but there's no safe way to bike there. And there's no alternatives to arteries other than cars and (very infrequent, so infrequent as to be almost useless) buses. |
| 11 | The regional train plans that got canceled still would make SO much since for this area. Imagine in Fall someone in greater triangle takes the train to go to the State Fair or sports fans take trains to each other campuses / events at PNC/Walnut/Red Hat. |
| 12 | We need sidewalks! It's a disgrace how unsafe it feels for a person to walk in Durham! |
| 13 | Transit should be affordable but these other ideas are strange. |
| 14 | Why are more paths and free bus fare linked? Feels like a US senate bill. Use bus fare to improve buses and add paths too. |
| 15 | No pay is not acceptable, for those who can't afford full transportation costs should be charged a min. payment.....nothing is free, someone is paying and that is the tax payers. |
| 16 | Again, isn't this a no-brainer? We've been talking about the need for a rail system in the Triangle since the early 1990's....30+ years! In the meantime, property values and development has soared, which only increases the cost of a (light) rail system. It will not get cheaper to do. Can we not make a decision NOW vice waiting another 30 years? |
| 17 | If fares return to buses, they should be limited to a maximum amount per day, month, etc to minimize harm to low income residents |
| 18 | I want mor car centric roads with increased speeds. |
| 19 | Only the first bullet matters. The others are for the dreamers with lofty goals. Promo days don't change habits. Fares are reasonable and so many are free. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 20 | Any increase in bicycle traffic on existing highways in the Orange County area will only cause additional stress and aggravation to motorists who use these highways to get to work, to schools, to doctors, professional appointments, to shop and to get anywhere where a scheduled time of arrival is necessary. Bicycle travelers, whether they are traveling to and from work, school, etc can and do pose a danger to themselves as well as to the motorists that travel the same roads as the bicyclist. Counties and towns should work together in order to provide bicycle travel paths that connect to each other and do not interfere with highways. Those that choose to travel by bicycle whether to work, school or just as sport should be required to license their bicycle just like any other vehicle. Those that choose to travel by automobile which requires driving on highways have to pay taxes and fees to register their vehicle, to put gas in their vehicle, to have their vehicle inspected, to insure their vehicle, etc. Based on my understanding those that travel the same highways by bicycles do not have to pay any of these fees or taxes, yet they use the same highways as those paying for the right to do so. Start requiring bicyclist to also pay fees for the right to use highways designed for auto travel. Do not include bicycle lanes along the same path as the highways, look back at the suggestion for counties & towns to provide such paths away from highways. |
| 21 | Yes more direct transit routes, more frequent busses so that transit is a viable alternative. |
| 22 | Need to also consider safety (e.g., safe crossings to transit stops) and comfort (e.g., bus shelters) for improving multimodal transportation. |
| 23 | alternative modes of transport, other than the car are very important. |
| 24 | I find walking school buses neat :) No problem w actual school buses though, let's keep funding those as well. |
| 25 | I rank this goal as #3 in importance. This is a critical goal, and is how we should be trying to connect people and places. Apart from being more equitable, it's an important step in addressing climate change. It incidentally will also help us address our health crisis by encouraging people to be more active. A second important point is that if multimodal transportation choices are to compete with cars, they must not only be affordable in dollar terms, they must be affordable in terms of time. If using multimodal transportation is significantly slower, no one will use it other than those who must because they can afford nothing better. |
| 26 | Cars are the only viable form of transportation in the state of North Carolina. Amtrak is great for city-to-city transportation but once you arrive at any destination there is virtually zero option for local transportation. The bike service that amtrak offers is amazing but once you get to any of the destination stations you enter into the car-centric world of transportation where anything smaller than the car becomes a minor obstacle that drivers optionally consider while driving. |
| 27 | Major opportunity missed by not placing a Greenway along I540 from Knightdale to Holly Springs. It would have been inexpensive, and could have connected to the Falls of Neuse Greenway. That would have been a true and incredible value to the whole area. To execute on that now you will whine about how expensive building Greenway bridges and tunnels will be... or put Greenway users in danger by having them cross roads. |
| 28 | Density, density, density |
| 29 | Not just access though, quality of public transit must substantially improve. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 30 | Extremely important as the area continues to grow, having options for the traveling public will help economic growth and mobility in all modes of transportation. |
| 31 | Fare-free transportation increases usage, helps encourage first-time riders, contributes to a good and easy experience for riders, and thereby increases the speed and on-time reliability of transit. Wayfinding signs also help encourage biking and walking trips. Multi-use paths can be "advertised" by wayfinding signs to help encourage users. |
| 32 | All of this 100%! |
| 33 | Providing more paths (trails, sidewalks, side paths, etc.) and more direct routes to destinations |
| 34 | Essential. |
| 35 | There are no good people work here and live there locations where major public transportation would help. No real progress has been made on any train routes in the area and the only answer from 'leaders' is we need a train but temporarily using more busses. How much carbon do the busses really save? We are going to have to drastically change the nature of cars to get anything that might work or redevelop most of the region. |
| 36 | I would love more biking infrastructure including the triangle bikeway. I would also love more transit infrastructure and service. The BRTs are progress. I would also love to see the 100X start sooner and more regional transit connections. |
| 37 | This is very important. |
| 38 | Yes -- this is critically important. |
| 39 | As income and access changes in the region, it's vital to have as many means of transportation that as many people can use as possible to keep our area as a place for ALL people. |
| 40 | Make biking easier and make it the easy choice by making it safe with easy connections. Prioritize bike parking at businesses. |
| 41 | More funding needs to be devoted to multimodal transportation |
| 42 | I also think that partnerships with transit agencies should be prioritized to promote better waiting conditions for transit riders. |
| 43 | Very important |
| 44 | Safe, reliable routes for Bikes, Pedestrians, and other mobility devices (scooters) is important. |
| 45 | East of US 70 the only way to get to work, hospitals, doctors, groceries, schools, etc is by use of cars yet no proposed improvement for capacity and delay are being proposed. |
| 46 | People in our location DO NOT USE BIKES, and buses are Not used. |
| 47 | I would like to see the development of a light rail system or bus system that can connect Zebulon to Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill, Cary, and Wake Forest. A system that I can reliability take to work and use on the weekends to visit friends and go to events. Right now if you do not have a car you have very few choices on how to travel. I support increasing the funding for public transportation especially if that means taking it away from building new roads outside of improving the busing system. Please keep the pricing transparent and offer free traveling times throughout the week and weekend so that it does not exclude those with limited finances. Also, it would be a good idea to offer multiple ways to pay (in advance, in cash, or by card). I think promoting alternative modes are wonderful. Newer sidewalks should be similar to the greenway trails where they are separated from there by protecting them from cars, improving the air |

| | |
|--|---|
| | quality, providing shade, and making the experience more enjoyable. These areas should be wider to accommodate a lot of traffic, including bikes. |
|--|---|

Goal: Manage Congestion and System Reliability

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow people and goods to move with minimal congestion, time delay, and greater reliability. • Promote Travel Demand Management (TDM), such as carpooling, vanpooling and park-and-ride. • Enhance Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), such as ramp metering, dynamic signal phasing and vehicle detection systems. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow people and goods to move with greater reliability. • Increase efficiency of the existing transportation system through strategies such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). |

