

## Appendix D – Comment Summary

<b>Table AppD.1. Comment Summary Index</b>	
<b>Crossing</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
General Comments	Appendix D-1
Neal Road	Appendix D-2
N. Lasalle Street	Appendix D-2
Anderson Street	Appendix D-3
Swift Avenue	Appendix D-3
Buchanan Boulevard	Appendix D-4
Duke Street	Appendix D-5
Chapel Hill Street	Appendix D-5
Blackwell/Corcoran Street	Appendix D-5
Mangum Street	Appendix D-7
Dillard Street	Appendix D-8
Fayetteville Street	Appendix D-8
Ramseur Street	Appendix D-9
Alston Avenue	Appendix D-10
Plum Street	Appendix D-11
Driver Street	Appendix D-13
Ellis Road (West)	Appendix D-14
Glover Road	Appendix D-14
Wrenn Road	Appendix D-15
Ellis Road (East)	Appendix D-15
Cornwallis Road	Appendix D-15

## GENERAL COMMENTS

### Following First Workshop

- Trench the tracks downtown
- Pedestrian access in downtown is crucial. Trench the RR between Roxboro & W Chapel Hill St. Develop the land near the RR tracks to link Am Tobacco and the loop
- Encourage the NCDOT Rail Division to keep up their good work!
- Consider using traditional traffic lights directly in front of tracks at crossings. I think people tend to pay attention to red lights and it wouldn't cost nearly as much as a road closure or median.
- Uses Trent to cross the railroad tracks in the area.
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists if possible at each crossing
- Have operation life saver at each of these sessions, maybe to do a brief presentation or at least to have information available.
- Uses Chapel Hill to cross the railroad tracks in the area.
- Avoids using street/railroad crossing in the area only if I see/hear a train coming – sometimes I'll go over a block to a crossing with a bridge
- Bridge over Chapel Hill St makes the sidewalks on Chapel Hill St very unpleasant
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: Not sure how this could work in Section 2 downtown. Sounds clumsy and expensive.
- Pedestrian bridge from American Tobacco to Five Points.
- I'm ok with at grade crossings if they have good equipment and smooth surfaces. The old unused train bridges over Chapel Hill St should be torn down allowing the sidewalks below to be improved. Only one bridge here has been used for more than 10 years.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): Do not prefer this aesthetic.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: Not for Downtown!
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists: Yes please. Bike commuting is on the rise to downtown
- Train underground is preferred but probably too expensive.
- I wish I had more suggestions for a solution rather than just negatives. I prefer not to have RR barricades/Lights/Gates due to aesthetics. I think a gently sloping very wide tunnel with lots of bright light is ideal. However, it can't be dark and feel unsafe for people. Create a bike lane, emergency call boxes, skylights, bright energy through the tunnel.
- Requests enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists on Main Street and Chapel Hill St.
- Look at greenways and pedestrian oriented crossings. Cars are fairly well addressed by crossing signaling.
- Uses Roxboro to cross the railroad tracks in the area.
- Avoids using Roxboro to cross tracks –overpass feels dangerous, not pedestrian friendly, narrow sidewalks
- Dedicated walks: gates for pedestrians at grade crossings in downtown.
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: uncertain of how feasible this is. Concerned about impact on economic development if poorly designed.
- Dedicated pedestrian walks aligned with sidewalks on roadways. Dedicated pedestrian gates see examples in Europe.
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: Briggs Ave connection to 147 interchange.
- RR crossings do not address pedestrian needs or perceived safety and act as a barrier through downtown. Improvements specifically aimed at a positive ped experience are essential to the continued success and growth in downtown. Connectivity is an essential aspect of this which closing crossing would negatively impact.
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: Potentially burying throughout entire downtown would work as long as the RR trench is covered and not just an open trench. Don't know anywhere that would be a positive change.
- Referring to enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists: Yes! Dedicated sidewalk area for peds at all at grade crossings in downtown sections.
- Put traffic signals 10-20 feet before RRX – make drivers stop as if for a red light.
- Install speed humps prior to RR to make cars slow down.
- I try to avoid the East Durham switching tracks because the train is on the tracks morning, noon, and evening.

