

## Triangle Region TDM Plan and Goals

Compilation of Comments (received through 12/03/19)

---

### Email Responses

11/20/19

You couldn't get your light rail by hook or crook so now you bed wetting liberals have to go stick your noses where you don't belong, again - in mine and everybody else's business.

This is just like you people. Advocate conservation, conservation, conservation, so everybody conserves until the utility company cries the blues over lost revenue, jacks up water and power rates then we all have to pay more and are expected to keep living on less, less, less.

Then when you can't stand it anymore you think we don't drive enough electric cars. Guess what? The legislature goes and slams electric car owners with an electric car tax. Why? Lost revenue on gasoline tax.

Why can't you people just STFU and live your life and let everyone else live there's.

Regards,  
GK

---

11/20/19

Hi Dale,

Thank you for asking for public input on the new TDM.

I have briefly glanced at the "Draft Triangle Transportation Demand Management Updated Plan" and the "2020 Draft Updated Triangle TDM Goals", and I do not see anywhere the new goals to replace VMT as suggested by this statement from the message below that I am responding to:

"...the Triangle TDM Program has surpassed its original goal of 25%

reduction in growth of vehicle miles traveled for many years and needs a more challenging goal."

Is the proposed replacement for VMT described somewhere that I have missed, or have the new goals not been developed yet?

Thanks,

Ned Kennington

---

11/20/19

Hi Dale,

This is probably not what you want to hear after the recent demise of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit project, but it has been my experience during a significant amount of business travel during my career, that a city that incorporated a serious light rail system, integrated with local bus transit lines flourished.

The best example of this I have personally experienced is St. Louis. I traveled to St. Louis before and after the introduction of the light-rail system and the change was very dramatic. Another system you might want to study is the SunRail system that links Orlando, FL with it's north and south suburbs. It is only a few years old now but has already had an impact on local traffic. How do I know this? I own a winter house in Kissimmee, FL and have been a very pleased recipient of it's success. As I travel on the SunRail trains, I can't but help to notice that a significant portion of the riders are professionals in their 20s and 30s.

This area appears to be ideal for a light-rail system incorporating Raleigh, Chapel Hill and Durham, with a future goal of extending it to Wake Forest. Go for it.

Sincerely,

Pete Smullen  
Durham, NC

---

11/20/19

The most obvious single rider vehicles are the buses I see in Durham, which often have no one aboard except the driver. Surely with all the technology available, we can establish much more efficient bus routes. Or perhaps get a fleet of much smaller buses which can reply on demand to requests, such as a Lyft or Uber type solution. Even though that increases the number of drivers, I suspect it would be much less expensive than empty buses burning fuel all day.

Eileen Pruette

---

11/21/19

Dale,

I would LOVE to take the bus to work. I live and work in Durham. These two places are in the same ZIP code and are 6.5 miles apart if I stay on the major roads.

There is a bus stop in my neighborhood less than a quarter of a mile from my house on Ivey Wood Lane. It looks like there is a bus stop across the street from my office on Silicon Drive. Go Triangle tells me there is no way to get between those two places by riding the bus.

Why is it that every bus route (in Durham) requires that you go to the terminal to change buses? Bus routes should intersect "in the wild" and it should be easy to transfer. It is disappointing that this isn't the case.

So I will continue to seek out alternate side street routes between work and home to keep me moving rather than sitting in traffic twice a day.

Best Regards,

Shayne Sherbert  
Durham Resident

---

11/22/19

I was hoping to go to a session to provide input, but am recovering from a recent surgery so I'd like to submit my comment via email:

I would be interested to see the city explore a model that employs shuttles that use technology to transport people to their workplaces from home. This technology would utilize an app (similar to the concept of group ride features of Uber Pool), so when individuals within the same area who also have a similar destination request a ride, the app would then calculate a route for the shuttle for the riders. I commute from the Hope Valley area to Chapel Hill everyday (and my final destination in Chapel Hill is a few miles from downtown Chapel Hill). This kind of technology would help people like me who otherwise would have to take 2-3 buses to get to my destination and that would take 1.5 hours, compared to my 20 minute commute via individual car. Instead of putting more funding to large buses, this would allow for more shuttles (8-12 passenger vehicles) to take people to destinations that are not centered around "downtown" areas. Passengers would still pay to ride (maybe pay even more than the bus since it's a more custom ride). The total drive time would be longer than a vehicle commute because of different passengers headed to slightly different destinations, but would be shorter than the bus commute that require 1-2 transfers and take 1.5 hours to go only 10 miles. Here is a model very similar to what I'm envisioning:

<https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/carolineodonovan/lyft-is-launching-a-commuter-shuttle-service>

I'd be happy to discuss this thought more, and I appreciate your time!

Janna Starr

---

11/23/19

In response to the request about reducing single-vehicle traffic in Durham This Week: We'd walk rather than drive from our home in Hope Valley to woodcroft shopping center if all of Hope Valley Road had sidewalks.

Thanks -  
Abigail O'Neill, Sunningdale

---

11/23/19

Some general thoughts on the TDM plan and additional recommendations for reducing reliance on single-occupancy vehicles:

- Current level of public transportation is not good enough to warrant significant investment in public outreach. Goal should be to increase convenience of service so that single occupancy transportation becomes less attractive.
- Increase public parking fees on government-owned property.
- Fare-free bus service is very achievable and should be a top priority.
- TDM standards should apply to all providers as to prevent the expanded use of services like Uber and Lyft that don't provide an improvement over single occupancy vehicles.
- Prioritizing city sidewalk installation to connect public to transportation hotspots.
- Moratorium on street widening unless it is for bus-only/bike/pedestrian improvements.

