

Charlotte Multi-Modal Station Feasibility Study

Summary of Comments



**North Carolina Department of Transportation
Rail Division
1556 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1556**

June 30, 2002

Summary of comments received on the Draft Charlotte Multi-Modal Feasibility Study

With Charlotte's growing population, a multi-modal transportation system that provides transportation options and easier ways to connect between them will be critical to the future of the region and will have positive and lasting impacts on the state of North Carolina.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation conducted a feasibility study in 2001 to plan a multi-modal station in the uptown area that would house intercity passenger trains and buses, regional transit and bus services, taxis and future high-speed trains. The following are the main comments on the January 2002 Draft Feasibility Study received by Gannett Fleming and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Rail Division during the review period from February through April 2002. (Electronic copies of the full report and the executive summary are available from the Rail Division.)

More than 50 comments from nine entities were received. This report does not contain verbatim comments but has edited them for clarity and organization purposes. Comments on typographical errors and other minor revisions to the report were not included in this summary. Actual comments and letters from all parties are on file in the Gannett Fleming and NCDOT Rail Division offices.

Most of the comments were about the various station layout options presented in the study, while a few comments were on the track improvements and on design issues. Several common themes emerged.

- There is a high level of support for the multi-modal station project.
- The station should combine all transportation modes on a single block. Other comments, however, noted the numerous traffic flow conflicts among transportation modes (particularly between pedestrians and buses) that were evident when placing all modes on one block. No single design option appeared to fully meet both goals of integrating modes and eliminating traffic conflicts.
- The Greyhound portion of the station should be located south of Trade Street, and integrated with the other station components if possible.
- The station's design should be integrated with the other improvements in Third Ward, particularly a new sports and entertainment arena and urban park.

Below are comments from each group, followed by a reply *in italics* from the NCDOT Rail Division.

Greyhound

Letter dated February 7, 2002.

1. Construction sequencing in Chapter 5 assumes that Greyhound will have a stand-alone facility, which is not the case in all station options. If Greyhound is incorporated into the main station then a temporary Greyhound station will need to be constructed while the existing Greyhound station is demolished and the new station is constructed. The cost of a temporary facility would likely be \$1.5 million.

The final report will be corrected to clarify this issue in Chapter 5. If Greyhound is included in the main station block, a site for a temporary Greyhound station will need to be identified and a temporary station constructed, which will increase the overall station cost.

2. Greyhound prefers options 6 and 7, particularly option 6, which incorporates Greyhound into the main station block. The geometry of option 6 station interior space should be easier to work with than option 7. However, option 7 has a better separation of buses and automobiles.

This will be noted and considered in the next phase of planning and design, where the number of station options will be narrowed from seven to two.

3. Greyhound will require 12 bus loading positions (slips), and will need additional "ready bus" parking, preferably on-site, for a minimum of 20 total positions. A sketch showing how additional loading bus slips and ready bus parking might be achieved under option 6 has been submitted. This revised plan also calls for an additional bus exit on Graham Street.

The NCDOT will work with Greyhound and others to determine the number of bus bays and parking spaces that can be accommodated, and will work with all parties to carefully design the vehicular circulation components of the station.

4. The entry and exit drives for Greyhound need to be carefully designed, as they appear congested under the current design.

Noted. Plans will be revised in the next phase of planning and design.

5. We have concern about the cross traffic of automobiles and buses, as well as pedestrians and buses. A particular concern is the routing of pedestrians behind Greyhound buses as the buses must back up to leave the station. This element will need to be carefully designed to help eliminate accidents.

Noted. NCDOT will work carefully with Greyhound and all other tenants to minimize pedestrian and vehicular conflicts in the station design.

6. Greyhound would like to have food operations integrated into the Greyhound station passenger waiting area and be operated by Greyhound. Experience has shown that this works best for our customers.

Noted.

Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS)

Memo dated April 29, 2002, with attached memo dated November 20, 2001.

1. CATS is in the process of developing a five-corridor rapid transit system plan for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg region that could include a combination of commuter rail, light rail transit (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT) along with enhanced local and express bus services throughout the region and circulator and shuttle services in the Center City and adjoining neighborhoods and attractions. Trade Street would have a series of transit stations for bus or LRT with the existing CATS Transportation Center and the proposed multi-modal station acting as the two operational anchors. The existing CATS Transportation Center (on East Trade Street) will continue to function as a terminal and as an interchange location among local and express services but will also provide the same function for the LRT and BRT services.