The comments generally support the goal of "**Manage Congestion and System Reliability**" by emphasizing the importance of investing in public transportation, bike/pedestrian routes, and alternative modes of transportation to reduce personal vehicle use and congestion. There is skepticism or opposition to building new roads or expanding existing ones, with a preference for improving existing infrastructure and prioritizing modes of transportation other than cars. Additionally, there is support for policies promoting hybrid and remote work options as well as the optimization of traffic signals and freeway controls to enhance system reliability. Overall, the comments reflect a desire to shift away from car-centric transportation planning towards more sustainable and efficient alternatives.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Please give vehicles a better option than McDowell/ Dawson. It's a highway that take cars at high speeds through downtown Raleigh. |
| 2 | Again, the examples of this mix things I support and oppose. Increasing public transit to reduce car dependency? Absolutely yes. New and annoying traffic control onto freeways? Hell no. |
| 3 | Yes to everything except building new roads. I'd rather see investment in public transit and density, |
| 4 | I honestly think to actually make non-car modes more reliable and desirable, they will need to be prioritized over car modes. To move more people to non-car modes, there will need to be some congestion, and general discomfort with driving. We can't achieve the first three goals mentioned here and also ensure most of our major roads have minimal delay. |
| 5 | Smart traffic signal grids is important. The public sector and local governments should not intervene in the private market to promote broadly remote work policies. Building more roads encourages more commuting, and therefore isn't a priority. |
| 6 | Increase funding for public transit and bike/pedestrian routes |

| | |
|----|--|
| 7 | Include Bike loops at key intersections! Increase walking infrastructure; lower speed limits throughout town to encourage alternate routes for passthrough traffic and enhance safety of vehicle-pedestrian/bike interactions. Include signage and enforcement of crosswalk rules. |
| 8 | Important to reduce number of cars on the road |
| 9 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 10 | We will not see a decrease in the number of cars on the road until we have both a robust public transportation system and more commercial areas within walking distance of more residential areas. Until then, the more housing you build, the more cars there will be. I support more housing, but it will only lead to more traffic if you don't expand the bus service. Right now, the free bus system is great for UNC, but it is borderline useless for anyone not affiliated with the university. My partner and I both work from home, but we still need a car for most errands. I dislike the fact that CH/Carrboro was designed to be car-centric as much as anyone, but that's the reality of our area. People that are privileged enough to live in areas like Southern Village and downtown Carrboro are not morally superior for biking and walking – they're just lucky. For those of us who would like to be less reliant on cars but were priced out of those areas when choosing housing, the pressure to "just bike or walk" everywhere is tiresome. |
| 11 | Prioritizing public transportation is the best way to reduce congestion. Prioritize fast and reliable public transportation! |
| 12 | We shouldn't be building new roads. Build new greenways and bike paths. Fundamentally the Triangle's entire problem is that there's nothing but dangerous highways connecting a series of small metros. So you either own a car, you don't go anywhere, or you take bus and it takes hours. The Triangle should be more ambitious and come up with ideas other than "let's build more highways" while pretending that it will help downtowns. |
| 13 | You also need to build a highway that goes North/South through Wake Co. Upgrade Route 1? |
| 14 | This is too vague. Are you talking about more bus transportation or BRT? If so I'll give it a high rating. |
| 15 | Policies that reducing vehicles on the road is much more important than more intelligent traffic systems. |
| 16 | Why are public transportation and promoting hybrid work tied with freeway improvements? This is like a poorly written bill from the US government. More public transportation and hybrid, less clear cutting and freeways. |
| 17 | I put this as a little less than "Very Important" because I do want to increase funding in public transportation and bike/ped routes and promote hybrid and remote work policies. I'm less passionate about the first three. I would like to see less priority on constructing new roads and more energy on increasing bike and public transportation options. |
| 18 | Reducing traffic congestion is not a priority, the second two bullets are though. |
| 19 | No one likes congestion. But we can deal with that by introducing mass transit that connects our ever increasingly dense population across the triangle, the airport, and rtp. |
| 20 | Congestion will always be there, but with system coordination of traffic and congestion hours & more flex hours for workers going to an office, this at least would spread out the numbers. |
| 21 | This is one of those survey questions wherein who is going to say no? This just helps promote the need for (fill in the blank). Dumb. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | The way in which our system increases speeds for vehicles and expands capacity does so in a way that is almost always at the expense of walking, biking, and public transportation. With increasing pedestrian deaths, I do not support roadway capacity expansion until we start cutting deaths and injuries. |
| 23 | I don't care about bikes as fuel taxes fund roads. The majority of car centric people who will never see this survey feel the same. |
| 24 | Improve headway, less wait is so important to a system of choice. |
| 25 | More roads, fewer bikes |
| 26 | As population grows, vehicular traffic will also grow. Currently the east/west interstate highways moving through the triangle area are clogged to the point that accidents are inevitable. I lived in Wilmington for a while and drivers were constantly running through red lights at intersections and causing tremendous amounts of accidents. The area installed cameras at intersections and provided pictures of vehicles clearly breaking the law and the number of accidents was greatly reduced, not to mention that the schools were receiving funds from the ticketing proceeds. A few years later those same cameras were put out of use for whatever reason, whether it be political or technicality of the law. Now we find cameras taking pictures of autos traveling on toll roads in order to eliminate the need for toll booths & the high cost of having to provide staff to efficiently operate toll collections. Where are the cameras and systems in place that would help catch the abusers on our current highways and city streets. I travel I 40/85 often and I drive only 3 or 4 miles over the speed limit, but there is always someone who is weaving in and out of lanes, traveling excessive speeds over the speed limit, why cant we use technology to curb those abusers? There probably already exists studies that indicate the north/south highways in Orange County need to be improved, especially highway 86 north of Hillsborough and the intersection at highway 70. These studies might also indicate the need to widen highway 70 from West Durham all the way to Burlington. If such studies do not exist, I highly recommend that studies need to be performed. |
| 27 | Need: Reliable alternative modes of transportation along i 40 between raleigh and durham without building new roads |
| 28 | The corridors between Durham and Raleigh both need priority fixes. 147/885 needs additional lanes and 70 needs fewer stoplights. |
| 29 | Increasing funding for public transportation is the only good example of implementing this goal listed. |
| 30 | Don't build new roads or expand existing ones! |
| 31 | road demand is based on road supply, if we provide more supply, there will be more induced demand. This can lead us to a devastating cycle of car dependency, and should be avoided. |
| 32 | We will still depend upon cars into the future |
| 33 | Interested in funding public transportation and bike routes to lower personal vehicle use, but ranking this goal as unimportant b/c I do not think spending money on intelligent traffic signal systems is a worthwhile use of any funding. Additionally, I don't think new roads should be deviating commuter flow from downtown areas. Commuters should go right through downtown..on their bikes, e-scooters, or on public transport. It's cars that should be reduced from downtown. I want narrower, slower-moving car roads that make biking and walking safer. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 34 | Cars should be relegated to areas meant for them, not mixed with pedestrian and transit traffic. Building durable transit systems, primarily light rail, supported by a robust bus system, commuter rail and park and rides, will concentrate development in a way that makes growth more sustainable over investing in a sprawling infrastructure that, though it serves relatively few, constitutes a maintenance liability. |
| 35 | I rank this goal as #5 in importance. The plan needs to accept that building roads/adding lanes to minimize congestion for car traffic actually adds to the problem. Most of the examples given are engineering fixes that have been shown again and again to not work well in the long term. That said, policies like encouraging alternate transportation or remote work will be helpful for controlling congestion for car traffic. |
| 36 | I am very supportive of increased funding for public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use, but I do not support the construction of new roads or managed freeways. |
| 37 | Prioritize investments that make using transit safer and more convenient for people in older neighborhoods and where residents don't have cars, not newer suburban neighborhoods. |
| 38 | better make sure to accommodate, just as well, bike-ped-transit in any plan to manage congestion. The goal should NOT be just to make it quicker/easier to drive...that will not lower VMT, GHG or address equity. It's really hard to rate these because you have 5 bullets and some are VERY IMPORTANT (increase funding for bus-bike-ped) and some are NOT (move traffic more efficiently)...so, I'm really not sure HOW to rate this one. You just can't stick both in there and expect an understandable answer. |
| 39 | Promote and optimize public transportation for the routes that people take on a regular basis. For example, an increased number of trains between local cities at regular intervals to connect business commuters or commuters to local sports/entertainment venues. Also, there is a desperate need to increase pedestrian and bike safety so it can become more practical to commute shorter distances without the use of motorized vehicles (ie. grocery shopping). |
| 40 | Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use. New roads are not the answer. We have done so little in the other directions. Hence new directions would have a much larger effect/ |
| 41 | Don't focus on building new roads , it doesn't work. 147 created the need to build 85, created the need to expand 40 it never stops. Ask Atlanta and it's 18 lane highways that are always congested |
| 42 | increase funding in public transit and bike/pedestrian use. Less traffic signals, more traffic circles. No new roads |
| 43 | The two parts I think are very important are: Constructing new roads to deviate main commuter traffic flow from downtown areas and Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use |
| 44 | Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use |