### Following Second Workshop

- To avoid waking us up during night, can you give up the horn during night or after 10:30pm?
- Long term solutions have a devastating impact on economic development, urban design, and pedestrian connectivity in downtown.
- That the fare include discount for seniors and free for seniors over 65 yrs. of age.
- Provision for passenger access to parking near rail facilities and a senior citizen rate!!

- Ideally we would want this sector from Fayetteville Street to Briggs to have minimal disruption. This is an active trucking corridor and this area employs many individuals. Hopefully, the city will be aware of the positive impact we have on this area and commerce in the Durham community.
- Since our group also owns 904 Ramseur and 9211 Ramseur Streets we hope the high speed rail commission will not alter our property as well. As you can see, we are very concerned on the decisions that will be made and how these decisions may impact our business.
- Prefer no closures at all!
- It seems to me that livability and human-scale architecture friendly to people is being sacrificed to "safety" and a landscape designed for efficient vehicle traffic. Ugh. I have sent comments before, and will do so again.

## **NEAL ROAD CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Flatten the crossing at Neal Road Crossing.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area

### **Following Second Workshop**

- Very interested in future plans.
- For the interim, establishment of a "Quiet Zone," would be very beneficial. There is a very high number of homes as well as a school within direct sight line of crossing. The frequent sirens/horns of the train are very disruptive to daily life as well as school activities.
- Quiet zone is first priority.
- Bridge for Neal Rd. crossing would be wonderful.
- Having some sort of quiet zone or even hours would be great. Is there someone to contact regarding this? [Follow-up requested].

## **NORTH LASALLE STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- This is a heavily used crossing that definitely needs grade separation.
- DATA Route 11 Crossing.
- Construct a larger radius curve for RR over Fulton Street. Buy out company that has private road crossing. Move RR closer to Hwy 147 with larger radius and new RR bridge over Fulton. This will create more retail land at Hillsborough Street.
- Bridge it!
- It is obvious to me that grade separation is important in most of these instances. Improved sign and more creative/effective way of communicating "Do Not Stop on Tracks" would go a long way to improve the safety of these crossings. Wait times are short (except at Duke Amtrak stops) so that should not be an issue. Please do not destroy the \_\_\_\_\_ of our City by closing any of these crossings.
- Grade separate road under rail.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area

## ANDERSON STREET CROSSING

### Following First Workshop

- 15th Street, this street is a Duke University bus route for parking shuttles and connecting off-site offices.
- This crossing like Swift, is an important connector between Old West Durham/ 9th Street, Duke and the neighborhoods to the south and should definitely remain open. I have never experienced a dangerous traffic condition here. Although, signing more clearly where northbound traffic should stop at the 15th main light (before the railroad tracks) might be helpful.
- Add turn lanes to keep traffic flowing when crossing arms are down. Going east, if arms are down the thru traffic cannot proceed.
- A dangerous crossing, numerous cars stop on the track at this crossing. I often walk across here and have seen cars honking trying to get off of the track when a train was approaching. Definitely need closing or grade separation.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)