The multi-modal station will provide a similar function on the west side of center city acting as a terminal and as an interchange location among CATS local and express services. CATS expects significant growth in its bus services – local, express, BRT and other types – which will outgrow the capacity of the existing Transportation Center to provide the passenger and operational needs of the system, including layover, comfort break and recovery time functions. The multi-modal station could function as a second “transportation center” for CATS bus operations in Center City, accommodating local bus, express bus, BRT, special shuttles and commuter rail tripper services.

The future number of buses operating in the center city and the operational and facilities needs at the Transportation Center and multi-modal station will depend on the System Plan selected by the Metropolitan Transit Commission. At this point, however, CATS views the multi-modal station as an important element in any system plan that may emerge from the current planning process and therefore should identify the nature of its programmatic needs at this location.

Noted. The NCDOT agrees with CATS that the multi-modal station will have an important function in Charlotte’s 2025 Transit Plan as CATS commuter rail terminal and second center city bus transfer facility.

2. CATS concurs that only the Preferred Alternative, Station Build Only Alternative and ADM Relocation Alternative be carried forward in the next phase of engineering and design.

Noted.

3. A disadvantage noted for the Station Build Only Alternative includes possible delays to the ‘O’ Line (North Corridor) commuter trains due to not grade separating the NS and CSXT lines. However, this alternative does not include the North Corridor commuter rail platform or tracks. Please clarify.

The Station Build Only Alternative does not include the North Corridor tracks and platform. The Station Build Only Alternative was developed to include only those components of the station that likely would be paid for mostly or wholly with state funds. CATS could implement the North Corridor program after construction of the main station by the NCDOT. If CATS, however, decides to implement the North Corridor commuter rail project, a grade separation of the ‘O’ Line and CSXT is most likely necessary. CSXT has stated that they will not allow an

at-grade crossing of commuter rail service on their line, due to operational and safety concerns. Therefore, the Full Build Alternative provides the most flexibility and safest operating plan for all parties. This will be made clearer in the final report.

4. It is anticipated that a final decision on the North Corridor technology and alignment will be made in late summer/fall of 2002. In the event that a commuter rail alternative along the Norfolk-Southern 'O' line is selected, coordination of the commuter rail project and multi-modal station/ track improvement project becomes critical. If selected, commuter rail could be implemented as early as 2007. The report states that the project could be designed and built within 64 months. If the funding were in place today and the project moved forward, that would mean completion in late 2007/early 2008. Because the project funding has not been committed, a longer implementation schedule is likely. It would be very desirable for Phases I, II and III of the project to be completed along a similar timeline. Commuter rail could operate during construction of Phases IV and V through use of a temporary passenger platform.

NCDOT understands that the timing and phasing of the construction of the multi-modal station is important to the successful implementation of Charlotte's 2025 Transit Plan. The NCDOT will work with CATS to secure funding for the project as quickly as possible, and to develop a phasing plan that works best for CATS and the NCDOT.

5. CATS would like to see all the bus and rail functions accommodated on the station block. Options 3, 6 and 7 satisfy this requirement. CATS also requested in the November 2001 memo that the facility include 16 to 20 bus bays for CATS. CATS also requested that for safety and security concerns, auto and taxi passenger drop-off be removed from within the station and instead be located on adjacent street frontage. Option 3 shows only 8 bays for CATS and auto/taxi functions within the building, with numerous auto/bus circulation conflicts. Option 6 provides 11 bus bays and still includes auto/taxi drop off in conflict with CATS buses. Option 7 provides 16 bays for CATS and a better separation of Greyhound buses from CATS buses. Taxi and auto drop off is still within the building but separate from the bus operations in Option 7.

Options 1 through 5 were developed before the NCDOT received the November 20, 2001 memo listing CATS requirements. At earlier meetings city staff had indicated that CATS would need at most 10 bus bays, or perhaps none, if all bus functions occurred on the street next to the station. Option 6 was developed in early November 2001 to provide at least 10 bays and Option 7 was developed in late November 2001 in response to CATS request for a minimum of 16 bus bays. Because the needs of both Greyhound and CATS have changed over the course of the project, all station options have been retained in the study.