| | |
|----|---|
| 45 | You lost me at "constructing new roads." Let's move beyond the "one more lane" approach. Let's invest in moving people not cars. For that reason, i'm on board with the last two bullets but less so the first three. |
| 46 | Do not mix public transportation into this category. |
| 47 | The act of deviating traffic flow needs to be separated from creating an alternative method to alleviate flow (i.e. decreasing vehicle counts by remote work, public transit etc). By lumping those two divergent goals into the same criteria, results from this survey are bound to be contradictory or biased in favor of auto-favoring results. |
| 48 | Everything sounds good except the build new roads part. Maybe it's occasionally necessary, but we must be cautious. Our money has to go to effective transit methods first. Bus and train priority over cars. |
| 49 | promotion of hybrid work is the only important item in this list. Please do not build additional new roads from downtown areas. |
| 50 | Building new roads or widening is not the only way to improve congestion. The area needs efforts focus on alternative modes of transportation. |
| 51 | Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use: this goal is important. |
| 52 | This is important: Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use. This is the best way to decrease traffic. |
| 53 | I do not agree with fixed location transportation solutions like rail. |
| 54 | "Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use." This is what I find very important. And "reducing the number of motorized vehicles on the roads." |
| 55 | Yes to this, but only if improving single occupancy vehicle flow is the absolute lowest priority. If anything we should reduce this flow if it means improving more efficient public transit flows. Let's absolutely get commuter traffic away from dense areas where people live. |
| 56 | Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use |
| 57 | Less sure about this: Constructing new roads to deviate main commuter traffic flow from downtown areas |
| 58 | Stop building major highway and belt line overpasses with traffic signals!!!! |
| 59 | Congestion is a good thing. Working to mitigate it through any policy other than congestion pricing is a fools errand |
| 60 | Controlling highway access is not important, the other goals are worthwhile |
| 61 | I support making better use of existing facilities but generally do not support road widening and constructing new roads. Do more low-cost, interim design safety countermeasures on state owned and maintained roadways. |
| 62 | Please don't widen roads or make more car roads. Pedestrian streets are fine. |
| 63 | Some of these goals seem important (Increase funding in public transportation and bike/pedestrian routes to lower personal vehicle use), others seem unimportant. Should not have been lumped into one question. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 64 | Increasing capacity for motor vehicles only increases the number of motor vehicles. Please no more. |
| 65 | No new roads. We need to use tolling to manage the use of roads we currently have. |
| 66 | Efficiency of best use of the space and systems we already have is important. |
| 67 | This question combines too many options. I am for bike infrastructure but not more roads for cars. This survey seems pointless. |
| 68 | Prioritize alternate modes of transportation rather than only focusing on improving flow of automobiles. |
| 69 | Construction of new roads should not be the priority - I'd rather improve the operations and safety of the existing network. |
| 70 | Yes for public transit and bike/pedestrian routes. No for upgrading traffic signals to "move traffic more efficiently". "More efficiently" means greater speeds which is not what we want. We don't want traffic moving at fast speeds through our neighborhoods. Faster traffic belongs on the freeway. Local traffic on the slower streets. |
| 71 | Very important |
| 72 | As our region continues to grow, we must find ways to reduce VMT. Endlessly expanding highways is not the solution. At a certain point, we must provide most of the region with timely and reliable alternatives. |
| 73 | Given current funding trends, most congestion relief will go to increased lane miles via widening. Implementing BRT, dedicated lanes, and protected bike/pedestrian pathways has been given little attention by the DOT. |
| 74 | Local implementation of bike lanes should not be restricted on the basis of concerns for future potential level of service. |
| 75 | Very important to provide for commuter traffic not in the daily traffic. |
| 76 | This goal has some merit, however our taxes have been increasing greatly over the last few years, so I think cautious forethought is needed. |
| 77 | I would like to see the promotion of hybrid and remote work options for workers. I am not interested in building new roads unnecessarily and the new roads will just get congested a few years later. I would love to see more protected bike lanes on the street or even bike/pedestrian-only routes to make it safer to travel by bike or scooter. We need to make sure that sidewalks are all connected and that we provide shade (i.e. trees) for those who are using them (similar to the greenway trails). If upgrading the traffic signals and freeway controls make the intersections and surrounding areas safer, I am for that but I think focusing on public transportation and encouraging that will help reduce the strain on our highways and roads. |
| 78 | I wish there were a way to rank each of these, but since they are only "examples", presumably there would be other things to rank as well. Upgrading traffic signals is more important than building new roads. How will we "Promote" hybrid/remote work policies. Does this mean improving broadband? If so, I would move it to the top or close to the top of these. If it means that CAMPO will actively work with businesses, I would love to know how that will happen. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 79 | Yes, the system should be reliable, and congestion should be managed, however I do not fully support two of the implementation examples provided. Moving traffic more efficiently should not undermine intersections being safe for people who are walking or biking across an intersection. Many traffic signals should be replaced by modern roundabouts that can keep drivers moving, but at a slower speed. New roads should not be the first strategy to deviating commuter traffic flow from downtown areas - new and better transit service should be invested in first. Adding capacity for driving should be a last resort since it will induce additional demand for driving which runs counter to other goals. |
| 80 | New roads are less important, but more transit, bike and pedestrian facilities is important to me. |

Goal: Promote Safety, Health and Well-being

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the safety of travelers and residents. • Promote public health through transport choices. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve zero deaths and serious injuries on our transportation system. • Provide all residents with active transport choices. |

The goal of "**Promote Safety, Health and Well-Being**" receives significant support, particularly in terms of improving infrastructure to lower speeds and enhance safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and other vulnerable road users. Here's a breakdown of the comments:

- **Infrastructure Improvements:** Many comments advocate for infrastructure changes aimed at enhancing safety, such as adding more ADA-compliant bus stops, promoting pedestrian-friendly designs like narrower roads, speed bumps, elevated crosswalks, and protected bike lanes.
- **Lowering Speed Limits:** Several comments support the idea of reducing speed limits, especially in urban areas, to improve safety for all road users.
- **Vision Zero:** There is support for initiatives like Vision Zero, which aims to eliminate traffic fatalities and serious injuries, indicating a desire for a safer transportation system.
- **Enforcement of Safety Measures:** Some comments emphasize the importance of enforcing safety measures, such as stricter enforcement of non-speed related traffic violations.
- **Infrastructure Design and Speed Reduction:** There are suggestions for improving road design for safety, such as narrowing roads, and that this may be more effective in reducing speeds than simply lowering speed limits.

