



MEMORANDUM

To: Public Workshops, May 19 & 20, 2008

From: Peter Trencansky, PE
Project Engineer

Date: September 9, 2008

Subject: **Summary Comments of Public Workshop Meetings
US 64 Corridor Study**

Two public workshops were held on May 19 and 20, 2008 at the following locations:

Date: May 19, 2008
Time: 5:00 – 8:00 PM
Location: Apex High School
1501 Laura Duncan Road, Apex

Date: May 20, 2008
Time: 5:00 – 8:00 PM
Location: Northwood High School
310 Northwood High School Road, Pittsboro

The public was provided the opportunity to listen to a presentation describing the project and review maps showing the long-term Alternatives. Participants were encouraged to talk to NCDOT staff and project team members and provide comments. All attendees received a project handout with a comment form.

A total of 222 participants signed in at the two workshops (May 19 - 171; May 20 - 51). NCDOT also received 49 comment sheets, emails, or letters regarding the project during the comment period for the workshop. A summary of written and email comments is presented in the Summary of Public Workshop Comments.

An executive summary of the main issues concerning the project is as follows:

Executive Summary

- Many of the comments focused on a concern for access, impacts to property and effects of property values in the study area.
- Access concerns focused on opposition to individual neighborhoods being blocked for emergency vehicles, school buses and public buses. Some participants did not like the service road system.
- There was concern about providing better pedestrian and bike facilities and access to/from public facilities.
- Out of 47 comments, only 13 people clearly stated a preference to the proposed

alternatives. Alternative 2 received eight supporters, Alternative 3 had three supporters and two favored Alternative 1.

Summary of Comments and Responses

The following people submitted written comments from the May 19 or May 20 Public Workshop Meeting:

Concerns relating to Access

Comments

Karen Taylor – Ms. Taylor is concerned that Alternative 1 blocks access to her neighborhood (Macgregor West).

Elton Chevalier – Mr. Chevalier feels the access points are too limited.

Jenny Kolb – Ms. Kolb is concerned about access to/from the Knollwood Community and would like to see right-in/right-out access provided under Alternative 2. Ms. Kolb also noted that access to the Kroger Shopping Center was important to their neighborhood.

Wayne Miller – Mr. W. Miller is concerned about “choking” access for local drivers and recommends continuous flow lanes parallel to US 64 along the entire length of the project for local traffic.

Michelle Barry – Ms. Barry states that the Castlewood neighborhood needs improved access to US 64W and that without signals the breaks in traffic that allow them to safely enter US 64 will not be present.

Cynthia F. Wilburn – Ms. Wilburn is concerned about access from Kelly Glen subdivision to NC 540.

Thomas Vroman – Mr. Vroman is concerned that there is not enough room to add a service road in front of Abington Subdivision (Kelly Ridge Road).

Tommy Burns – Mr. Burns requests a different system for the service road entrances and exits that is similar to those used in Texas. Mr. Burns is also concerned with the location of access roads being ½ mile from the existing US 64 and feels that it is likely that it is to accommodate developers and that the roadways should be directly adjacent to the roadway.

Jack Michenfelder – Mr. Michenfelder hopes that the project will preserve the integrity of the state parks with respect to easy access.

Mindy Gill – Ms. Gill is not in favor of eliminating access to her Crosswinds Estates neighborhood.

Marian Lein - Ms. Lein suggests the service road be constructed to the west to Pea Ridge Road. This would allow improved emergency vehicles access to Crosswinds Estates.

Response

Any time the amount of access to a roadway is decreased, the effects on those whose access will be modified is a major concern. Finding the balance between providing local access to properties and providing for regional mobility and connectivity is the most difficult and often the most controversial element of projects that change the access control of a roadway. The difficulty lies in determining how much access to local properties will provide adequate access

without presenting the operational difficulties associated with lesser access constraints. Converting US 64 to a facility with highly controlled access was established in Phase 1 of the US 64 Corridor Study and reflects the importance of a facility with a US route designation that is designated as a NCDOT Strategic Highway Corridor(SHC). The corridor is also designated as a route on the National Highway System denoting that it is a route that important to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility. The levels of access provided for the three alternatives are consistent with the SHC vision and present options that balances cost, the level of access to local properties and the need for regional mobility and connectivity.