With regards to the separation of taxi and auto traffic from bus traffic, there is a potential conflict between the desire to place all bus and rail functions on one block and the desire to separate all vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic from each other (see also Greyhound's and NCDOT Public Transportation Division's comments). Careful planning and design will be undertaken in the next phase to develop solutions that will keep all transportation choices as seamless as possible and provide the space and functional needs for all users as well as minimize traffic circulation conflicts in the station.

6. Regarding the platform connection options in Chapter 3, CATS would prefer multiple tunnels from the station to the platforms, although further investigation will be required in preliminary engineering.

Noted.

7. CATS bus activity will be focused on Trade Street. Auto/taxi drop off areas and parking garage access should be focused on Fourth and Graham Streets. Bus platforms will need to be provided along both sides of Trade Street under and just east of the railroad overpass.

Noted. Future plans will show the appropriate space on Trade Street for bus shelters and loading areas.

8. CATS will require space within the station for passenger waiting area, driver lounge and transit police.

Noted. Space needs for all parties will be detailed in the next phase of design.

9. The mail handling facility should be located either on the Annex block or off-site. The addition of mail delivery trucks to West Trade Street is inconsistent with the vision for Trade Street developed in the Center City 2010 Vision Plan.

The mail handling facility has been relocated to the service facility ½ mile south of the station. This will allow for the station plan to best meet the vision for a pedestrian and transit friendly Trade Street.

NCDOT Public Transportation Division

E-mail comments received April 3, 2002.

1. The method shown for CATS bus berths in Option 1 is not desirable. The berths have no room to allow a bus to pull past a stopped bus in front of it and would not allow for the possibilities of bus breakdowns or delays. We strongly recommend against such an arrangement. This arrangement also appears in Options 4 and 5.

The bus bays will be altered in future plans during the next phase of design.

2. In Option 2, the layout of the bus and taxi berths and the passenger drop off point appears to promote numerous pedestrian/bus/taxi conflicts. Similar conflicts appear in the other station options, particularly Option 6. Detailing a safe, but convenient pedestrian network within and around the station will be a major concern of any option chosen.

The NCDOT Rail Division agrees that there are numerous conflicts among pedestrians, buses and autos in the options that place all of the bus and rail components on the station block. As stated under the CATS comments, the NCDOT sees a potential conflict between the goals of

placing all modes on one block and separating traffic. As stated, designing a safe but convenient pedestrian network in the station will be a major concern.

3. In many of the station options, there are storage berths of the intercity (Greyhound) buses. Providing such storage areas within the station cuts significantly into the space available for bus, taxi and pedestrian circulation and leads to potential bus/taxi/pedestrian accidents. We would like to see concepts for all modes on one station block that does not include the intercity bus storage on-site. Providing intercity bus storage adjacent or nearby to the site should allow for developing bus and taxi location options that provide much safer circulation patterns for buses, taxis and pedestrians.

Removing all, or nearly all, intercity bus storage on the station block may allow for better circulation patterns. We will explore this further in the next phase of planning and design.

4. In Option 4, the arrangement for intercity buses would not work. The buses, given their turning radii, would not be able to be stored perpendicular to the roadway as shown.

Noted. If this option is carried forward in the next phase, we will change the arrangement of the buses.

5. Under Option 7 a number of the bus/bus conflicts are eliminated. However, there are still many potential pedestrian/bus conflicts in the CATS and taxi areas.

Noted. See answer to NCDOT comment number 2 above.

6. In figure 3.6-2, there are many facility spaces listed that the NCDOT Public Transportation Division believes will not be eligible for transit funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). FTA funding will support the cost of necessary intercity passenger functional areas and common areas shared with other functions/modes, but not things like a refueling area and office space for staff not related to customer service.

The NCDOT Rail Division will work with the Public Transportation Division and other parties to determine eligibility and funding sources for the station components in the next phase of design.

7. Although the NCDOT Public Transportation Division has not done a detailed review of the rail portion of the report, we are supportive of rail options that would allow for as many of CATS fixed guideway options as possible to use the station.

Noted.

Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation Department

Comments received February 11, 2002

1. Some of the conceptual plans utilize existing Mecklenburg County property (a portion of the Annex block between 4th and 3rd Streets) that may be used for the new sports/entertainment arena. If the new arena were placed here then it would have an obvious impact on some of these conceptual designs.

Specific plans for a new arena that might use a portion of the Annex Block came to light after completion of the January 2002 draft of the Multi-Modal Station report. The NCDOT, through its consultant Gannett Fleming, has been involved with the city and county in developing plans to create a new arena and county park near the station. As details become available of how the new arena, urban park and a relocated Graham Street will be integrated together, the NCDOT Rail Division will use those plans to help narrow the number of station options from seven to two and will consider how best to integrate the station with the arena and park.

2. Ninth Street may be a “green street” and extend from First Ward to Elmwood Cemetery. If this occurs then the multi-modal greenway loop should extend through the Fourth Ward Park and tie into Ninth Street.

The Preferred Alternative recommends the closure of the at-grade crossing at 9th Street for safety and noise reasons. Access into Elmwood Cemetery from 9th Street would be closed. If this occurs the greenway loop will connect with 9th Street and take pedestrians and cyclists to 6th Street to connect to Elmwood Cemetery. The county has also endorsed this plan as a way to reduce the number of entrances into and provide better overall security for Elmwood Cemetery.

3. Extend green line referencing greenways in the plans under I-77 near Elmwood Cemetery along Irwin Creek. Irwin Creek Greenway will continue under I-77 up through JCSU and beyond. Also, illustrate 2nd and 9th Streets as “green streets”. This will further provide pedestrian and bicycle connectivity for center city residents and workers in the First and Second Ward communities.

This will be added in future plans.

4. The possibility of attracting bicyclists to Charlotte via train can be quite appealing to tourists. We need to ensure that this is promoted appropriately and that the greenway system look for connections beyond the center city area to offer bicyclists as many choices as possible to ride to various destinations of their choice. The same concern would need to be reflected regarding kayaking IF the proposed “Artificial Whitewater Park” evolves into reality; especially if it is to be located on Irwin Creek adjacent to Fourth Ward and Greenville Neighborhoods.

We agree that attracting bicyclists to Charlotte via train can be appealing to tourists. Since 1996, the NCDOT has allowed cyclists to take their bikes on the Piedmont with great success. As of May 2002 the two preferred locations for a new Whitewater Park were moved to areas outside of the center city. Regardless of where the Whitewater Park is built, however, the NCDOT Rail Division will work with local entities to help tourists reach the park from the station.

Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

Letter dated March 18, 2002

1. The USDOT has encouraged and supported the construction of multi-modal facilities in or near the downtown centers of or largest cities, such as Charlotte, N.C. The plan for the downtown station is in tune with the department's recommendations. The railroad tracks were elevated above the city streets in the vicinity of the multi-modal station some time ago and your proposals include further closing or grade separations of several remaining highway grade crossings in the area. In short, the site selection offers many benefits to future rail travelers.

Noted.

2. Several station options appear to include decking over the bus, taxi and parking areas and/or placing them under the railroad station. The FRA simply notes that similar proposals were rejected at other sites because of diesel exhaust fumes seeping into the station areas. Automobile parking facilities are typically located adjacent to or above station facilities in order to eliminate or minimize exhaust fumes.

This concern will be considered when narrowing down the number of station options from seven to two. Also, exhaust ventilation systems will be considered in the station design where needed.

3. The single tunnel access option for access between the platforms and the station would be the most economical, (particularly with lower costs for fewer escalators and elevators) and would create less confusion to the traveling public. Platforms also need to be approximately 25 feet wide to get wheelchairs past elevators stairway walls when trains are present. Various ADA requirements should be addressed very early in the preliminary design.

Noted. ADA and North Carolina disability requirements will be followed as the design moves forward.

4. FRA believes that the current track layout in the feasibility study could create numerous conflicts with the Norfolk Southern (NS) freight traffic. Freight railroad operations in the Charlotte area center around the operation of the NS freight yard, which is located approximately 1.5 miles north of the proposed station on the east side of the NS main line. With freight trains of 5,000 to 8,000 feet in length moving in and out of yard tracks at typically 5 miles per hour, FRA believes that scheduling 22 daily intercity passenger trains and 22 commuter trains through the same area will cause delays to passenger trains. With the freight yard on the east side of the main line, it appears that all of the passenger tracks and platforms should be on the west side of the main line freight operations.