### Following Second Workshop

- I attended the presentation, and the earlier presentation, in order to learn what the plans might be for the crossings at Swift/Broad/Pettigrew/Main, and 15th/Anderson/Main, which are closest to Old West Durham, of which I am a resident and the Vice President of the Neighborhood Association. My comments primarily concern the controversial longer-term 'solutions,' and not the reasonable shorter-term solutions. I do understand that these plans are very preliminary, and the planning horizon for these plans are long, but they are nonetheless very disturbing: from an urban planning perspective, the proposed 'overpasses', 20+ft over the rail tracks, are cataclysmic. These ramps, aside from the obvious, grotesque visual blight, would carve new roads across at least one historic structure (the Cottage on Swift); create illogical spaghetti of traffic flows, and bizarre urban 'dead zones'. Sidewalks will abut 20'-high walls; cars will have to negotiate tertiary streets to go from primary street to primary street, views will be blocked. What is most shocking is the disproportionality between the extreme measures these plans represent and the minimal problem they attempt to solve. The stated purpose of the study is to study alternative 'safety improvements' for these rail crossings; based on this, and the name of the study, presumably NCDOT and the railroad are most interested in eliminating the possibility of any car/train interaction. This would clearly have to be a huge problem to invite the extreme and destructive interventions being proposed. However, while I have no statistics to support this, I would think there are many regular vehicular intersections in Durham that see more fatalities than these rail crossings. When I questioned the project engineers about this, they offered that another (possibly more important?) issue was that of increasing rail traffic in the long term (commuter train traffic, light rail traffic, increased freight traffic), and the potential to snarl vehicular traffic, as headways between trains could be as little as ten minutes. Once lights start and gates come down, there could only be a few minutes for car traffic to pass over the tracks, and this might have implications for emergency vehicles, etc. This makes much more sense as a 'problem' to be studied than car/train collisions. However, if this is truly the issue, this frames the discussion in a slightly different way. To avoid emergency vehicles getting stuck in traffic, maybe the railroad can install simple sensors (as on city buses) that can map a train's location on a GPS unit, which can alert the driver to take, say, the Hillandale underpass rather than the Anderson crossing. (The same app could even be used for cars). Or maybe the railroad would have to run limited freight schedules, or limited freight train lengths, during peak traffic periods, and run more freight at night. And if the planning period is as long as stated (20+ years), and the threat of congestion so great, perhaps the railroad (a private corporation) should try to find ways to build new 'bypasses' around our cities. There are seemingly many, many other potential solutions that have not seen the light of day in this study. If the stated goal of the study is 'traffic separation,' you've already come to an answer before beginning the study: 'separate the traffic.' I cannot help but think the deck is stacked. One last point concerns the apparent lack of research on the affected properties undertaken by the persons conducting the study. The Anderson proposal calls for the 'overpass' to bisect a property between 15th and Rutherford, aligning with Rosehill; anybody even remotely familiar with the neighborhood would know that land is privately-owned, and is currently being developed into an apartment complex. This is an embarrassing error, and illustrates just how poorly the proposal's effects may be understood by the engineers. To conclude, I am dismayed that such truly terrible proposals are still on the table at this point and that more creative options have not yet been forthcoming after months of study. My neighbors and I will be watching this process as it develops very closely. To conclude, I am dismayed that such truly terrible proposals are still on the table at this point, and that more creative options have not yet been forthcoming after months of study. My neighbors and I will be watching this process as it develops very closely.

## SWIFT AVENUE CROSSING

### Following First Workshop

- This road –RR crossing is very difficult for pedestrians to navigate, but the route is very important for the Duke students.
- North on Swift needs a longer left turn light. Lanes need painting every few years.
- On Broad Street, just north of Main, consider closing the left turn into the shopping center. Cars waiting to turn there sometimes block northbound flow, and can trap northbound cars on the tracks.
- This road is an important connector between the old west neighborhood and 9th Street. Access to the 147 and neighborhoods and users to the south. The crossing should definitely remain open, but improve signing would probably be good.
- A dangerous crossing. This crossing should definitely be grade separated. Cars stop on the tracks at this location frequently.
- Northbound traffic on Swift doesn't stop clear of the crossing – drivers need to be educated to stop before the crossing.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- It is absolutely imperative that pedestrian & vehicle access be maintained at Buchanan & Swift crossings
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area

- Many drivers do not stop clear of railroad crossings in close proximity to street intersections (e.g. Swift Ave near intersection w/ W. Main St.). Drivers need to understand that they should not stop on tracks! Ellis Rd is also a location w/ this problem.
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- The Swift Street tracks has traffic backups, also Driver Street has backups.