Responses to the specific concerns raised are as follows:

- *Karen Taylor comment:* The access associated with Alternative 1 for the MacGregor subdivision would reduce the current level of access but was the best opportunity to include the parallel service road concept.
- *Jenny Kolb comment:* The elimination of the connection in Alternative 2 was due to the safety concerns related to the location of the intersection conflicting with vehicles accelerating from the on ramp.
- *Wayne Miller comment:* The use of a continuous access road along US 64 is represented in Alternative 3 for the Cary/Apex area. For the area in Chatham County, due to the restriction on access within 1000 feet of an interchange ramp the use of a continuous access road is very difficult and it becomes more feasible to access US 64 for longer trips.
- *Michelle Barry comment:* The access to Castlewood was evaluated and an option (Alternative 2) was developed that provides a connection to NC 55 instead directly to US 64.
- *Cynthia Wilburn/Thomas Vroman comment:* The Kelly Ridge area is a difficult area and much of the concerns relate to the re-routing of traffic to the entrance on Kelly Road. Due to the configuration of the Kelly Road interchange the potential solutions are quite limited and the benefits gained from the improved traffic flow were determined to be the most appropriate solution despite the impacts to the local properties.
- *Tommy Burns comment:* The use of Texas style slip ramps was incorporated into Alternative 3 for the Cary/Apex area but was considered too cost restrictive for the Chatham County portion of the project.
- *Jack Michenfelder comment:* The portion of the US 64 corridor across Jordan Lake is very difficult and consideration was given to keeping the access as close to what currently exists as possible. However, due to constraints on acquiring property from a park and the need for a safe facility, the eventual closing of the median openings is the best option available.
- *Mindy Gill comment:* Direct access in the form of an interchange would not be feasible due to the low density in the subdivision and the impacts associated with an interchange. Any direct connection that is not in the form of an interchange would not be in keeping with the vision for the corridor.
- *Marian Lein comment:* The connection to N. Pea Ridge Road was considered, but due to the impacts to properties along Country Lane Road it was not included in the design.

Concerns relating to Community Goals and Values

Comments

Evan Miller – Mr. Miller questions whether this project aligns itself with the Apex 2005 Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, he asks, “Will local businesses suffer if traffic flows through the area more easily?” Also inquires “How will pedestrians reach the community park?”

Steve & Cynthia Swamp – Mr. and Mrs. Swamp feel that Alternatives 1 and 3 are too “radical.” They state that too much change will ruin the small town look and feel.

Robert Lamb – Mr. Lamb is concerned that the plan for Jenks Road intersection is not in line with the Apex Comprehensive Plan.

Daniel B. Martin – Mr. Martin feels that the project would facilitate long-distance travel at the expense of local travel and that NCDOT has the balance of these interests wrong.

Responses

The improvements proposed along this corridor have been developed with the input of the towns of Cary, Apex and Pittsboro as well as Wake and Chatham counties. The Town of Apex has approved a resolution supporting Alternative 1 because it is compatible with their current plans. The balance between long-distance travel and local travel is a very delicate balance and will be considered by the entire study team as a preferred alternative is selected; however it should be noted that US 64 is a Strategic Highway Corridor that is vital to moving people and goods within North Carolina.

Concerns relating to Property Value and Relocations

Comments

Thomas Vroman – Mr. Vroman stated that proposed alternatives would have a negative effect on the beauty and value of the entrance to their neighborhood (Abbingdon).

Mallie Jenks – Ms. Jenks fears that she may lose the property she owns at Jenks Road and US 64. This would be a third time property loss for her.

Rhonda Strother – Ms. Strother suggests moving the bridge at Jenks Road to the east to prevent ten families from moving. She notes that these families have owned the land for generations.

Pheobe J. Jenks – Ms. Jenks proposes moving the bridge at US 64 and Jenks Road east to tie into Jenks Road. She notes that this would prevent ten families from moving.

Joseph & Tamara Powers – Mr. and Mrs. Powers oppose the service road near their property. They feel that this study has already devalued their property.

Paul Vivirito – Mr. Vivirito is concerned that his neighborhood (Deer Run) would suffer from devalued property.

Belinda Spears Hester – Ms. Hester adamantly opposes all 3 alternatives because she owns commercial property that would become land locked, reducing its value dramatically. She would like to be called to discuss how she can oppose the project.

Edith Resnick – Ms. Resnick is concerned about decreasing her property value. She feels the area will be seriously affected by any of the proposed plans.

Frankie Pendergraph – Ms. Pendergraph is concerned about a possible new road near her property, property devaluation, and her property being seized by the project. Additionally, coordination with an attorney for Ms. Pendergraph, Ms. Lisa Finklestein, has occurred and will

be discussed further in the near future.

