

Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Analysis

Subtask 2.8c Working Paper

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

February 25, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	PROCESS OVERVIEW	2
2.1	participant selection	2
2.2	participant contact	2
2.3	interviews	2
2.4	Follow-up.....	3
3.0	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	4
3.1	perception of existing and future corridor mobility conditions	4
3.1.1	How would you describe the current traffic/transportation conditions on the specified corridors?	4
3.1.2	What are the transportation issues or concerns shared by members of the group you represent?	5
3.2	managed lanes concepts – pros and cons	6
3.2.1	What current community issues do you think could affect the outcome of implementing managed lanes in the region?	6
3.2.2	What are your (or your organization’s) concerns or problems with this approach? What do you see as the project’s biggest challenge(s)?	6
3.2.3	Which is preferable to you to avoid congestion on the managed lanes---limiting access, increasing tolls, or combination?	7
3.2.4	Does the managed lane concept present safety and/or enforcement concerns for you?	7
3.2.5	What do you suppose would be the impact on travel behavior of implementing tolling? How would it impact on your own personal travel patterns, mode, and time? How would it impact travel behavior for corridor travelers overall?.....	8
3.2.6	Perceived effectiveness—what managed lane strategies do you think will move the most people? Be most acceptable from a community perspective? Be most acceptable from a political perspective?.....	8
3.2.7	What are your (or your organization’s) views on potential environmental benefits/concerns?8	8
3.2.8	Do you have any suggestions for improving any managed lane concept?.....	9
3.3	Environmental justice issues.....	9
3.3.1	How do you see the issue of equity relative to this study? What do you suppose would be the perception of fairness on the part of various groups?	9
3.3.2	What areas of the community, or what specific groups do you think have a special interest in managed lanes?.....	10
3.4	Other Public input.....	10
3.4.1	Where do you see support coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region? 10	10
3.4.2	Where do you see opposition coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region? What would be the basis for opposition?	11
3.4.3	How do you think we should involve the public and other groups within the region?.....	11
3.4.4	Which project elements (transit only, HOV, HOT) would, in your view, receive more support?11	11

APPENDICES

Appendix A Stakeholders Participants ----- 12

Appendix B Interview Script and Questions ----- 13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- One-on-one stakeholder interviews were conducted with 15 businesses, environmental and public leaders in the region to document issues, opportunities, and concerns regarding the management of freeway lanes and to record ideas for travel option improvements. These interviews:
 - Documented perceptions of transportation conditions on subject corridors, their needs regarding trips to work, school, shopping, and other essential local, regional, and intrastate destinations.
 - Gathered initial feedback on managed lane options being studied.
 - Gathered attitudes and expectations of the project. Query for opinions on lanes managed by access, eligibility, pricing, or a combination thereof.
 - Documented suggested study analysis to address stakeholder concerns.
- The most congested corridors (representing the best candidates for managed lanes) mentioned by interview participants were:
 - US-74
 - I-77
 - I-85
- Highlighted transportation issues or concerns included:
 - Congestion impacts the quality of life for residents of the Charlotte region.
 - Congestion affects recruitment of new businesses to the region.
 - Congestion hinders delivery of products throughout the area, increasing costs to consumer products.
- Interview participants believed, the greatest challenges to implementing managed lanes in the region were:
 - Funding
 - Political will to obtain required funding
 - Public reluctance to change travel behavior to use managed lanes
- The top three priorities when implementing managed lanes included:
 - Increase options for solo drivers to pay/buy-in
 - Encourage use by buses and transit vehicles
 - Encourage use by carpools and vanpools
- According to interview participants, the least important priorities for managed lanes were:

- Raise as much revenue as possible
- Allow trucks to use the lanes at appropriate times during the day
- Allow clean air vehicles use the lanes with no toll
- Interview participants believed equity issues were not a concern because:
 - The best candidates for managed lanes (I-77, I-85 and US-74) are not roadways which would prompt equity concerns inside Charlotte.
 - Persons can use the managed lanes by participating in carpools or vanpools or by riding transit.
 - Managed lanes potentially affect traffic levels in the general-purpose lanes, improving travel for motorists in those lanes as well.
- According to interview participants, managed lanes opponents could object to implementation because:
 - Tolls are perceived as a “government cash grab”.
 - Two tiers of commuters, those who can pay to improve their travel and those who cannot, would be created.
 - Users appear to be paying a second time to use the highway (citizen has already paid for roadway with highway-related taxes).
 - Failing to build necessary infrastructure could stop regional growth.
- Interview participants provided additional opinions about managed lanes:
 - High-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes may be the “sexiest” to the public because no one has to change behavior to use them – you simply pay money.
 - HOT lane revenues have to be fairly administered, and the reasons for implementing toll lanes have to be clearly-articulated to the public.
 - The public could embrace HOT lanes once they understand the advantages to them personally.
 - Implementing “transit only” lanes could receive the most public support because the concept is better understood by Charlotte region citizens. Educational outreach will be required for high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) and HOT lanes.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Public Involvement Program for the Charlotte Region Fast Lanes Study is to identify and involve stakeholders who can help identify the region's key mobility and congestion management issues, opportunities and deficiencies. One-on-one stakeholder interviews were conducted with a select group of business, environmental and public leaders in the region to surface issues, opportunities, and concerns and how the management of freeway lanes could improve travel options. The intent of these interviews was to ensure that study recommendations are sensitive to the vision of and adequately address issues raised by area stakeholders.

These interviews:

- Documented perceptions of transportation conditions on subject corridors, their needs regarding trips to work, school, shopping, and other essential local, regional, and intrastate destinations.
- Gathered initial feedback on managed lane options being studied.
- Gathered attitudes and expectations of the project. Query for opinions on lanes managed by access, eligibility, pricing, or a combination thereof.
- Documented suggested study analysis to address stakeholder concerns.

These interviews provided an opportunity to assess initial perceptions and opinions from a select sample of key stakeholders along the corridor

2.0 PROCESS OVERVIEW

2.1 PARTICIPANT SELECTION

At the study's initiation, a list of potential stakeholder categories were delineated reflecting the political jurisdictions, economic development, environmental, law enforcement and corporate interests of the region. This aided the Study Team in identifying participants who could represent a spectrum of issues likely to exist in areas across the nine-county study area. The Study Team solicited recommendations from the Regional Technical Team (RTT), composed of representatives from the City of Charlotte, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Rural Planning Organizations (RPOs) from the region in the participant selection. Final selection was made in consultation with NCDOT and CDOT staff. Interviewees were selected because of:

- Representation of a specific geographic region that is included in the study area
- Knowledge or responsibility to a specific mode or environmental, social, or community issue
- Stature in the community
- Ability to reflect a representative range of opinions and interests

Appendix A provides the final list of stakeholder participants. Represented organizations and individuals included elected officials, environmental organizations, law enforcement officers, community leaders, chambers of commerce/economic development officials and major employers.

2.2 PARTICIPANT CONTACT

Recommended interview participants were contacted by letter to invite them to participate in interviews. (See appendix for sample of invitation letter) These letters were followed up with a telephone call to answer any questions and schedule the interview time and location. If a selected participant was unable to participate in the interview, an appropriate substitution was made.

2.3 INTERVIEWS

A total of 15 one-on-one interviews were conducted during a four-month period between August and November of 2007. Participants were introduced to the study, its goal and objectives, and study process and schedule. For consistency, the same member of the Study Team conducted all interviews, took the comprehensive notes and compiled the final draft summaries.

Interview participants were informed that specific questions would be posed to engage and encourage feedback. Visual aids including maps and photographs of examples of existing managed lanes were used during the interviews. Participants were generally

posed the same questions, with some flexibility based on their interests and concerns. Questions focused on the following topics:

- Existing conditions along the roads being screened in the first phase of the study
- Issues and constituencies that might impact the study
- Environmental justice challenges
- Concerns that might be raised by managed lane implementation

The interview script and questions are included in **Appendix B**.

2.4 FOLLOW-UP

An interview synopsis was drafted following each interview to document participant feedback. The synopsis was sent to the interview participant for review and approval.

3.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following summarizes the participant interview findings, presented by category. Individual interview summaries are included in **Appendix C**.