Overall, the majority of comments express strong support for initiatives aimed at promoting safety, health, and well-being on the roadways, indicating a recognition of the importance of creating a safer and more accessible transportation system for all users. However, there are differing opinions on the most effective strategies for achieving these goals.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|--|
| 1 | We need far more enforcement of non-speed related traffic violations, rather than trying to slow everyone down because some people can't drive. |
| 2 | Decrease NON-highway speeds too. |
| 3 | Decreasing highway speeds and upgrading intersections would lower accidents and would improve progress toward climate change goals. Decreasing vehicle traffic around neighborhoods has negative impacts and would be a low priority if when done it increases commute times, increases trip distance, or inadvertently discourages bike, pedestrian, and public transportation. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 4 | Slowing traffic on highways doesn't seem to actually make a positive difference, but the other examples make sense. |
| 5 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 6 | Please make bus stops ADA-compliant, which also means adding more of them to the current system. Protection from rain and heat is also needed. |
| 7 | When lowering speeds the design of the road should be prioritized over lowering posted speed limits. Wide roads with big clearings on both sides will encourage people to drive faster, regardless of what the posted speed limit says. ALL BUS STOPS NEED TO BE PERFECTLY ADA COMPLIANT. Disabled people need to be able to EASILY use ALL public transportation! Bike and pedestrian routes need to be pleasant to use in order for people to choose them as a mode of transportation. Sidewalks should be shaded and not alongside a stroad. Bikeways should be protected from traffic by bolsters or curbs. |
| 8 | Don't "promote" bike/pedestrian routes, build actually safe bike/pedestrians routes. Eg greenways. Get a Dutch person to tell you what I'm talking about. |
| 9 | So traffic is bad on highways already and you want to slow traffic down? |
| 10 | Speed limits are much higher here than other states (local roads and highways). They should be reduced now that the population has doubled. |
| 11 | Highway speeds should be set as appropriate for the design of the road, traffic volume, and safety. |
| 12 | I don't think you will get much helpful information out of the survey. Everyone can agree on goals. It's the mode of transit, cost, accessability you need to be asking about. |
| 13 | ADA compliance is a must, but the reducing highway speeds isn't going to fix anything. |
| 14 | Unless the growth in SE Durham slows down or stops, traffic is going to increase proportionally. Hwy 70 must remain a highway - and not a boulevard - to relieve the extreme congestion. Remaining traffic lights should be removed rather than increased. |
| 15 | I think in addition to signs and signals, it would be great to build the behaviors that promote safety into the infrastructure (ex. narrower roads, speed bumps, elevated crosswalks, traffic circles, protected bike lanes, bus only lanes, etc.) |
| 16 | Improve with more overhead bridges in the high traffic area for bikers, walkers, roller blading, skateboards etc., Nothing fancy, a bridge with high railings to keep some from falling over the sides or tossing objects into cars below. |
| 17 | Again, this is one of those survey questions wherein who is going to say no? This just helps promote the need for (fill in the blank). Dumb. |
| 18 | Speed limits were set with less safe cars. We need faster Increase speeds, especially in urban area. Minorities should be able to get to and from their destination as quick as everyone else and use a car if they want. Anything less is racist |
| 19 | I am 100% supportive of ADA, and going beyond, but not the other bullets. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 20 | I live on a street is a nice sub division but twice a day there are hundreds of automobiles traveling up and down our street taking children to and from schools; many of these automobiles are traveling 10 to 15 miles/hour above the speed limits.. Many of the residents of this sub division have tried to encourage law officials to help the speeding situation but their resources do not always allow them to do so. In the future, especially in small towns, schools should be located in areas where residents are not put in perilous situations where speeders threaten children playing or clogged streets do not affect the travel routes of emergency vehicles. My house was built in 1995 and I would have thought that the house would have stopped settling by now, but every two years I have to re-caulk or re-support places where the house is still settling. I believe that the amount of traffic traveling the street in front of my house has a lot to do with this ongoing problem. |
| 21 | Planning efforts around all goals, but especially this one should include improved partnerships with the public health sector in NC |
| 22 | Decrease speed on city roads. Convert all one-way roads to two way. Take over ownership of roads in-town from NCDOT. |
| 23 | All other priorities should be beneath safety. Nobody should die on our roadways. |
| 24 | Great goal. Very important for sure. |
| 25 | I rank this goal as #8 in importance. Important, but if the other goals are pursued correctly, this goal will be met along the way. That said, it's obvious that unsafe alternate transportation modes will be underused. |
| 26 | If design begins with prioritizing ADA access then all other designs will fall into place. |
| 27 | Include Bike/pedestrian investments for travel to jobs, to allow people who don't have cars to get to jobs from older suburbs where housing is more affordable |
| 28 | Please look into the fundamental design of our roads instead of patch fixing and adding more that are inherently less safe. Instead of traffic lights investigate the feasibility of traffic circles. Instead of building more roads to divert traffic away from rich neighborhoods, focus on building non-car systems that allow people to commute via non-car methods. Get rid of one way roads. Add more protected space for alternative modes of transportation. |
| 29 | bikes and walking are for transportation not recreation. |
| 30 | reduce neighborhood traffic to make things safer for community residents - get rid of the one way streets on Greyson and duke, remove the downtown loop. promote pedestrian/biker friendly passageways |
| 31 | Yes and lets lower speed limits in general and promote pedestrian safety. Perhaps with Vision Zero if it has not already been adopted by the MPO. |
| 32 | Most important! Make this the biggest priority. |
| 33 | We need to stop speeding cars and cars parked on sidewalks and in bike lanes. Currently, regulation and enforcement have not been sufficient. We need design and infrastructure solutions. Raised intersections and crosswalks, for example, promote safety and comfort of pedestrians, increase access for disabled people, and slow traffic. |
| 34 | Use technology like driver assistance systems in cars... |
| 35 | Promote bike and pedestrian routes as practical transportation options, rather than just for recreation. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 36 | This oh so much! We are so far behind on street safety that we need to prioritize this for decades in order to recover. Speeds are out of control and it's dangerous for me to simply exist in my neighborhood due to unsafe behavior by motorists. |
| 37 | Promote bike/pedestrian routes to provide recreational benefits |
| 38 | zero deaths or serious injuries from traffic crashes, zero carbon emissions, and zero disparity of access based on race |
| 39 | I would love to see more grade separation of the Greenways of the triangle. So that we aren't crossing busy roads at grade with only a HAWK or Rapid Pedestrian Beacon signal. I would also love to see bicycle protected intersections and roundabouts. |
| 40 | The MPOs should adopt an Intersection Control and Evaluation policy that applies to all transportation changes (safety projects, TIP projects, developer-built projects, etc.). The number of traffic signals should be reduced and more roundabouts constructed. Sidewalks should be kept open when new buildings and infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.) are being constructed. NCDOT should be a good neighbor and support efforts to improve safety by reducing speeds and supporting all travel modes on state-maintained streets that pass through cities and neighborhoods. NCDOT and the MPOs should implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan. |
| 41 | Yes, let's lower the speed limit to 55 mph on our highways and 20 mph on roads with residents and businesses to make them safe for all. |
| 42 | NCDOT does not care about safety and well-being for bicyclist and pedestrians. Something needs to be done to mitigate their destructive approach to transportation planning. |
| 43 | I like CAMPO and DCHCMPO's commitment to SS4A |
| 44 | More concerned about upgrade of technology related to signals and signs |
| 45 | Decrease speed limits to save lives and to conserve fuel |
| 46 | decrease speeds on multiple types of roads. |
| 47 | Vision Zero should be more than a slogan! |
| 48 | support for vision zero--zero deaths or serious injuries from traffic crashes, zero carbon emissions, and zero disparity of access based on race |
| 49 | I believe promoting public transportation and building walkable/bikeable communities would increase the air quality and safety of our highways and roads. All bus/train stops and facilities should be ADA-compliant and provide shelter from rain or sun. I also like the idea of the stops being separated from the main flow of traffic by using a curbside pull-out stop for buses. |
| 50 | Safety for pedestrians and bicyclists matters too, not just safety for those in cars. Investments in road redesigns that lower speeds and reduce risk for non-car users is needed across the region. |
| 51 | Highway speeds are important, but lowering the speeds will not lower the speed cars are going. I would love to see highways go back to 55, but I would be very surprised if that happened. Speeds CAN be controlled through speed enforcement cameras and ISA. Perhaps promoting these technologies should be included in this category. Also, urban speeding has far more serious consequences in crashes, esp. in car crashes that involve vulnerable road users. I think it is very important to lower speeds in urban areas. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 52 | Zero pedestrian and bike fatalities. Zero emissions public transit vehicles to make our air quality safer |
| 53 | Both MPO's should confirm their commitments to Vision Zero and set a target of zero deaths or serious injuries by 2050. |
| 54 | Bike and pedestrian traffic need sot be protected from automotive traffic! |
| 55 | So important, the streets are incredibly dangerous near us. Most specifically the one way roads like Roxboro and Mangum!!! |

Goal: Stimulate Economic Vitality and Opportunity (CAMPO); Stimulate Inclusive Economic Vitality (DCHC MPO)

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve freight movement. • Coordinate land use and transportation. • Improve project delivery for all modes. • Target funding to the most cost-effective solutions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve freight movement. • Coordinate land use and transportation. • Improve project delivery for all modes. • Invest in cost-effective solutions to improve travel reliability and safety. • Ensure equitable distribution of transportation investments especially to communities of concern. |

The comments provide mixed support for the goal of "**Stimulate Inclusive Economic Vitality and Opportunity.**" Some comments express the importance of coordinating denser, mixed-use development with multi-modal transportation options to promote economic vitality and opportunity. Others highlight the need for improvements in public transportation to connect people to jobs and support small businesses, especially in underserved areas. However, there are also comments expressing skepticism about the examples provided for implementing the goal, with some suggesting that the examples are too vague or do not address key issues such as housing affordability and land use planning. Overall, while there is some support for the goal, there are also concerns about the effectiveness and focus of the proposed objectives.

Comments suggest changing the goal or adding additional objectives emphasizing specific strategies and priorities that they believe will be more effective in stimulating inclusive economic vitality and opportunity. These suggestions include:

- **Focusing on Transit-Oriented Development (TOD):** Many comments advocate for promoting mixed-use zoning and coordinating development with transit infrastructure, such as bus rapid transit (BRT) or light rail systems. This approach aims to improve accessibility to jobs, services, and entertainment venues, particularly in areas currently underserved by public transportation.
- **Investing in Public Transportation:** There is strong support for increasing funding for public transportation, including buses, trains, and bike/pedestrian routes. Enhancing transit options and improving connectivity are seen as essential for reducing dependency on personal vehicles and expanding economic opportunities, especially for low-income communities.
- **Addressing Housing Affordability:** Some comments stress the importance of addressing housing affordability issues, suggesting that access to affordable housing is critical for inclusive economic development.