Response

The economic effect of a project is an essential consideration in determining whether a project will provide an improvement that meets the needs of the overall community while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the greatest extent possible. The effect of the project on property for those along the corridor would vary depending on location. Several research efforts have evaluated the effects on property values in the vicinity of freeways and have determined that the biggest negative influence on property values is the noise associated with the freeway. It should be noted that the studies are for areas outside of North Carolina and the effects on property values do not always translate from geographic region to geographic region. In general the increase in noise does have a negative effect on single family dwelling units.

Responses to the specific concerns raised are as follows:

- *Thomas Vroman comment:* It was determined that improved benefit in traffic operations and safety would be the most appropriate solution despite the impact on the entrance to the Abbingdon neighborhood.
- *Mallie Jenks/Rhonda Strother/Pheobe J. Jenks comment:* The alignment at the Jenks Road interchange will be discussed with the corridor study team to determine if relocation to the east is possible.
- *Paul Vivirito comment:* The proposed project would likely increase noise levels which could potentially devalue the property. Noise abatement measures could reduce this affect and would be considered in future studies for the project.
- *Belinda Spears Hester comment:* The parcel would be landlocked by the proposed alternatives. Further studies as the project moves forward would be required to determine if constructing a service road to this parcel would be feasible from a cost standpoint. In the event that access could not be provided the parcel would have to be acquired based on its highest and best use in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act.
- *Frankie Pendergraph comment:* The service road will be evaluated to determine if the road can be located in manner that it will minimize or avoid the property if possible.

Concerns relating to the Natural Environment

Comments

Frankie Pendergraph – Ms. Pendergraph is concerned about wetland destruction and storm water run off.

Paul Vivirito- Mr. Vivirito is concerned that his neighborhood (Deer Run) would suffer from air pollution.

Response

The impacts to environmental features must be balanced against all other impacts and minimized or avoided to the greatest extent possible. The project will likely improve the air quality due to the reduction of vehicles idling and accelerating along the corridor. The increase in average speed along a facility has a positive effect on air quality. Additional analysis of the environmental effects of the project will be conducted on the preferred alternative once selected.

Concerns with Safety

Comments

Edith Resnick – Ms. Resnick would like to adjust the speed limit to 45 mph through the residential community.

Robert Hall – Mr. Hall is concerned that the loss of a left turn access to/from Abbington Road will cause congestion and safety issues due to re-routing of traffic to Lansbrooke Lane where many small children live.

Paul Vivirito- Mr. Vivirito is concerned with safety for school buses entering and exiting the highway. He also feels that NCDOT should keep US 64 as safe as possible with current roadway makeup and design.

Brad & Anne Williams – Mr. And Mrs. Williams believe the project should include protection for Apex High School students who leave during lunch.

Ron King – Mr. King was concerned about safety for Apex High School students as well as for those entering and exiting the library.

Mark Bryant – Mr. Bryant is concerned about increased traffic and safety, especially along Olde Raleigh Road, near the library and along Lake Pine Drive.

Joseph & Tamara Powers – Mr. and Mrs. Powers are concerned that the improvements would not be safe for their children.

Responses

The evaluation of safety in determining the preferred alternative for this project is one of the primary evaluation measures. All of the alternatives would increase the control of access along the corridor which has been shown to improve the overall safety of roadways. Protecting pedestrians and bicyclists is another measure that must be considered and development of a plan that provides adequate safety is essential to the development of the corridor.

Responses to the specific concerns raised are as follows:

- *Edith Resnick comment:* The reduction in speed along the residential portion of the project in the future would not be in keeping with the vision for the corridor. The best measure to improve safety would be to keep traffic flowing with as few stops as possible and to provide for adequate, safe crossings of the corridor for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- *Robert Hall comment:* The left-turn movement into Kelly Road (Abbington Subdivision) will likely be removed for safety reasons regardless of the outcome of this study due to increasing traffic volumes and safety concerns with turning vehicles. The improvement in safety resulting from closing the median opening would likely be more substantial than the reduction in safety at the Lansbrooke Lane entrance.
- *Paul Vivirito Comment:* The proposed alternative would likely improve safety for school buses. The number of crashes involving school buses on interstate freeways made up only 1.8% of the crashes. Additionally, a majority (over 70%) of crashes involving school buses were for crash types that would be eliminated with full control of access roadways (such as angle, head on and backing up). It is also noteworthy that the most dangerous movements for buses on freeway facilities is merging or changing lanes and this type of movement resulted in 16 of the 1,146 accidents involving buses.
- *Brad & Anne Williams/Ron King comment:* The protection of pedestrians in the vicinity of

the school was strongly considered as the Alternatives were developed. The inclusion of sidewalks and the proposed grade separated crossings would improve the safety by reducing conflicts between vehicles on US 64 and pedestrians.