#### **Following Second Workshop**

- We would like to see it left as is no overpass, no closing.
- Need crosswalks on both sides. Duke is largest generator of pedestrians.
- I attended the presentation, and the earlier presentation, in order to learn what the plans might be for the crossings at Swift/Broad/Pettigrew/Main, and 15th/Anderson/Main, which are closest to Old West Durham, of which I am a resident and the Vice President of the Neighborhood Association. My comments primarily concern the controversial longer-term 'solutions,' and not the reasonable shorter-term solutions. I do understand that these plans are very preliminary, and the planning horizon for these plans are long, but they are nonetheless very disturbing: from an urban planning perspective, the proposed 'overpasses', 20+ft over the rail tracks, are cataclysmic. These ramps, aside from the obvious, grotesque visual blight, would carve new roads across at least one historic structure (the Cottage on Swift); create illogical spaghetti of traffic flows, and bizarre urban 'dead zones'. Sidewalks will abut 20'-high walls; cars will have to negotiate tertiary streets to go from primary street to primary street, views will be blocked. What is most shocking is the disproportionality between the extreme measures these plans represent and the minimal problem they attempt to solve. The stated purpose of the study is to study alternative 'safety improvements' for these rail crossings; based on this, and the name of the study, presumably NCDOT and the railroad are most interested in eliminating the possibility of any car/train interaction. This would clearly have to be a huge problem to invite the extreme and destructive interventions being proposed. However, while I have no statistics to support this, I would think there are many regular vehicular intersections in Durham that see more fatalities than these rail crossings. When I questioned the project engineers about this, they offered that another (possibly more important?) issue was that of increasing rail traffic in the long term (commuter train traffic, light rail traffic, increased freight traffic), and the potential to snarl vehicular traffic, as headways between trains could be as little as ten minutes. Once lights start and gates come down, there could only be a few minutes for car traffic to pass over the tracks, and this might have implications for emergency vehicles, etc. This makes much more sense as a 'problem' to be studied than car/train collisions. However, if this is truly the issue, this frames the discussion in a slightly different way. To avoid emergency vehicles getting stuck in traffic, maybe the railroad can install simple sensors (as on city buses) that can map a train's location on a GPS unit, which can alert the driver to take, say, the Hillandale underpass rather than the Anderson crossing. (The same app could even be used for cars). Or maybe the railroad would have to run limited freight schedules, or limited freight train lengths, during peak traffic periods, and run more freight at night. And if the planning period is as long as stated (20+ years), and the threat of congestion so great, perhaps the railroad (a private corporation) should try to find ways to build new 'bypasses' around our cities. There are seemingly many, many other potential solutions that have not seen the light of day in this study. If the stated goal of the study is 'traffic separation,' you've already come to an answer before beginning the study: 'separate the traffic.' I cannot help but think the deck is stacked. One last point concerns the apparent lack of research on the affected properties undertaken by the persons conducting the study. The Anderson proposal calls for the 'overpass' to bisect a property between 15th and Rutherford, aligning with Rosehill; anybody even remotely familiar with the neighborhood would know that land is privately-owned, and is currently being developed into an apartment complex. This is an embarrassing error, and illustrates just how poorly the proposal's effects may be understood by the engineers. To conclude, I am dismayed that such truly terrible proposals are still on the table at this point and that more creative options have not yet been forthcoming after months of study. My neighbors and I will be watching this process as it develops very closely. To conclude, I am dismayed that such truly terrible proposals are still on the table at this point, and that more creative options have not yet been forthcoming after months of study. My neighbors and I will be watching this process as it develops very closely.

## **BUCHANAN BOULEVARD CROSSING**

#### **Following First Workshop**

- Less used and less dangerous than Swift / 15th or LaSalle, but still would be unsafe if additional trains were added to these lines.
- Need to provide a pedestrian walkway/crosswalk across the RR along the west side of Buchanan Blvd.
- Very important link between Burch Ave. neighborhood and Brightleaf area (on Main Street).
- Buchanan is an important N/S corridor for 2 funeral homes (Howeren-Bryan and Hall-Wynne); Parent traffic to and from Immaculata Catholic School; trucks and ambulances; fire trucks from 9th Street and Chapel Hill Road; Durham and Duke police cars ;vehicular traffic from southeast Central Durham to Guess Road; alternate route into downtown Durham (or on Buchanan, southeastern Chapel Hill Street); Impeding Buchanan would increase traffic on: Broad Street (already congested w/ turns into Whole Foods parking lot). Gregson Street and Duke Street (both heavily driven and one-way).
- No change to Buchanan RR is warranted for safety reasons. No vehicular or pedestrian accident there for decades, no near missed either.
- Additional traffic on Maxwell Ave. and Campus Dr. Not planned for by Duke in their recent renovations.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- Needs sidewalk + ped gate/arm at Buchanan this will improve ped safety
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists
- It is absolutely imperative that pedestrian & vehicle access be maintained at Buchanan & Swift crossings
- Nearly impossible for me to avoid the Buchanan crossing – it is one of only 2 egresses from my neighborhood.
- In the past, there were frequent malfunctions of the arm on Buchanan – went down when no trains coming, so people started ignoring the warning and crossing anyway. Problem seems to have been resolved.
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)