Moving the station tracks and platforms to west of the main line would have severe consequences. First, it would require a more complex and expensive construction plan, as the NS main lines would require relocation as all tracks are shifted to make room for the new passenger tracks and would almost certainly require the complete relocation of ADM. The current plan in the feasibility study allows the two NS main line freight tracks to remain in place, thereby reducing conflicts with NS during construction and keeping the overall track

improvement costs down. Second, shifting the passenger tracks to the west side would likely create negative consequences for the center city. Relocating the passenger tracks and platforms on the west side might require additional grave relocations in Elmwood and Pinewood Cemeteries, and would place rail freight traffic closer to the neighborhood of Fourth Ward. While not completely eliminating all of them, the current track improvement plan in the feasibility study vastly reduces the potential for passenger and freight train conflicts that existing at the current Amtrak station on North Tryon Street. NS staff has reviewed the plan and have voiced their support for the project.

5. The report has several references to an FRA regulation requiring 26 feet between commuter and freight tracks. No such regulation exists.

References to an FRA regulation will be removed from the report. However, a minimum of 26 feet is required by NS between tracks to avoid shutting down a track when completing routine maintenance on an adjacent track. This standard has been incorporated into the planned track improvements to reduce potential service disruptions to both passenger and freight rail.

6. As a result of Amtrak's very successful experience at the Baltimore Washington Airport, the FRA recommends that all trains originating or terminating from the north also stop at Charlotte/Douglas International Airport (CDIA) approximately six miles west of the station.

The NCDOT believes that an additional intercity rail station at CDIA is unwarranted. The additional stop will add to the overall travel time for trains and likely would create numerous conflicts with the future NS air/rail freight intermodal yard to be located at the airport. CATS is also planning for a rapid transit line between downtown Charlotte and the airport, which would most likely connect with the multi-modal station. An additional Amtrak stop would be in direct competition with this new local transit line. Finally, the NCDOT believes that the nature of air traffic at CDIA (a hub airport) is different from BWI (a non-hub airport), and an additional Amtrak stop would likely not have the same success.

7. The FRA also recommends that the service facility be located just west of the airport station, and mail and express package movement should also be located near the airport.

As with an airport passenger stop, locating the mail/express and service facilities at the airport will create numerous conflicts with future NS air/rail intermodal freight traffic. An acceptable mail and service site has been identified apart from residential areas near the I-277 freeway in downtown Charlotte. This downtown site is also within a few blocks of the main downtown postal facility, where most of the mail will be transported.

8. In principle, FRA supports the grade separation of the CSXT and NS lines as identified in the Preferred Alternative. However, construction of grade separations is very costly. It may be more effective in the short term to upgrade the diamonds for a speed of 30 to 40 MPH on the CSX route instead of spending \$60 million for a grade separation.

The benefits and costs of the CSXT/NS grade separation will be studied in more detail in the next phase of engineering. The NCDOT is hopeful that federal funding will be available to assist in the grade separation project, as was provided for other grade separation projects in other states.

Charlotte Center City Partners

Letter received March 22, 2002

1. Center City Partners is pleased to learn that the multi-modal station, Greyhound and CATS can be combined into one facility situated south of West Trade Street. This option maximizes use of the property and locates the station further away from residential development.

As seen in the report, some options place all of the station functions on one block, while others place them on multiple blocks. As notes in the comments from Greyhound, CATS and the NCDOT Public Transportation Division, placing all of the transportation modes on a single block between 4th and Trade Street allows for better transit connections but also creates many conflicts among modes (buses, auto, etc.), vehicles and pedestrians.

2. The NCDOT should work closely with the city of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County on plans to develop the new arena and center city park in the Third Ward. Government agencies must maximize the economic development potential that can be realized from investing nearly \$500 million in this area. A creative urban design plan should be produced showing how a new sports and entertainment district could be developed with housing and other uses. Such a plan would address integration with other urban improvements.