- *Mark Bryant comment:* The increase in traffic along Olde Raleigh Road would likely require some improvements to improve the safety along the corridor, especially improving the geometry and sight distances at the Lake Pine Drive intersection.

Concerns with Noise

Comments

David Marty – Mr. Marty feels that noise protection is necessary for US 64.

Yvette Crawley – Ms. Crawley states that her property is adjacent to US 64 and she wants a sound wall constructed.

Paul Vivirito- Mr. Vivirito is concerned that his neighborhood (Deer Run) would suffer from highway noise.

Ellen Buck – Ms. Buck would like sound barriers for those properties that back up to US 64.

Joseph & Tamara Powers – Mr. and Mrs. Powers are concerned with the noise from the project being unbearable.

Responses

The conversion of the US 64 corridor to a freeway/expressway will likely not result in substantially higher noise levels than would be present without the conversion, however the reduced buffering may make the noise impacts greater. The volume of traffic on US 64 will continue to increase in the future as development occurs. The level of highway noise depends on three things: (1) The volume of traffic, (2) The speed of the traffic and, (3) the number of trucks in the flow of traffic. Vehicle noise is a combination of noise produced by the engine, exhaust and tires. The largest component of noise generation is from vehicles accelerating or decelerating. With the current configuration it is likely that vehicles would be in a constant state of acceleration and deceleration due to the traffic signals and intersections, which would potentially be louder than a constant stream of traffic going a constant speed. The abatement, or buffering, of noise is considered and evaluated for any noise impact in accordance with standards set by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and NCDOT. Since this study is for planning purposes only and no funding has been programmed for improvements, the evaluation of noise abatement measures is not appropriate at this time. Once the project is funded a detailed noise analysis will be completed, including the full evaluation of noise abatement measures.

Concerns with Long-term Alternatives

Comments

Karen Taylor – Ms. Taylor likes Alternative 2 the least and Alternative 3 the best. Alternative 2 increases cut-through traffic in her neighborhood (Macgregor West).

Pat & Ed McCall – Mr. and Mrs. McCall dislike Alternative 1 and prefer Alternative 2 because it does not utilize Olde Raleigh Road as a service road.

Kenneth Marks – Mr. Marks feels Alternative 3 is best because the service road concept provides better access.

Doris Bowman – Ms. Bowman proposes moving the bridge at US 64 and Jenks Road east of her property to the vacant land.

Evan Miller – Recommends stacking lanes at school that would prevent the use of Knollwood.

Mark Bryant – Mr. Bryant feels that Alternatives 2 and 3 are better than Alternative 1, especially for the Lake Pine Drive Area.

Tom Colwell – Mr. Colwell thinks that Alternative 2 is the best and feels that Alternative 1 won't be good enough for the future and that Alternative 3 is overkill. He suggests the following to consider: Use traffic circles instead of signals, use high quality aesthetics on overpasses and sound barriers in the Apex area, and use quality landscaping.

Robert Bush – Mr. Bush wants interchanges with a "Texas Turnaround" approach to accommodate U-turn movements.

John Buck – Mr. Buck states that he does not like the "New Jersey Turnpike Answer" to the project (Alternative 3). He prefers Alternative 1 to Alternative 3 and feels that Alternative 2 may be a good compromise.

David Rowland – Mr. Rowland prefers Alternative 1 as it is the least disruptive to the existing neighborhoods and businesses.

Chuck Evans – Mr. Evans feels that a combination of Alternatives 1 and 2 would be most viable for residents and businesses. Alternative 3 makes the largest impact on the area and is the most confusing.

Jim Scarborough – Mr. Scarborough prefers Alternative 2 at Lake Pine best and does not like Alternative 3. He stated that Alternative is almost right from east of Lake Pine Drive to US 1 but should consider making Gregson Drive right-in/right-out and Edinburgh and MacGregor West similar to Gregson on Alternative 1. He also has concerns about the left turn from US 64W to NC 55S, and feels that more improvements are needed. He is thankful for the workshop.