## **DUKE STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Major traffic corridors should not be closed. Look at ped/bike improvements so that entire crossing doesn't feel like you're in the street.
- This is a thriving business district and with downtown light/commuter rail station coming should not be closed or grade separated.
- Maybe minor safety improvements. No closing. Essential traffic route.
- Do not close for \$ reasons.
- Needs major pedestrian improvements- expand pedestrian study to include Amtrak to Durham trans. connection.
- Don't need to close since all passenger trains stop @ Durham station anyway.
- Duke St. is a main artery in Durham so closing is not an option. Right now the gates work well and crossing on foot is not a problem.
- Duke Street – do not close; critical to traffic flow.
- Gregson – Grade separation already in place.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- Duke Street, I'd suggest installing additional earlier warning lights further back on Duke Street (by Duke Memorial?) to give drivers more warning (notice) of an approaching train
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

## **CHAPEL HILL STREET CROSSING**

### **Following Second Workshop**

- When considering these closures, which would undoubtedly improve safety along the tracks, please take bridge clearance into account. There are a number of big trucks which need to move north and south across the tracks in a normal business day (we average 12 with a clearance height of 13'6" and another 20 with a clearance height of 12'8"). If the Chapel Hill Street, Roxboro St. and Alston Ave. bridges were adjusted to allow passage of 13'6" vehicles, we could probably figure out how to stay in business, continuing to employ 32 +, half of whom live in close proximity to our facility. Movement of 13'6" vehicles across the tracks is of primary concern to us.
- If Chapel Hill Street RR bridge is raised to 13'6", our spur bridges which cross Chapel Hill Street should be removed.
- A pedestrian bridge connecting bus depot and light rail stations makes a lot of sense. Grades are such that it seems relatively easy. Please ensure clearance over Chapel Hill Street exceeds 13'6"!
- Remove disconnected tracks and bridges in near term.

## **BLACKWELL/CORCORAN STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Hire a crossing guard. Improve current aesthetic.
- Walking from DPAC to downtown restaurants on Saturday afternoon, my wife and I would like a smoother walkway across the tracks.
- Close this to vehicular traffic, create a pedestrian bridge over to connect. Elevate entire rail through downtown.
- Pedestrian bridge here – American Tobacco to Five Points.

- There are studies that are meant to deal with the Blackwell Corcoran Crossing-but going underground may be the best solution for DT, very expensive, but solves most issues related to RR crossing in DT. What are NCDOT's long term goals for DT? If \$ is an option perhaps some thought to re-routing around Blackwell before DT. We don't want to "halve" DT with more RR crossings as more rail comes to Durham.
- Crucial to keep it open at grade to pedestrians and cars.
- Bull City connector crosses here.
- Closing intersection to pedestrian and/or vehicular traffic is not an option from an economic developer and property owners perspective. This applies to Blackwell and Mangum St.
- Blackwell critical ped/bicycle connections (East Coast Greenway, Maine to FL) underpass?
- Blackwell- do not close. Closing would create a traffic nightmare, especially during ball games.
- Durham has worked for 20 plus years to revitalize our urban core. Closing the Blackwell St. crossing would be a blow to all the \$ private and public interested in this area. DO NOT CLOSE- a crossing guard, better.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- Railroad crossing closures
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists
- Lots of pedestrians cross the tracks mid-way between Chapel Hill St. and Blackwell to get from American Tobacco to Five Points. A pedestrian bridge here would help take a lot of pedestrian traffic off Blackwell.
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Crossing guard at Blackwell and Mangum during events and lunchtime.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

**Summary:**

Twenty-three (23) comments expressed opposition to closing the Blackwell/Cochran Road crossing.