Interview participants demonstrated both an sophistication regarding and interest in the subject of managed lanes (only one expressed antipathy for their implementation) and offered good insights on the roads being considered for managed lanes application. Because of their geographic spread and backgrounds, interview participants provided wide-ranging information as to how increasing congestion is impacting the study region.

The following sections provide an overview of the input gathered from interview participants. The questions are added to facilitate understanding.

3.1 PERCEPTION OF EXISTING AND FUTURE CORRIDOR MOBILITY CONDITIONS

3.1.1 How would you describe the current traffic/transportation conditions on the specified corridors?

Peak traffic was called “unbearable” although most added that “many off peak times are bad as well.” If participants had moved into the region or traveled a lot, they understood that the Charlotte region did not have the same level of congestion as larger cities. However, all recognized the need to find new ways to tackle the region’s worsening traffic and expressed interest in the study.

The one road almost everyone mentioned as being in failure was US-74 East. The participant representing Harris Teeter described the challenges their distribution center faces delivering perishables from their Indian Trail location. Participants noted that NCDOT road improvements had eased travel in the Charlotte segment of US-74 west of Albemarle Road. All commented on the inordinate amount of “stop and go” traffic that occurs after those improvements end and persists all the way through Monroe.

The other most frequently mentioned roads for congestion were parts of I-77 and I-85. I-77 was the road where North Carolina State Highway Patrol (NCSHP) troopers most often saw accidents and congestion. The Cabarrus participant characterized widening I-85 as a “critical and urgent need” not just for Cabarrus County, but also for the region.

I-277 was generally called efficient except during peak hours. The NCSHP interviewee singled out the 4th Street exit on I-277 as both functioning poorly and having a lot of wrecks.

One interview participant noted with dismay that “Charlotte is the largest city in the U.S. without a completed loop road.” Finishing the northern leg of I-485 was called “urgent” while widening of the southern leg was termed “10 years late.” NCSHP troopers called I-485 a racetrack, noting they do not have enough officers to patrol it adequately.

The other three roads in the list – NC-16, Gaston East-West Connector, and US-321 – received significantly fewer comments, even from interview participants from those areas.

One participant said that NC-16 had become a feeder road and is consequently very accident-prone, adding that, “It carries so much more traffic than it was designed to carry.”

US-321 at I-85 in Gaston County was mentioned as having a dangerous choke point that is especially backed up during summer months as residents go to their mountain homes.

The Gaston East-West Connector received no major comment until the last interview when the Gastonia native gave very specific details on how completion of this road would open important new areas to development.

3.1.2 What are the transportation issues or concerns shared by members of the group you represent?

Because of feedback from a recent Charlotte Chamber of Commerce trip to Texas, a special effort to probe the business and economic development impact of traffic congestion was made. The representative from the Regional Partnership said that congestion on US-74 hurts Anson and Union counties in business recruitment. Likewise, this interview participant saw a need for the Gaston East-West connector. The existence of US-321 was termed to be “very helpful in recruiting businesses to the Lincoln Industrial Park and represents good cooperation between Gaston and Lincoln Counties.” The interviewee noted the following:

“Put a pushpin and where there is infrastructure, you can recruit. Companies want quick access to the interstates and the airport.”

An interviewee commented that the Regional Roads Committee focuses its concern on the challenge of moving commerce across the region, demonstrating a real need to be proactive in addressing congestion before it worsens. The group has taken a real interest in toll roads, recognizing that once one is built, the next ones will be welcomed.

Congestion was judged to cause a loss of productivity. Many middle-income people who have no choice but to get to work by a certain time have to alter their lifestyles and must face an hour and a half commute each way just to be on time, one person noted.

According to the interviewee from Wachovia, major businesses are analyzing alternative work and mobility patterns to tell the bank where future facilities could be established. Wachovia has also allowed for greater work schedule flexibility to help employees avoid peak travel times when feasible.

For a company like Harris Teeter with the 560 weekly trips originating from its Union County distribution facility alone, fuel is one of their biggest expenses. This company’s representative noted that, despite all of Harris Teeter’s efficiency efforts, traffic is the one thing they cannot control.

Political interviewees noted that people are totally frustrated, but they don't know who to complain to and, to a degree, don't even expect any resolution. They want to blame someone for the decisions as well as know who created this mess.