David Marty – Mr. Marty prefers Alternative 3 because it provides similar access to Chalon Drive as currently exists.

John R. Jarus – Mr. Jarus shared that he is researching the alternatives.

Rena Hatley Perry – Ms. Perry hopes that the project never receives funding, but if it does, she prefers Alternative 2.

Ann Oakley – Ms. Oakley hopes that the project never gets funding, however, she prefers Alternative 2.

Frankie Pendergraph – Ms. Pendergraph is concerned with the service road near her property and the proximity to the Colonial Pipeline as well as potential impacts to her well and septic systems.

Response

The preferences of individuals are noted and will be considered as the preferred alternative is selected by the project team.

Responses to the specific concerns raised are as follows:

- *Doris Bowman comment:* The alignment at the Jenks Road interchange will be discussed with the corridor study team to determine if a relocation to the east would be beneficial.

- *Tom Colwell comment:* The use of roundabouts along the mainline of US 64 would not serve the future traffic volumes; however consideration for the use of roundabouts at intersections where connections between US 64 and side streets occurs, such as where ramps meet the side road, were considered. Due to the constraints on land adjacent to the roadway the footprint of roundabouts would generally not be feasible because of the impacts to properties. In some of the less urban areas the implementation of roundabouts may be considered further by the project study team. Additionally, aesthetics and landscaping are areas that are being evaluated by the project study team and will be considered in selection of the preferred alternative.
- *Robert Bush comment:* The use of Texas-style turnarounds will be evaluated further to determine the potential benefits to traffic operations. The inclusion of the turnarounds would increase the cost of construction due to the longer bridge structures and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis once the preferred alternative is selected.
- *Chuck Evans/Jim Scarborough comment:* Individual elements from each of the alternatives may be combined to make up the preferred alternative.
- *Frankie Pendergraph comment:* The design in the vicinity of the pipeline will be evaluated in greater detail to determine if modifications would provide for an improved design.

Concerns with Alternative Modes of Transportation

Comments

Mindy Gill – Ms. Gill is concerned about re-routing the bus routes and the impact on children and elderly.

Connie McAdams - Ms. Adams opposes the proposed changes to US 64 and feels that Chatham County does need additional growth. She recommends finding ways to decrease traffic and encourage carpooling.

Paul Vivirito – Mr. Vivirito says to, "Stop the US 64 Study! Take mass transit."

Cynthia F. Wilburn – Ms. Wilburn inquired if thought was being given to public transportation due to the high gas prices.

Tom Colwell – Mr. Colwell recommends that the alternatives accommodate bike traffic.

Liz Cullington – Ms. Cullington is dissatisfied with the limited focus and goals of "long-term planning." She notes that plans include traffic projections, but do not address rising fuel costs. Enhancements are centered around cars/commercial trucks, and not on bikes/pedestrians. She feels strongly that the study should include a greater look at mass transit.

Abe Shocket – Mr. Shocket notes that the model does not consider rising gas prices. He feels that planning should consider home and work together, not more cars and driving.

Robert Bush – Mr. Bush wants more consideration for bikes/pedestrians and feels that it should be integrated at the beginning of the process and not added at the end. He also feels that the pedestrian/bike improvements should be developed to the same level as the roadways.

Ellen Buck – Ms. Buck wants more consideration for mass transit (e.g., monorail) with the rising price of gas.

Chuck Evans – Mr. Evans is concerned about pedestrian/bicycle access and crossings.

Michael Gapin – Mr. Gapin requested that road biking be incorporated into the final design of the study and indicated this study had the opportunity to set the standard for bike riding in the future.

Ron King – Mr. King felt that, with high gas prices, the best use of taxpayers money would not be in building a large artery for automobiles and that improved rail service would be a better use of the money.

Response

The implementation of multi-modal accommodations for bicycle, pedestrian and transit will be evaluated in detail once a preferred alternative is determined. Consideration for these measures was included in the development of the alternatives, however was not shown on the maps due to scale of the maps not being conducive to such details (ie. A sidewalk would show up less than 1/32 of an inch wide). The evaluation of transit will also be coordinated with the ongoing efforts of the Regional Transit Blueprint (<http://www.transitblueprint.org/>). The current blueprint does designate the US 64 as a transit corridor, however; additional coordination with regard to future transit will be completed in the upcoming months.

Concerns relating to Public Outreach

Comments

Daniel B. Martin – Mr. Martin feels that NCDOT "tramples on the principle of government of the people, for the people, and by the people." And that NCDOT has a reputation for ignoring citizen input.