- **Prioritizing Freight Rail Improvements:** Several comments highlight the need to prioritize freight rail improvements to enhance economic vitality and reduce congestion on roadways. They suggest investing in projects such as double tracking and off-hour deliveries to improve the reliability and capacity of freight transportation.
- Overall, these suggestions aim to refine the goal by focusing on specific strategies that address key challenges and opportunities related to inclusive economic development, transportation, and land use planning.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Coordinating denser, mixed-use development with multi-modal transportation options -- and tree canopy and sidewalks -- are important. |
| 2 | Adjust bus routes to serve as a functional transport system, not just a commuting service to downtowns. |
| 3 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 4 | This is rather vague. |
| 5 | I would still like to see a light rail system in the Triangle, though I know much of that is out of the control of local government. |
| 6 | These are all so vague as to be meaningless. Obviously get money. Obviously make things better. Not sure what the point of survey question is. Build bike greenways so I can easily bike from Chapel Hill to Hillsborough, Cary, etc. |
| 7 | My wife is actually looking for work closer to home vs. commuting to downtown Raleigh but there are limited opportunities that pay the same rate as her current position. So she commutes 30 minutes to Raleigh and back from Wake Forest everyday. |
| 8 | Improvements such as double tracking to the freight rail network would help greatly in the implementation of regional passenger rail. Freight rail improvements should be prioritized to assist with future passenger rail implementation. |
| 9 | improve freight movement by getting more of it off the roads and on to rail. |
| 10 | If people do not have to walk a half mile to a bus stop that has inconsistent service (let alone change busses two-three times), that would be a key step in moving toward inclusive economic possibilities. |
| 11 | More support for small business, not the small businesses that are over 100 + employees that is not SMALL. |
| 12 | Again, this is one of those survey questions wherein who is going to say no? This just helps promote the need for (fill in the blank). Dumb. |
| 13 | Managing congestion is often a technical euphemism for speeding up cars, which leads to harms to people walking and biking, and more vehicle to vehicle crashes. |
| 14 | More travel lanes for cars will help. Cars equals road funding. Bikes equal sadness. |
| 15 | This should be a low priority in transportation planning. |
| 16 | Land use planning is extremely important because it promotes growth and safety for all people and because the availability of land decreases every minute of every day. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 17 | I think you are misplacing examples. Strategically submit for grant opportunities is for all the goals |
| 18 | Yeah, medium-level goal. We should try and stimulate inclusive economic vitality, just not sure how these examples of implementation actually build towards that goal. I would expect something like, support mixed-use developments connected to greenways, neighborhoods, and workplaces. |
| 19 | I rank this goal as #4 in importance. Connectivity to jobs is key. If people can connect to jobs, stores and entertainment venues will follow in short order. |
| 20 | North Carolina has a growing issue of housing affordability. This has pushed tons of people away from jobs. If we want to increase public transportation to those areas that would be great, but I believe this would just add further justification to continue the creation of economically gate kept cities. For the large majority of people, living in or near any of NC's major cities is a mere impossibility. |
| 21 | I don't believe this effort will be considered genuinely. Waiting for massive congestion before adding infrastructure is backwards. |
| 22 | Restrict city traffic that is hazardous to pedestrian and cyclists. Max. truck size. Reduce max. speed in urban areas, remove parking minimums. |
| 23 | improvements to non-road means of transportation is my top priority, not additional pavement. |
| 24 | Honestly, these examples do not seem like things that need improvement. |
| 25 | This is probably fine as long as it's centered around reducing the requirements and incentives to be dependent on personal vehicles to do everything. |
| 26 | Introduce mixed use zoning to improve economic quality as well as the quality of life for citizens, residents, and tourists. |
| 27 | Mitigating congestion through any policy besides congestion pricing is a fools errand and congestion is generally good for a city. However I would love to see more transit oriented Development along the BRTs GoRaleigh and other agencies are working on. |
| 28 | I support increased use of rail for freight traffic and more off hours deliveries in downtown areas. More car free streets in downtown areas. |
| 29 | I don't agree with the goal to "Strategically submit projects for local/state/federal grant programs to increase chances of funding. " Some of the projects that score well for funding are large bloated road projects that shouldn't be submitted in the first place. |
| 30 | Coordination is good. |
| 31 | Are plans not already being coordinated? |
| 32 | Very Important |
| 33 | Complete 540! Give Southeast Raleigh more viability by using 540 to link this area more directly to the entire Triangle region |
| 34 | Federal funding affects our taxes just as county, city, etc. do. There is no free ride. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 35 | <p>If we expand the train system we must prioritize passenger trains instead of freight. This will help improve the reliability of the system and make more people want to use it. If that would be an issue, the train systems should be separated. Hopefully local, state, and federal grand programs will understand that. It would be helpful if rails used by freight trains were moved either above or below the main road to help improve traffic (i.e. Hillsborough Street and Blue Ridge Road). The same can be done with bike and pedestrian lanes.</p> |
| 36 | <p>I would like to know how you can coordinate land use planning to transportation planning efforts. Shouldn't this be reversed? Coordinate long range traffic planning to land use planning? Also, for freight, consider small EVs (including electric cargo bikes) for urban deliveries to clean air and improve traffic.</p> |
| 37 | <p>Both MPO's should set a target to eliminate disparities of access attributable to race or income by 2050.</p> |

Goal: Ensure Equity and Participation

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that transportation investments do not create disproportionate negative impacts for any community, especially communities of concern. • Promote equitable public participation among all communities, especially communities of concern. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that transportation investments do not create disproportionate negative impacts for communities of concern. • Ensure equitable public participation among communities of concern. |

The goal of "**Ensure Equity and Participation**" is supported by the majority of the comments provided:

- **Recognition of Underrepresented Communities:** Many comments emphasize the importance of hearing from underrepresented and marginalized communities in transportation planning processes. They highlight the need to engage with these communities to understand their needs and priorities, ensuring that transportation projects benefit all segments of society.
- **Community Engagement:** Despite skepticism about community participation processes, there is a general acknowledgment of the importance of community input in transportation decision-making. Suggestions include revamping engagement processes to reach a broader range of voices and ensuring that community feedback informs project planning and design. Some comments demonstrated "survey fatigue" among respondents, as well as a desire to see more action and implementation.
- **Transportation Equity:** Comments underscore the role of transportation in promoting equity and access to opportunities. Strategies such as investing in public transit, improving transit routes and schedules, and expanding transportation options to underserved areas are seen as essential for addressing disparities in access and ensuring that all people have adequate transportation options.
- **Eliminating Disparities:** Some comments advocate for setting targets to eliminate disparities of access attributable to race or income. This reflects a commitment to equity and a recognition of the need for deliberate efforts to address historical inequities in transportation infrastructure and services.

Overall, while there are variations in perspectives and opinions, the majority of comments express support for the goal of ensuring equity and participation in transportation planning and decision-making processes.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Community participation is great in theory, but in reality only empowers cranky old people to stop anything from happening. The people that need transit improvements do not have the time to come to a thousand meetings and make their voice heard, but the retired 75 year old that doesn't want anything to change does. |
| 2 | What hours, days and routes are needed to be supported to improve transportation equity? Early morning & late evening routes? |
| 3 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 4 | The redesign of the Chapel Hill portion of Estes is fantastic, but I can't help but notice that it's in a very privileged part of town. To the extent that it's possible, please extend those changes to the rest of Estes. I would also like to see a sidewalk from the new Carrboro library down to South Green (I believe this was discussed at some point, but I haven't heard much about it lately). |
| 5 | Lower income people will benefit the most from having fast, reliable, and inexpensive public transportation. |
| 6 | Feedback is stupid. This is all process nonsense designed to slow things down, do nothing, accomplishes nothing. Useless box-checking process that bad people can use to stop good projects. "The community" has no particular opinion so just go ahead and hire competent people with good ideas. Community ambassadors are not representative and inherently weirdos with weird opinions (because they're the kind of people who want to be community ambassadors). |
| 7 | Public input is very important but should not be allowed to delay decision making indefinitely. US 15-501 (Durham-Chapel Hill Blvd) has been in 'corridor study' mode for decades yet zero improvements have occurred. |
| 8 | There is already community participation -- it has just been focused on extremely selective communities (neighborly and corporate ones). Hearing from underrepresented communities and communities traditionally just ignore is important. |
| 9 | Hire most qualified, not the color of their skin or ethnicity. |
| 10 | Again, this is one of those survey questions wherein who is going to say no? This just helps promote the need for (fill in the blank). Dumb. |
| 11 | Not all people live where they drive. I don't want to ride a bike or walk. We need more travel lanes for cars only. |
| 12 | No comment, this speaks for itself. |
| 13 | I would encourage planning around these efforts to avoid overinvestment in the project by project-specific style of community engagement and instead work more closely with divested communities to identify their goals and priorities to work back from. |
| 14 | Don't let engagement slow down actually building projects. Too many engagement cycles, studies, and delays make projects too expensive and slow. |
| 15 | Equity is important overall but not as valuable as much in transportation planning |