3.2 MANAGED LANES CONCEPTS – PROS AND CONS

3.2.1 What current community issues do you think could affect the outcome of implementing managed lanes in the region?

3.2.2 What are your (or your organization's) concerns or problems with this approach? What do you see as the project's biggest challenge(s)?

Interview participants moved from one issue to another when answering this set of questions. Interview participants who were also elected officials recognized that naysayers would invariably balk. However, the elected officials were somewhat sanguine on the subject. On the one hand, they knew that the public was clamoring for solutions, while on the other hand they were resistant to making the hard choices to change their behavior.

Elected officials highlighted the two key obstacles as 1) money and 2) the political will to make the hard decisions to get the money to make it happen. When asked if the increasing lack of funding had exacerbated the decision making on road funding, one elected official indicated, "No, road politics haven't changed, but the process has been infected."

One elected official recommended a look at a transportation authority for the region, with strong governance including taxing authority. He felt that this approach was the only comprehensive way to address the region's multi-modal needs and encouraged the inclusion of South Carolina.

Interview participants gave priority to the following:

- Increase options for solo drivers to pay to use managed lanes
- Encourage buses/transit vehicles
- Encourage vanpools and carpools (although listed separately, many coupled the two)

Giving emergency vehicle access at no toll was considered as mandatory by many.

Interview participants often used their three responses on other items, making it difficult to rank.

The items below received considerably fewer responses from interviewees:

- Raise as much revenue as possible
- Allow trucks to use the lanes at appropriate periods during the day
- Allow clean air vehicles at no toll

While specific findings will be the subject of separate technical memoranda prepared during Phase II, overall findings will be presented in matrices and quantified to the extent possible for each type of managed lane treatment identified for each horizon year. A comparison of findings for each corridor will be ranked for overall effectiveness in accordance with pre-determined goals set adopted by the Regional Technical Team. These goals could include:

- Maximizing person throughput
- Maximizing cost effectiveness
- Reducing overall delay
- Maximizing overall net revenue

Results of the corridor and regional evaluation will be presented to agencies and project teams for consideration as part of their ongoing corridor planning and development activities.

3.2.3 Which is preferable to you to avoid congestion on the managed lanes---limiting access, increasing tolls, or combination?

There was no consistent answer here with some favoring limiting access or combining limited access with producing revenue. Only one interview participant felt that producing revenue was the most important goal. The following two quotes reflect the general feeling:

“Limit access. Producing revenue is secondary... money is needed, but reducing congestion is the goal.”

“A combination. The top priority is to move the most people in the fewest vehicles.”

3.2.4 Does the managed lane concept present safety and/or enforcement concerns for you?

“No and no” was the general answer. From a safety perspective, one interview participant advocated the use of full barricades, not the “plastic sticks.” Regarding enforcement, he acknowledged that there would always be those that break the rules stating, “Use technology to enforce.”

The NCSHP representative indicated that, while the department does beef up HOV enforcement when possible, drivers see that the HOV lane is quicker and feel they can (and often do) get away with using the lane so they dart into and out of it. When caught, they respond by saying they paid for that lane so feel they should be able to use it. He did favor expansion of the HOV lane, feeling it had worked well, commenting that “Even when other lanes are moving slowly, the HOV lanes move well.”

3.2.5 What do you suppose would be the impact on travel behavior of implementing tolling? How would it impact on your own personal travel patterns, mode, and time? How would it impact travel behavior for corridor travelers overall?

Those to whom time was important uniformly felt they would pay a toll to gain time. Others who could alter travel times to avoid congestion or who had limited commutes might rarely or never use a managed lane where they would need to pay a toll. That response was true both for those answering the question and for their estimate of what the general public might do.

3.2.6 Perceived effectiveness—what managed lane strategies do you think will move the most people? Be most acceptable from a community perspective? Be most acceptable from a political perspective?

The sense was that many would rather pay money than carpool. Typical reactions were:

“Soon people will do anything not to have to sit in traffic. They will be looking for relief.”

“Give people an option”.