David Rowland – Mr. Rowland feels that the workshop was not properly advertised. He says that an ad in newspaper is not enough. A notification to all property owners within 100 feet of the proposed project by first class mail is necessary.

Robert & Jane Pan – Mr. And Mrs. Pan own ten+ acres off Jenks Road and have concerns that they were not contacted about the alternatives.

Response

Two newsletters (including one announcing the workshop) were mailed to all property owners within 1600 feet of US 64 within the project study limits. The workshops were also advertised in the newspaper and stories were carried on several local television news programs. The mailing list was developed based on the current tax data entered into the GIS systems for both Wake and Chatham Counties. For each newsletter a total of 2,000 newsletters were sent via first class mail, with fewer than 50 being returned as undeliverable. While it is possible that every property owner did not receive a newsletter, every effort was made to include all property owners along the corridor and all procedures for NCDOT public involvement were followed.

Concern relating to Historic Properties

Comments

Hope Blackford – Ms. Blackford is concerned about historical properties and sites.

Response

The study includes the evaluation of effects on historic properties. While this study is not subject to all historic preservation laws, it is being developed under the assumption that the project will be constructed with federal money and will be subject to the regulations included in

the National Environmental Policy Act and all applicable historic preservation laws.

Concerns relating to facility type and traffic patterns

Comments

David Rowland – Mr. Rowland would like to see the area west of NC 540 be the highest priority with traffic being re-routed along NC 540 to US 1. He suggests that the improvements east of NC 540 should not be done until it becomes overloaded.

Evan Miller – Recommends re-routing US 64 along NC 540 to US 1 and re-designating US 64 from NC540 to US 1 as US 64 Business.

Steve & Cynthia Swamp – Mr. and Mrs. Swamp feel that routing traffic to NC 540 (without the toll) would be a better option than improving US 64 in the Apex area.

Pete C. Deicher – Mr. Deicher feels that the priorities of this project are wrong and that there is no need to upgrade US 64. He feels that attention should be paid to other roadways that are in greater need. Mr. Deicher also inquired if a citizens advisory committee was a part of the study.

Paul Vivirito – Mr. Vivirito feels that I-40/I-85 should be used as the freeway facility, not US 64.

Response

The potential of bypassing the area from US 1 to NC 540 by using NC 540 and US 1 was considered to some extent when the alternatives were evaluated and the future traffic forecasts for the corridor were completed. The forecast considered whether or not cars would change routes if the congestion along the Cary/Apex section was heavy. The traffic model used for the study showed that due to the increase in length associated with the route (it is 5.5 miles from NC 540 to the US 1 interchange on US 64 while the route from NC 540 south to US 1 and back to the US 64 interchange on US 1 is 8.5 miles) combined with the cost for the toll on NC 540 that very few drivers would choose that route.

Concerns relating to emergency access and response

Comments

Thomas Vroman – Mr. Vroman is concerned that there is not safe access for emergency response vehicles to Abbingdon subdivision.

Mindy Gill – Ms. Gill has serious doubts if emergency vehicles could get to her neighborhood in a timely manner. She notes that her neighborhood has no fire hydrants and eliminating the pond would put these 32 homes at risk.

Marian Lein- Ms. Lein suggests the service road be constructed to the west to Pea Ridge Road. This would allow improved emergency vehicles access to Crosswinds Estates.

Response

The effects of the project on emergency access are likely to result in an increase in the distance that emergency response vehicles must travel to reach their destination. However, the effect of this may be reduced or eliminated due to the increased speed and decreased congestion that would be encountered by emergency responders.

Requests to be added to the mailing list



Request

Scott Kelley - Mr. Kelley is interested in being updated on the project because of real estate investment interests along US 64.

Doris Bowman – Ms. Bowman would like to be included on the mailing list.

Maryann Smith - Ms. Smith would like to be included on the mailing list.

Response

The individuals have been added to the mailing list.

Resolutions

The Town of Apex Town Council passed a resolution on June 3, 2008 to support the adopted Apex Transportation Plan in NCDOT's US 64 Phase 2A Study. The resolution states that NCDOT adopt policies wholly consistent with the Apex Transportation Plan with partial control of access on US 64 east of NC 540.

If you have questions or comments regarding this information, please contact David Wasserman, P.E., NCDOT, at (919) 733-7932 Ext. 361 or Peter Trencansky, URS Project Engineer (Consultant) at (919) 461-1332.