Thanks for the opportunity to share!

Patrick

---

11/25/19

Hello,

Looking over the materials shared for public comment, I believe this evaluation also needs to track accidents, injuries, and fatalities involving different forms of transportation occupying a shared space (e.g. car and bicycle collisions). In particular, I'm concerned about increasing bicycle & pedestrian traffic on roads with higher speed limits (45 mph+) that lack bike lanes, sidewalks, or marked pedestrian crossings.

Thank you.

Chuck Wagon

---

11/26/19

The updated 5 goals seem to be more about the process of how we get somewhere rather than the goal. I can see the need to focus on something more broad than just VMT, but I don't think this gets us to a useful goal. I'd rather see a goal put in place of a net carbon reduction (not just a reduction in growth). The ideas about how we get there are still appropriate.

Sincerely,  
Abraham Palmer  
Carrboro resident and business owner

---

12/1/19

Hi Dale,

I was confused by the updated plan and what kind of feedback is being requested. I had the following questions while reading the Transportation Demand Management Updated Plan and with a clearer understanding I might be able to provide more useful feedback or encourage input from other individuals and organizations.

Hope this helps in any case.

Sincerely,

Nick Doty  
Durham, NC

---

Is public comment being sought for recommendations of plans, projects and policies? Or for setting priorities by which individual programs will be evaluated? I suspect you'll get more focused and more useful public feedback if you explicitly indicate what you're looking for.

Why is Durham County not included in the list of Local Service Providers?

Why are climate change, global warming and/or the climate crisis not mentioned in the transportation demand management plan? Why are transportation-related injuries and deaths not mentioned? I would expect any current transportation-related plan to begin with a statement of the enormous challenge facing our state and region in dramatically reducing carbon emissions, the essential role that transportation plays in those emissions and the huge but preventable costs to human life from our current car-centric system. That the road system is overtaxed is relevant, but I'm surprised to see it described with a higher priority.

The update notes that from 2007 to 2014 there was a single goal of reducing the growth of vehicles mile traveled by 25%. That goal was far too modest, but it was quite specific. To be consistent with the goals of the Paris treaty and with the continued sustainability of our species and civilization, we need massive reductions in vehicle miles traveled, not just reductions in the growth of vehicle miles traveled. Why doesn't this plan explicitly include absolute reductions in VMT and large reductions in per capita VMT as metrics?

Are the numbered goals actually goals? These sound like reasonable activities for the regional service provider to engage in in terms of managing the transportation demand management program for the region. But they largely aren't specific, measurable or time-bound. At the end of any time period (it's not clear if this is a new 7-year plan, or it's a plan for the remaining years of the 7-year plan started in 2014, or some other time period), will we be able to assess clearly whether the goals were achieved or not? Is GoTriangle or the Joint Council of Governments planning to assess at some date in the future whether or not the TDM has "gotten innovative"? If these are not intended to be SMART goals, what is the intention for these goals?

The updated Transportation Demand Management Plan largely doesn't describe what kinds of policies and programs are recommended or considered. That might be about maintaining flexibility for the individual hotspots and local service providers, but it also makes the plan vague and hard to evaluate and decreases the potential for large-scale coordination. Could this plan include what your expert staff believes are the necessary directions for the providers to take on managing transportation demand? For example:

- \* vehicle parking must stop receiving subsidies and must be priced appropriately for all users and by all providers
- \* zoning and planning policies must prioritize infill development, increased density and improved access to jobs, schools and retail
- \* employers must provide plans for substantial increases in telecommuting
- \* road space must be re-allocated to prioritize walking, biking and public transit over single-occupancy vehicle use
- \* transportation options must be priced to reflect their true impacts on the environment and community, including SOV travel priced well above mass transit

12/2/19

Dear Mr. McKeel,

This email constitutes my comments for the above referenced updated plan. When I review the plan goals, I struck by the absence of any discussion about racial equity and the types of accessible public transportation that makes a difference in residents' lives. I am a regular user of public transportation (buses) from Chapel Hill to Raleigh. Goal #4 talks about "Organize educational events on alternative commuting for transportation and planning professionals in MPOs, local government, local transit and economic development agencies, and universities and colleges." Should the question be asked why those individuals are being targeted and not other populations in the community?

I would like to see the planning community assess what are the obstacles for persons to use mass transit to keep their employment. Should it take 2 hours to get to Raleigh from Chapel Hill or Carrboro if you miss the last express bus from GoTriangle. How does that attract additional riders for the bus systems?

Finally, I would like the plan to include a strategic plan to encourage more dedicated bike facilities on the roads, and not more cars. More people, including myself, would ride a bicycle for many trips if we felt safer on the road with cars. I think we are at the point of congestion that we should look at providing dedicated bike lanes.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to the Triangle Transportation Demand Management Updated Plan.

--

Joal H. Broun

---

### Facebook Responses

11/25/19



**Stephanie Grey** Teleworking and flexible work weeks. All bus stops to be covered. More bike lanes. More walking trails.

6d