One interview participant cautioned not to provide these lanes at the expense of other lanes. And if some lanes are converted, not to do so during peak travel times (i.e., 6-9 a.m.), although it might be possible to do something like is done with reversible lanes.

“Politicians will oppose anything that costs them. However, that is the best way. They need to have ‘some skin in the game.’ Politicians are happiest when they can blame someone higher up for imposing change. Then they can complain.”

One elected official estimated that about 65 percent of area elected officials would support this effort.

3.2.7 What are your (or your organization’s) views on potential environmental benefits/concerns?

With one exception, all participants identified improving air quality in the region as a growing issue. Across the board, interview participants expressed concern with the devastating effect that would come if the region was ruled non-attainment for air quality. While most interviewees approached it from an environmental issue, they also saw severe economic development implications. The former Sierra Club national president also hoped solutions could address VMT (vehicle miles traveled).

The following quotes exemplify the feedback:

“The region has to be able to move people. Our trees, clean water, clean air all make us attractive for companies looking for a new location. We need to encourage lifestyle choices that lessen the environmental impact.”

“By 2015, we must reduce carbon emissions. That means our behavior must change from carbon intensive to non-carbon intensive. We must incent the use of HOV lanes, transit, driving low emission/ high mileage vehicles.”

“Congestion is growing at a dramatic rate no matter what we do. We will still have to use freeways. Congestion will not decrease. Basically what we are trying to do is keep things from getting worse.”

3.2.8 Do you have any suggestions for improving any managed lane concept?

One interviewee stated, “Do not use any existing lanes as managed lanes.” However, the individual then offered an observation that perhaps if you wanted to use an existing lane, make it very clear that the tolls collected would pay for a new free lane to be built alongside the managed lane. This approach might work and expedite the process.

“Build the lanes but barricade them off so people cannot go in and out of them to pass or to use them illegally.”

One interview participant wondered if there was a way to give the trucks of locally based companies a lower toll rate than long haul trucks traveling through the region. Another suggested NO TRUCKS lanes as he had seen in Raleigh.

Any monies generated should be fairly administered. The reasons that they are being collected should be well articulated.

Other suggestions included:

- Make it as simple as possible.
- Do it electronically
- Expand HOV to Iredell
- Use shoulders during peak times
- Doublewides should be barred from using the interstates at peak travel times.
- Find a single point like license plates to issue permits

3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUES

3.3.1 How do you see the issue of equity relative to this study? What do you suppose would be the perception of fairness on the part of various groups?

- Lower-income groups
- Members of ethnic minorities

- **User groups**
 - **General purpose lane users**
 - **HOV lane users**
 - **Transit riders**
 - **Charlotte commuters vs. interregional travelers**
 - **Truckers**

The general response was that allowing people to opt in by changing behavior (i.e., car pool, transit) mitigated some of their equity concerns. Interview participants were encouraged to explore this issue as being important. The major focus was whether HOT lanes unfairly impacted lower-income groups regardless of ethnicity. One interviewee felt, given the roads in the study, that equity was less likely to be an issue inside Charlotte. Another interview participant hoped that tolls could be kept minimal and/or that other options be made available so the working poor would be able to get around. A third opinion was that moving others into HOV/HOT lanes should free up space in the general lanes so there should be a spillover benefit even for those not in the HOT lanes. The following quotes are representative of interviewee perspectives:

“Anything that gives the greatest range of options is best. Everyday we all make decisions on how we spend our money (i.e., people who choose to smoke).”

“Tolls are a way to have commuters share in the expense of the infrastructure that the host community has funded and built.”

3.3.2 What areas of the community, or what specific groups do you think have a special interest in managed lanes?

There were no surprising groups named with the list including governments, planners, elected officials, chambers of commerce, local businesses and counties actively engaged in business recruitment. Interviewees indicated that all of these groups should lend support.

3.4 OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

3.4.1 Where do you see support coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region?

Interview participants encouraged project proponents to figure out who will benefit most and make them the champions. Businesses, if they believe it will increase mobility of employees and goods as well as reduce congestion and help the bottom line, will support this. Commuters since they are the ones stuck in traffic.

3.4.2 Where do you see opposition coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region? What would be the basis for opposition?