| | |
|----|---|
| 16 | Equity is real important! I like this goal, reduce disproportionate negative impact distribution, and ensure disadvantaged communities are also benefiting from improvements. |
| 17 | I rank this goal as #6 in importance. These communities are under-served and I dislike putting it at such a low priority. Still, this goal is more aimed at how projects should be conducted, rather than aiming at what kinds of projects should be selected. |
| 18 | It is time for the region to acknowledge the harm brought upon underrepresented, underserved communities by past transportation decisions. Equity is more than a buzzword. It requires action and continual work. "Nothing about us without Us" should always guide project planning, design, and construction, as well as all decision-making from this place forward in the region's transportation project selections. |
| 19 | Roads are inherently exclusionary boundaries. They divide communities which destroys culture. They economically inhibit people as they require ownership of a car when there is inadequate means of public transit. They inhibit multimodal means of transportation as they're designed for large vehicles and large vehicles only (in most cases). They destroy the environment by introducing harmful waste to ecosystems and making areas unsafe for non-human animals to exist. |
| 20 | Yes, let's engage the community in this work especially those who will be impacted and marginalized communities. Let's also value the community as experts of their lived experience and not only rely on experts in the industry. |
| 21 | Anyone can become a special interest group. |
| 22 | You have a typo here (transportation). |
| 23 | This is important but we also have be cautious about allowing community voices to be manipulated in to advocating for what we know are unsafe solutions. Decades of propaganda from car manufacturers and oil companies will likely be tough to overcome. Sometimes the better solution of public transit, pedestrian & bicycle infrastructure, and road diets need to lead the community to a better place. |
| 24 | Coordinate with communities during all phases of project development |
| 25 | zero deaths or serious injuries from traffic crashes, zero carbon emissions, and zero disparity of access based on race |
| 26 | Obviously all of these goals are important. It would be good to have a side by side comparison of these goals vs. the last MTP goals. |
| 27 | Transit is a great equalizer, if done well. |
| 28 | Community participation should always be central. |
| 29 | You should find a way for the area around Hope Valley Road to be included in transit service of some kind! |
| 30 | This is good, but we can't let an obsession with process and gathering input override the very urgent needs we have in terms of transportation. Do fewer, better surveys, rather than surveys like this one. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 31 | Focusing on public transport should address many of these equity goals. Demographic distributions have changed. Lower income people live farther out from city center: include connection lines to outlying communities (a modernized version of Boston's system might be a model). Higher income people choose driving because it is so much more convenient: increase the number of bus stops and actual vehicles. The mini busses are great but don't go anywhere! Build it and we will ride. (As long as you don't spend so much on the roads that they remain the better option.) |
| 32 | Very Important |
| 33 | Design transit routes and schedules to include riders outside of typical 'office' hours. Include early morning and late night runs to transit hubs and population centers. |
| 34 | I consider it disgraceful that the first information I received about this survey arrived on the next to last date to participate! I have a network of minority friends who will not have the opportunity to participate unless they open their email from me yet today. |
| 35 | all people need adequate transportation accessibilities |
| 36 | of course, this is important, however the average person doesn't know enough to give an informed decision. This is why we employ experts and pay them hugh sums of money. |
| 37 | I believe it is important to communicate with the local community that you are building in what their needs and concerns are for their area. I would also like to suggest planning and building public transportation options for populations outside of city centers (i.e. Zebulon, Mebane, Angier, etc...) so that the disadvantaged people in those areas can be connected to resources and jobs in the triangle region as well. |
| 38 | Participation, if you are required to get public input, really needs to be revamped so you hear from many more people. |
| 39 | Both MPO's should set a target to eliminate disparities of access attributable to race or income by 2050. |
| 40 | These questions are a little hard to answer. A lot of them couple together funding for both roadway improvements and transit improvements. I do not want to support additional lanes for cars to help congestion, but you do not allow me to vote for only one aspect of the goal. I support improvements that prioritize transit that means bus only lanes, queue jumps at lights and TSP. These are the big infrastructure investments I think we need to promote with this plan. |
| 41 | The current design of many parts of roxboro provide excellent connection if you're in a car, but terrible connection and safety if you're not. The recent improvement of the bus schedule (30 mins intervals instead of 60 mins) is a huge improvement and much appreciated! |

Goal: Improve Infrastructure Condition and Resilience

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the proportion of highways and highway assets rated in 'Good' condition. • Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition. • Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities. • Promote resilience planning and practices. • Support autonomous, connected and electric vehicles. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the proportion of highways and highway assets rated in 'Good' condition. • Maintain transit vehicles, facilities and amenities in the best operating condition. • Improve the condition of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities. • Promote resilience planning and practices. • Support autonomous, connected and electric vehicles. |

There is a mixture of support and skepticism regarding the goal of "**Improve Infrastructure Condition and Resilience.**" Here's a breakdown:

Supportive Comments:

- **Emphasize Maintenance:** Many comments express support for prioritizing the maintenance of existing infrastructure over investing in new facilities.
- **Focus on Safety and Accessibility:** There is support for improving infrastructure to accommodate alternative modes of transportation such as e-bikes and micro-mobility options, as well as ensuring stormwater mitigation to enhance safety and accessibility.
- **Emphasis on Traditional Transit Solutions:** Several comments suggest prioritizing investments in traditional transit solutions like public transportation and bike infrastructure over emerging technologies and car-centric infrastructure.

Challenging Comments:

- **Skepticism of Emerging Technologies:** Some comments express skepticism about the effectiveness and safety of emerging technologies like self-driving cars, suggesting that resources should be allocated to more proven solutions.