The NCDOT Rail Division believes that a vibrant downtown is crucial for the success of the station. Conversely, the station's 24-hour operations and high level of foot traffic will help create a vibrant environment for Third Ward. The NCDOT has had numerous meetings with county and city officials as well as residents of Third and Fourth Wards about the project. Charlotte's 2010 Center City Vision Plan has been consulted to ensure that the station meets the overall objectives for the area. NCDOT, through its consultant Gannett Fleming, has been part of the recently created working group to develop a unified plan for a new arena, urban park and multi-modal station in Third Ward. The concepts shown in the station feasibility study were completed before plans for a new park and arena were brought forward.

3. The NCDOT should solicit input from and work closely with Fourth Ward residents and businesses on the design and development of the proposed park near 9th Street.

We have met numerous times with the Friends of Fourth Ward and others on the park and will continue to do so.

4. As noted in the draft report section 1.3, it is important that the train station's architectural design is memorable, making a distinct civic statement about Charlotte and the center city.

Noted.

5. Center City Partners supports the acquisition of relocation of the ADM plant, freeing up the site for future housing.

Property enclosed by the North Corridor, CSXT and NS would not be a candidate for future housing, given the lack of access to the site. ADM property north of 9th Street and east of the NS main line may be suitable for housing or expansion of the neighborhood park, and might also allow for expansion of the noise barriers.

Friends of Fourth Ward

Letter dated March 13, 2002

1. The Friends of Fourth Ward wants to go on record supporting the buyout of ADM as an addition to the Preferred Alternative. A large grain operation supported by additional trains and trucks has conflicts with our neighborhood.

The NCDOT will continue to study the potential costs of both reconfiguring ADM on-site and relocating ADM to a new location outside of the project area. We understand, however, that the Friends of Fourth Ward and others have stated their support for relocating ADM. The final decision will depend on whether the overall cost of reconfiguring ADM is greater than the cost of relocating ADM completely, and if the benefits of relocation clearly outweigh any benefits realized by reconfiguring ADM on-site. As Fourth Ward is aware, the Preferred Alternative calls for a reconfiguration of ADM that will reduce the number of trucks entering Fourth Ward and will close the crossings at 9th and Seaboard Streets, thereby improving safety and reducing noise

2. Keeping ADM requires the plan to recommend keeping the 10th Street crossing open, which with increased train activity will cause more whistle noise.

Under the Preferred Alternative, ADM would be reconfigured to allow for the closing of 10th Street.

3. The Preferred Alternative plan alone means a doubling of rail traffic and whistle noise, substantially more than what Fourth Ward has today.

A vast majority of the projected increase in rail traffic on the NS line will be freight, which will occur regardless of whether the station is constructed. As noted in the study and in our noise analysis completed in 2000, the various track improvements, at-grade crossing closures, as well as the landscaping and berm construction near Fourth Ward will greatly reduce future noise created by both passenger and freight traffic.

As noted in Chapter 6 in the full report, the CSXT/NS grade separation project under the Preferred Alternative would close the following at-grade crossings:

Norfolk Southern: 9th Street, 10th Street, Seaboard Street

CSX: Brevard Street, Church Street, Seaboard Street, 701 Johnson Street Access, ADM Access, Johnson Street

The closure of these nine at-grade crossings in the First Ward and Fourth Ward neighborhoods will eliminate the need for trains to sound their horns at each crossing and will improve safety.

4. We support the train station options that include the bus terminal within the same facility. We strongly oppose separating the bus terminal and moving it north between Trade and 5th Streets. This will cause the bus station and all associated vehicular traffic to adjoin a high-density residential project, which will have a severe negative economic effect on that project's

success.

Noted. We understand Fourth Ward's concerns about bus and other vehicular traffic north of Trade Street. However, as seen in the comments from Greyhound, CATS, and the NCDOT Public Transportation Division, placing the Greyhound bus terminal on the main station block between 4th and Trade Streets would create safety concerns with traffic flow conflicts among autos, CATS buses, Greyhound buses and pedestrians. These comments will be considered when the number of station options is narrowed from seven to two and in the future design of the station.

5. Friends of Fourth Ward would support the Greyhound bus terminal moving to the government district near the CATS Transportation Center on East Trade Street. That has been an option discussed by CATS in the past.

This option was discussed with CATS and Greyhound in October 2001 but was rejected by all parties for a number of reasons.