The following comments capture general responses to this question:

- Some people just will not believe this is an effective tool. They may also feel creating two tiers of commuters is unfair.
- Opposition will come from folks who will characterize tolls as yet another “government cash grab.”
- Other responses were that opposition would come from those with libertarian leanings regarding governmental programs.
- People who are resistant to change and to spending money will oppose this. They will say, “Don’t use our tax dollars this way. Build more roads.”
- One observation is that the opposition will come where you least expect it and will include an anti-toll road lobby. “There are people who won’t accept what is happening, who want to stop growth and who think if you curtail infrastructure that will stop growth when the reality is that it will just make things worse.”
- The traditional response will be, “I paid for this lane so I can use it.”

3.4.3 How do you think we should involve the public and other groups within the region?

The following responses were offered:

- Don't try community meetings – no one wants to attend. TV followed by a web cast you could view at your own convenience was the top recommendations from one interview participant.
- “Communicate with the Chamber, trade associations and the news will move like lightning.”
- An interviewee suggested a speaker to talk to the group about the study either at a monthly or a special meeting. This individual also mentioned talking to the investors.
- Tell the story often on the “rubber chicken circuit.” Also make the news media a partner.

3.4.4 Which project elements (transit only, HOV, HOT) would, in your view, receive more support?

Again there was no consensus, which reinforces the need for education and outreach. These comments reflect the range of opinions:

- “Transit only” will receive most support because folks understand it. They will need an education to understand HOV and HOT.
- Transit and HOV are things they know more about, but HOT lanes could be embraced if they saw the personal advantage.
- HOT lanes will be the “sexiest” because no one has to change behavior to use them – just pay money.
- One interview participant was not sure the public cares, but thinks HOV/HOT mix would benefit the region

Appendix A

Stakeholder Interview Participants

- Representative Mel Watt United States Congress
- Representative Becky Carney North Carolina General Assembly
- Mayor Lee Myers Town of Matthews, North Carolina
- Council Chairman Buddy Motz York County, South Carolina
- Mayor Bill Thunberg Town of Mooresville, North Carolina
- Councilman John Lassiter City of Charlotte, North Carolina
- Commissioner Brian Sisson Town of Huntersville, North Carolina
- Bob Spencer North Carolina Turnpike Authority
- Ronnie Bryant Regional Partnership
- Sergeant David Witherspoon North Carolina State Highway Patrol
- Stacy Davis Wachovia Bank
- John Cox Cabarrus County Chamber of Commerce
- Natalie English Charlotte Chamber of Commerce
- Lisa Renstrom Sierra Club
- Alan Smith Harris-Teeter Corporation

Appendix B
Interview Script and Questions

Charlotte Region HOV/HOT/Managed Lanes Analysis Study

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW SCRIPT OUTLINE

Interview participant: _____

Interview conducted/attended by: _____

Interview date: _____

▪ Introduction (4 min)

• Explain Purpose of Interviews

- Understand perceptions of transportation conditions on any of the specific highway corridors listed below, their needs regarding trips to work, school, shopping, and other essential local, regional, and intrastate destinations.
- Gather initial reactions on managed lane options being studied.
- Gather attitudes and expectations of the project. Query for opinions on lanes managed by access, eligibility, pricing, or a combination thereof.
- Explain how study will address stakeholder concerns.

• Describe Follow-up to Interview Process

- Interview participant will be sent a written summary of the interview for review and approval, allowing for a one-week review period.
- Approved summary will become part of the study report summarizing initial interviews
- Summary and analysis.

• Describe Follow-up to Interview Process

Study purpose is to determine

- If there are any potential HOV/HOT corridors (where HOV lanes are viable and/or HOT lanes will yield sufficient revenue to justify their installation);
- If any type of managed lanes, including express, truck-only or contra-flow lanes are feasible; and
- Where and how those facilities might be connected to form a system.

The results of the study will be used to decide whether and where HOV, HOT or any other type of managed lanes will be feasible for implementation in the Charlotte Region.