Overall, while there is support for maintaining and improving existing infrastructure, there are concerns about the prioritization of emerging technologies.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Once again, both good and bad included as examples. Maintain what we have? YES! Invest in self driving cars and other pipe dreams? NO! |
| 2 | Ensure we can maintain existing infrastructure before building new facilities |
| 3 | Pay more attention to e-bikes and what would encourage folks to bike more. They're widely available, and bike infrastructure is available in some places. Connecting gaps in infrastructure, and providing good infrastructure at the end destination, like indoor secure bike parking with showers and lockers, could help go a long way. |
| 4 | Maintenance is a very high priority -- if the maintenance is for transportation asset well placed and well designed and intensively used. |
| 5 | emerging technologies could include infrastructure for the many that now work from home |
| 6 | I am highly skeptical of self-driving/autonomous vehicles as a method of transit for two reasons: (1) The technology has yet to be proven reliable because of immense complexities particularly with decision making and many other aspects and (2) it's still an automobile which would continue to exacerbate the issue of congestion and environmental degradation (assuming use of ICE in operation). |
| 7 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 8 | The first bullet item is critical (add sidewalks and greenways), the third is important but the devil will be in the details. The second bullet is not a priority to me. |
| 9 | Please add stormwater mitigation to your list of infrastructure priorities. I know this has become an oddly polarizing issue here, but for those living in flood-prone areas, it's a practical – not political – concern. |
| 10 | Do not waste money on self-driving cars and other gimmicky tech. Spend money on rail, BRT, and well-maintained walkways instead. |
| 11 | I don't care if the road is bumpy. Roads need wider shoulders though. |
| 12 | Maintenance is very important. Lumping them with questionable, unproven technologies like self driving is a questionable choice. |
| 13 | I want is to focus on building a better infrastructure, not just upkeeping our current one. |
| 14 | The implementation examples are unclear and have grammatical mistakes. Why are maintaining bridges and self driving cars linked? This feels like a bill from the US government. Explain what micro mobility etc are, I'm not going to look it up. Maintain bridges as long as it's financially viable. |
| 15 | First example (prioritize funding to maintaining existing roads/bridges) is far more important than the second (investigate emerging tech). |
| 16 | I'm not super familiar with this |
| 17 | Addressing infrastructure needs for our changing population is important--simply adding more cars, though, is not sustainable. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 18 | Keeping up the condition of the structure & the resilience of continually adhering to it is very important and brings the "safety" feeling into it. A Security guard is needed as a jump off jump on basic, for visibility if nothing else. |
| 19 | See my last comment. Except that we must be careful about "emerging technologies." |
| 20 | we should spend more money on maintaining existing roads and retrofitting them to be complete streets. We should spend less on building new roads. |
| 21 | More high speed travel lanes are needed on all roads. |
| 22 | No comment this speaks for itself. |
| 23 | Need to plan for a future of fewer cars rather than increasing further. |
| 24 | of course, allowing for emergency transport is important. But new tech gadgets can be a waste of money and time. |
| 25 | Need to support innovative changes |
| 26 | Micro transit like solving the last mile problem? Yes, that's great. Bikes for rent around the city, ie: DC is a good example, yes. Working to make things better for self-driving cars? Not worth the money. Investigate more bus routes over that. |
| 27 | I rank this goal as #7 in importance. The current infrastructure is far too car-centric, and keeping it in place is not at all what we should be trying to do. With that said, we should include considerations for redundancies in case of emergencies. With climate change, we can count on more of them. |
| 28 | Although maintenance is a crucial element of our infrastructure, our region can't afford to invest significantly in what current systems as it continues to grow and sprawl. |
| 29 | this sounds like it's predominately to facilitate cars... if this will help with public transit than YES. self-driving cars meh. |
| 30 | We need to not just keep doing what we have been. We We don't need more expressways or widen a lot of roads to 3+ lanes. |
| 31 | High quality and well maintained roads are essential to a quality living and commuting experience |
| 32 | I don't think it is fair to ask us to rate something that includes jargon without providing definitions. I'm not sure if laypeople know what "micro transit", "micro-mobility" and "ITS systems" are or at least what this survey is specifically referring to. Similarly, I don't see as fair to include an acronym, "ITS," without providing a definition. This is important to making informed decisions as citizens. I'm conflicted on this. I'm for building redundancy and resilience through public transit, micro-mobility, and potentially micro transit (not as familiar with the latter). I'd really like to see improved public transit especially connecting areas of the Triangle. I see that as more important than further investments in roads and car-centric transportation. |
| 33 | People are moving here. Many have cars. Plan on that. |
| 34 | My concern is this will be focused on car infrastructure which is the area we need to stop throwing so much transit funding at. |
| 35 | Durham's roads are crumbling |

| | |
|----|--|
| 36 | Investigate micro-mobility for communities of Wake County, specifically in high growth areas in south wake county. There are very few public transportation opportunities in and around Holly Springs. I believe it would benefit microtransit options similiar to what is available in Cary and Morrisville. |
| 37 | Yes, we need to make sure the network is reliable. But there is proven technology that works. Improve existing roads with sidewalks, crosswalks, bus lanes and concrete-protected bike lanes. |
| 38 | I selected not important because what we really need is investment in traditional transit solutions. I don't want money wasted on new gadgetbahns when we can't even utilize our existing infra to make fast and frequent rail and bus service to everyone in our urban areas. That should be our top priority. Expanding trains service and dedicating space from currently overbuilt streets to buses would go a long way to make our infrastructure more resilient. It's simply unsustainable to have every commuter driving around in their own personal massive SUV or truck and think that our infrastructure will ever work. |
| 39 | Prioritize funding to maintaining existing roads/bridges/tunnels than new locations |
| 40 | I feel that emerging technologies belongs in a separate category. Of these 3, the first is the most important. |
| 41 | zero deaths or serious injuries from traffic crashes, zero carbon emissions, and zero disparity of access based on race |
| 42 | Most of our infrastructure is centering the travel of automobiles. I would like to de-emphasize automobility in the triangle. |
| 43 | Maintaining and having redundancy is important, but emerging tech is not |
| 44 | Maintenance of existing facilities is important. I support investigating emerging technologies but do not support allowing self-driving cars on our streets until the technology has improved significantly. |
| 45 | Especially emerging technologies mentioned will not work for mass transit - mass transit has very large numbers of individuals traveling in the same locations at the same time. With individuals means of transportation, this creates space and capacity problems. That's why we have trains. Micortransit is predominantly a form of transit advocated for by wealthy individuals who prefer chauffeured service such as Uber because they tend to wish to travel in privacy. Working transit needs to scale to large numbers in concentrated locations and spaces. Our priority should be transit that is suitable for growth in population and density. |
| 46 | We shouldn't spend money on new road infrastructure, but should upgrade it to make it safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. |
| 47 | Important only as an interim goal. Disappointed to see so much money going to highway widening, etc. Public transport has to be the priority. We are a single urban locale now. People want to go to all the places in the Triangle. Give us a safe and cost-effective way to do that. |
| 48 | We should be investigating pod transportation systems. An example is Skytran. |
| 49 | Very Important |

| | |
|----|---|
| 50 | While I think it's important to maintain existing infrastructure, I think that municipalities across the country often place far too much emphasis on "emerging technologies" that ultimately do not solve the fundamental issues their respective transportation systems face. There exists long standing, real-world, proven transportation solutions out there that could accomplish everything we need and more. We do not need to reinvent the wheel when we have so far to go in the way of transit frequency, bike infrastructure, etc. |
| 51 | In general, the vehicle infrastructure is reasonably sound and maintained. Bicycle and public transit infrastructure is woefully inadequate to demand and has large/frequent gaps. |
| 52 | provide funding to maintain existing infrastructure, roads, bridges to serve the existing people located and in need of the facilities. provide more capacity for the growing Durham county residents that have been placed in communities that are not mixed used and are dependent on cars. |
| 53 | Our area is experiencing rapid population growth and therefore an investment in infrastructure is indicated. |
| 54 | It depends on what infrastructure is in question. I believe that we should maintain our current bridges and tunnels but I believe that we should invest in a light rail and rapid system outside of the city centers that can connect ALL parts of the triangle and the counties that they are in. I support micro-mobility. I am lukewarm about micro transit. I am not interested in using uber and other gig economy jobs to help with this issue. It is a band-aid fix and is not sustainable long term. Although it may be useful for those in the disability community or in unique scenarios like going to the airport, it should not be implemented on a wide scale to where that is our ONLY option for transportation outside of a car. I am also not interested in self-driving cars (very dangerous). The ITS systems seem a bit too "Big Brother" for my liking. We need to build more electric charging stations that are actually maintained after they are built. They also should be built in the surrounding city areas and not just in the city centers. |
| 55 | Maintaining the current system should be a high priority. This should also include maintaining sidewalks, trails, bicycle facilities, signal systems, and our local streets pavements. The emerging technologies should also include signal systems that can be optimized for people walking and biking and riding transit; intersection designs that are safer for all users (modern roundabouts). Network redundancies are important and modifying our streets to create more grid by building out "paper" streets, or connecting cul-de-sacs to neighboring development for people walking and biking. |
| 56 | Maintaining and improving roads and congestion. Not interested in emerging technologies |

Goal: Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change

| CAMPO Objectives | DCHC MPO Objectives |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce negative impacts on the natural and cultural environments. • Reduce mobile source emissions, greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption. • Connect transportation and land use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce negative impacts on the natural and cultural environments. • Reduce transportation sector emissions. • Achieve net zero carbon emissions. |

The comments show significant support for the goal of "**Protect the Human and Natural Environment and Minimize Climate Change**" by advocating for measures such as investing in public transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure, promoting denser development in already developed areas, and preserving natural areas like wetlands and forests. There is support for prioritizing transit over road construction, integrating land use and transportation planning, and setting ambitious targets for reducing carbon emissions. However, there were concerns expressed about balancing environmental protection with development needs, ensuring affordable housing in denser developments, and addressing budget constraints. Overall, the comments reflect a recognition of the importance of protecting the environment while addressing the challenges of urban development and transportation.