- *The East Trade Street option creates less synergy with rail modes, and would require passengers who transfer from bus to trains to travel five blocks to multi-modal station. The multi-modal station site allows for easier transfers to all modes.*
 - *It creates additional problems for Greyhound buses accessing to and from I-85 and I-77 and increases travel time on all Greyhound routes.*
 - *It creates no possibility for shared costs, shared retail, shared parking; and no economies of scale when compared to the multi-modal station site.*
 - *Securing funding from FTA would be more difficult because of fewer intermodal connections.*
 - *Land use plans for Second Ward (East Trade Street) call for more mixed use and residential development, which would re-create the potential conflicts noted by Friends of Fourth Ward at the West Trade Street site.*
 - *The East trade Street site has multiple owners and some existing businesses, including the YWCA Daycare. Condemnation would be difficult and expensive, particularly with multiple owners and the relocation of businesses. Under the Uniform Act, NCDOT would need to show that there would be no other reasonable alternative for locating Greyhound other than on East Trade Street. This argument is not possible because NCDOT already owns most of the West Trade Street site and locating Greyhound on or near West Trade Street is feasible.*
6. The Friends of Fourth Ward have been told that having separate buildings for Greyhound and rail would add an additional \$10 million in business cost to the overall project. As taxpayers, this would further support our vote against separate facilities.

The report does not claim any specific cost savings from combining all modes on one block, although additional costs analyses of the station options will be completed in the next phase of engineering and design. If such a cost savings were realized, it would be an argument against placing Greyhound on East Trade Street (see previous comment).

7. We appreciate the NCDOT working closely with the neighborhood, but ask that you please be sensitive to the fact that there are more families and children moving into Fourth Ward. This historic neighborhood has become the home to several thousand people who are supportive of better transportation options and understand how valuable they are to the growth of our center city. At the same time, we also understand that there are issues with which we cannot coexist and ask your sensitivity and cooperation in making sure that the right long-term answer is put in place.

Noted. The NCDOT will continue to work with Fourth Ward and others to ensure that the multi-modal station is a welcome addition to Charlotte's center city.

Bank of America

Letter dated March 7, 2002

1. Bank of America supports the options that would include the bus terminal within the same multi-modal facility. We have significant concerns with any proposals to separate the Greyhound terminal and move it north of Trade Street. This would negatively impact the high-density residential project in that vicinity through high volumes of bus and vehicle traffic.

Noted. See our reply to Friends of Fourth Ward on this issue.

2. It is our understanding that CATS has discussed several other alternatives for the bus terminal siting, including moving it to the government district adjoining the existing CATS Transportation Center. This appears to be the most economical and logical solution.

The only other alternative for locating Greyhound discussed with CATS (outside of the seven options in the report) was the East Trade Street site, which was rejected for a number of reasons. See our reply on this matter in the comments from Friends of Fourth Ward.

Citizens for Effective Mass Transit (CEMT)

E-mail and fax received March 18, 2002

1. It appears that light rail could be integrated into the station if decisions are made locally to link the South Corridor or others to the multi-modal station. Despite the lack of definite decisions on that issue, it is still beneficial that the opportunity still exists.

The NCDOT wishes to incorporate as many transit modes as possible, including light rail transit and bus rapid transit routes from Charlotte's five corridor 2025 Transit Plan. We will continue to work with CATS to find ways to link the station with their future system.

2. CEMT proposes that consideration be given for a connecting track from the CSXT to the 'O' Line just north of the Brookshire Freeway. This would enable trains from Wilmington on the CSXT line to enter the Multi-Modal Station, then connect to the 'O' Line and proceed north to Statesville and perhaps directly to Asheville. The Asheville location was the second highest preferred destination of travelers in the Wilmington area in planning for the Southeast (NC) Passenger Study. Making travelers change trains to accomplish a Wilmington to Asheville

movement would be deemed a significant inconvenience. The connecting track would eliminate such an encumbrance. A sketch showing how this connecting track could be constructed has been submitted.

We believe that a connector track between the CSXT and the 'O' Line is not warranted. If passenger service between Charlotte and Asheville and Charlotte and Wilmington were implemented, travelers can easily transfer at the multi-modal station. Such a transfer would be far less difficult than transfers that most passengers undertake at hub airports today. Adding a connector track would be very costly and difficult given the various tracks, freeways and roadways near the CSXT and 'O' Line junction.