The roadways to be studied include: **(note – can have a map that shows these lanes)**

- I-77 between Mooresville, NC and Rock Hill, SC
- I-85 between Kings Mountain and the Yadkin River (Davidson County/Rowan County line)
- I-277 around Center City Charlotte
- I-485 around Charlotte
- US-74 between Center City Charlotte and the Union County/Anson County line
- US-321 between I-85 and the Catawba County/Lincoln County line
- Gaston East-West Connector between I-485 and US-321 near Dallas, NC
- NC-16 between I-77 and the Catawba County/Lincoln County line

▪ **Perception of Existing and Future Corridor Mobility Conditions (3 min)**

QUESTIONS:

- How would you describe the current traffic/transportation conditions on the specified corridors?
- What are the transportation issues or concerns shared by members of the group you represent (if applicable)?

▪ **Describe Managed Lane Options (8 minutes)**

Describe project, review map, use visual aids (pictures of transit only lanes, HOV lanes, HOT lanes, access management photos)

Context

- Planned transportation improvements and funding may not be enough to address future regional growth and congestion.
- This study will examine future opportunities for dedicating for managing some highway lanes to a highest and best use, typically giving priority to transit, rideshare and, if highway capacity is available, travelers willing to pay a toll.

Concept

- Consultant team and staff will evaluate feasibility of projects that could provide travelers with managed lane options to avoid congestion. Managed lane options could include:
- Traveling in a transit bus on a specially designated highway lane. In this case, the lane is called a “transit only lane”.
- Traveling in a carpool or vanpool on a specially designated highway lane. This type of lane is called an HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lane.
- If traveling alone, paying a toll to use a specially designated highway lane when space permits. This type of lane is called a HOT (High Occupancy/Toll) lane.

Caveats

- Doing nothing takes potential travel options away from commuters and leaves everybody facing increasing congestion.
 - In other parts of the country managed lanes (HOV lanes and HOT lanes) are part of a variety of options provided to manage travel demand. Other solutions, including building streets and providing more transit, are still needed.
- **QUESTIONS: Managed Lane Concepts -- Pros and Cons (25 min)**
 - What current community issues do you think could affect the outcome of implementing managed lanes in the region?
 - What are your (or your organization's) concerns or problems with this approach?
 - What do you see as the Study's biggest challenge(s)?
 - What are your top three priorities for the managed lanes?
 - Encourage buses/transit vehicles
 - Encourage vanpools
 - Encourage carpools
 - Increase options for solo drivers to pay/buy-in
 - Raise as much revenue as possible
 - Allow trucks to use the lanes at appropriate periods during the day
 - Allow emergency vehicles at no toll
 - Allow clean air vehicles at no toll
 - Other?
 - Which is preferable to you to avoid congestion on the managed lanes---limiting access, increasing tolls, or combination?
 - Does the managed lane concept present safety and/or enforcement concerns for you?
 - What do you suppose would be the impact on travel behavior of implementing tolling?
 - How would it impact on your own personal travel patterns, mode, time
 - How would it impact on travel behavior for corridor travelers overall
 - Perceived effectiveness—what managed lane strategies do you think will move the most people? Be most acceptable from a community perspective? From a political perspective?
 - What are your (or your organization's) views on potential environmental benefits/concerns?
 - Do you have any suggestions for improving any managed lane concept?
- **QUESTIONS: Environmental Justice Issues (5 Min)**
 - How do you see the issue of equity relative to this study?
 - How could any identified impacts or problems be mitigated with project modifications?

- What do you suppose would be the perception of fairness on the part of various groups?
 - Lower-income groups
 - Members of ethnic minorities
 - User groups
 - General purpose lane users
 - HOV lane users
 - Transit riders
 - Charlotte commuters vs. interregional travelers
 - Truckers
- What areas of the community, or what specific groups do you think have a special interest in managed lanes? How do you think we should involve them?
- **QUESTIONS: Other Public Input (5 Min)**
 - Where do you see support coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region? What would be the basis for support? Where do you see opposition coming from with respect to implementing managed lanes in the region? What would be the basis for opposition? Which project elements (transit only, HOV, HOT) would, in your view, receive more support?
- **Wrap-Up (1 Min)**
 - Reminder that stakeholders will receive emailed copies of their statements and be given one week to check for accuracy.
 - How would you like to be kept apprised of new developments as this project planning study goes forward?
 - Thank you!