| Online Survey Comments | |
|------------------------|--|
| 1 | Investing in public transit & bike/ped infrastructure |
| 2 | Focus of this goal should be on allowing denser development in already developed areas, and preserving existing farmland and natural areas. Any plans that utilize or expand existing infrastructure should be accelerated. |
| 3 | Yes to more investment in transit, not to more investment in road construction, yes to denser development |
| 4 | Protecting the natural environment (wetlands, woods, open space preserves, etc.) is important, but this is a lower priority than minimizing climate change. |
| 5 | The examples of this goal are too broad. I support some but not others. |
| 6 | I would like to see more development – even if that means multistory buildings – on the footprint of existing buildings, abandoned lots, and other areas that wouldn’t lead to clearcutting trees. For example, I applaud the development of the Blue Hill District because it involved repurposing an existing developed site. I’m not sure how, but in Chapel Hill-Carrboro, of all places, cutting down trees has become synonymous with being pro-environment. Likewise, opposing such efforts is seen as being a “NIMBY.” The reality is that many municipalities are rebuilding their green infrastructure, while CH and Carrboro is doing the opposite. It is short-sighted and doesn’t accept the fact that we are facing environmental issues due to climate change (heavier rains, more intense hurricanes, hotter summers, etc.). |

| | |
|----|---|
| 7 | These all sound great, but the biggest need is handling the amount of traffic in the area. The current infrastructure can't meet current demand or the pending growth in the region. |
| 8 | Very Important to save nature as is and work around it as much as possible. Traffic is going to always be a problem, Outer loops are always needed. Jump in and out of buses, similar to the sightseeing buses, use a loop and the mixed use area's . I believe in some type payment for this, could be adjusted due to economic needs, but \$1 is better than free. |
| 9 | Protect the environment to the extent possible. Growth is inevitable, but it must be managed with environment as one of the MANY considerations. It's just not as simple as, Protect the Environment! |
| 10 | I burned a dumpster full of tires in response to this question. The smoke will shade the earth helping to cool it back down. |
| 11 | I witnessed the re-routing of highway 17 from Chocowinity to Washington, NC over a 2 or 3 year time frame. The project included the construction of a bridge over wetlands. Not once in the time that I witnessed the construction of this project did I ever see any equipment touch the ground of the designated wetland; all of the construction was handled from the deck of the bridge. Technology exists today to do amazing things and protecting people and the environment are greatly affected when such technology is incorporated in the project. Please plan for more use of such technology. |
| 12 | Provide alternative crossings for wildlife that cross along our major highways. Apply for EV charging station grants to be available for us on public lands |
| 13 | Land use and transit are KEY to this goal |
| 14 | Stop sprawl and single-use-type land development. |
| 15 | Still this is more dependent upon the manufacturing community to build modes accessible to the public |
| 16 | I work as a biologist in animal conservation. I still think that it's perfectly OK to trade a wetland for a train line that could connect Chapel Hill - Durham - Raleigh and therefore take thousands of cars a day off the road. Residential developments should be well-connected. Absolutely denser development, but I think some of the goals here oppose each other. Let's lower GHG emissions and keep everyone connected, and probably! By nature of the growth occurring in this area! Even building denser it is possible we need to trade some amount of forest or wetland for increased density, a passenger train, or to take cars off the road and combat climate change by providing connections between existing communities. That's a good trade-off to make. So, YES to minimize climate change, and TO A DEGREE protect the natural environment. Let's not mow everything down. But some trade-offs should be expected and receive my full support. That's why my ranking on this goal falls in the middle/middle not-important. Other goals (increased connectivity by foot, bike, bus, and rail - building higher density) take precedence. |
| 17 | I rank this goal as #1 in importance. Given the huge contribution of our current transportation system to climate change, we have to do everything we can as fast as we can to diminish its impact. Taking this into account should drive how many of the other goals are achieved. |
| 18 | Dense new development must include affordable housing |
| 19 | this is better |

| | |
|----|--|
| 20 | We should definitely be cognizant about our impact on the environment, but we should be careful to put too much emphasis on things like cleaner transportation services. There is likely a much better ROI if we were to convert more people from driving single commuter vehicles to using public transportation. This accomplishes all of the presented goals above while also accounting for better safety and promote increased investment into our transit systems. |
| 21 | The environment will go on without us, its people that will die if air quality and indices worsen |
| 22 | Yes, let's also work to reduce overall Vehicle Miles Travelled for this goal even if its EV's. And YES lets please protect our ecosystems including wetlands the best we can. I appreciate the density and proximity centered approach. |
| 23 | Emphasize density and increase cost associated with sprawl development. |
| 24 | Investing in public transit technologies and alternative fuels. |
| 25 | Denser development is what we want. For example, the development of Northgate Mall has led to a high level of positive interest from the community. |
| 26 | The most important. |
| 27 | I get the sneaking suspicion that you are trying to get positive responses to promote a rail system |
| 28 | This is all great, but I want to call out some of the stuff around environmental analysis. We have to make sure we don't use that as an excuse to not expand our public transit options while continuing our single occupancy vehicle dependence. Damage from expansion and over-use of our streets and roads by personal vehicles likely far outweighs the construction of new public transit infrastructure. |
| 29 | We are risking the future of our only habitable planet. We have six years to rapidly decarbonize if we want to live. Very few things are higher priority. |
| 30 | Along with this, we should repurpose roads to accommodate biking and walking and to make them safer and more attractive modes of transportation. |
| 31 | I would like to invest in public transit and prevent sprawl. Sprawl loses money for the city and prevents transit from working well. |
| 32 | Denser development and avoiding wetlands are important |
| 33 | I support better coordination of land use and transportation and do not support the uncoordinated residential development that is occurring in Durham and some other jurisdictions. I support the 15-minute city concept. NCDOT and the MPOs should implement the Clean Transportation Plan including strategies to reduce VMT. |
| 34 | Critical |
| 35 | Some of these goals seem important (transit, wetlands), others seem unimportant. Should not have been lumped into one question. |
| 36 | Yes, build more housing, reduce need for roads. |
| 37 | Encourage denser housing and disincentivize further sprawl. |
| 38 | We need more viable alternatives to car dependency. |
| 39 | I'd prefer to see existing vacant parcels be prioritized for development. |
| 40 | Very import to identify, consider, and disclose the indirect and cumulative impacts in preparing and publishing the plan. |
| 41 | Very Important |

| | |
|----|---|
| 42 | We must increase density in the Triangle, particularly around in-demand locations (downtowns, universities, Village District, etc.) and transportation hubs. Of course, public transportation is essential to reducing emissions, but I urge caution in expending too many resources on green public transit technology: more specifically, while I do think it's important to transition the bus fleet to CNG and hybrid/electric, increasing frequency and reliability to attract significantly more transit ridership will likely have a much greater impact in reducing carbon emissions than keeping a low ridership, but clean-energy-powered, system. |
| 43 | What is a main road? If you prioritize main roads being away from residential developments, do you mean highways instead of main roads? How can having main roads away from residential developments be in the same section as denser development? |
| 44 | Density increases along with transit hubs and safe routes to schools, workplaces, and commerce is needed. |
| 45 | Again, our family's budget is stretched thin, and taxes would need to be raised in order to reach this goal. |
| 46 | I think we need to keep in mind that we need to make our towns and neighborhoods walkable and bikeable. That will lead to a higher impact on the environment and air quality. I worry that building main roads away from the areas that we live will increase car dependency not decrease it. I believe that we should support mix-use development and build housing for all income levels. I also think we should not forget about the people who earn above \$40,000 but who don't earn \$120,000 a year when we talk about affordable housing. They cannot afford \$500,000 houses either. I support protecting our natural resources like farmland and wetlands. I would love to see more community gardens and activities that can promote working with the environment and not against it. We need to build more electric charging stations that are actually maintained after they are built. They also should be built in the surrounding city areas and not just in the city centers. I support the electrification of our busing system and I hope that plans for a light rail system would include electrification generated by clean energy. We should also look into the concept of building wildlife bridges/crossings to help connect ecosystems broken apart by our highways. |
| 47 | I would like to understand how you plan to coordinate with land use planning. |
| 48 | Both MPO's should set a target for zero carbon emissions from the transportation sector by 2050. |

Note: The contents of this compilation were prepared utilizing ChatGPT and were edited for accuracy and content.