Nine (9) comments expressed support for closing the Blackwell/Cochran Road crossing.

Comments regarding **opposition** of the proposed project include:

- Hire a crossing guard. Improve current aesthetic.
- Walking from DPAC to downtown restaurants on Saturday afternoon, my wife and I would like a smoother walkway across the tracks.
- Crucial to keep it open at grade to pedestrians and cars.
- Bull City connector crosses here.
- Closing intersection to pedestrian and/or vehicular traffic is not an option from an economic developer and property owners perspective. This applies to Blackwell and Mangum St.
- Blackwell critical ped/bicycle connections (East Coast Greenway, Maine to FL) underpass?
- Blackwell- do not close. Closing would create a traffic nightmare, especially during ball games.
- Durham has worked for 20 plus years to revitalize our urban core. Closing the Blackwell St. crossing would be a blow to all the \$ private and public interested in this area. DO NOT CLOSE- a crossing guard, better.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Crossing guard at Blackwell and Mangum during events and lunchtime.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level

Comments regarding **support** of the proposed project include:

- Close this to vehicular traffic, create a pedestrian bridge over to connect. Elevate entire rail through downtown.
- Pedestrian bridge here – American Tobacco to Five Points.
- There are studies that are meant to deal with the Blackwell Corcoran Crossing-but going underground may be the best solution for DT, very expensive, but solves most issues related to RR crossing in DT. What are NCDOT's long term goals for DT? If \$ is an option perhaps some thought to re-routing around Blackwell before DT. We don't want to "halve" DT with more RR crossings as more rail comes to Durham.
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- Railroad crossing closures

- Lots of pedestrians cross the tracks mid-way between Chapel Hill St. and Blackwell to get from American Tobacco to Five Points. A pedestrian bridge here would help take a lot of pedestrian traffic off Blackwell.
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

## **MANGUM STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Please do not close this crossing. Doing so would create a traffic bottle neck for traffic moving in this direction. This crossing should not be included in even the preliminary study. As its access is critical to traffic.
- DATA routes 2,3, and 9 use this intersection.
- Potentially only minor safety improvements. No closing. Landscape it to connect ATC and the rest of downtown.
- Lower road to go under tracks.
- Mangum is a critical pedestrian and car link from DPAC to downtown. Don't mess with it.
- Routinely walk it, over Roxboro – even though Roxboro underpass is closer to my walking path. Right in the mix. Critical to keep it open for cars.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Avoids Mangum – Pedestrian undercrossing scary
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Crossing guard at Blackwell and Mangum during events and lunchtime.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

### **Summary:**

Twenty (20) comments expressed opposition to closing the Mangum Street crossing.

Four (4) comments expressed support for closing the Mangum Street crossing.

Comments regarding **opposition** of the proposed project include:

- Please do not close this crossing. Doing so would create a traffic bottle neck for traffic moving in this direction. This crossing should not be included in even the preliminary study. As its access is critical to traffic.
- DATA routes 2,3, and 9 use this intersection.
- Potentially only minor safety improvements. No closing. Landscape it to connect ATC and the rest of downtown.
- Mangum is a critical pedestrian and car link from DPAC to downtown. Don't mess with it.
- Routinely walk it, over Roxboro – even though Roxboro underpass is closer to my walking path. Right in the mix. Critical to keep it open for cars.
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Avoids Mangum – Pedestrian undercrossing scary
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Crossing guard at Blackwell and Mangum during events and lunchtime.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level

Comments regarding **support** of the proposed project include:

- Lower road to go under tracks.
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.



## **ROXBORO STREET CROSSING**

### **Following Second Workshop**

- When considering these closures, which would undoubtedly improve safety along the tracks, please take bridge clearance into account. There are a number of big trucks which need to move north and south across the tracks in a normal business day (we average 12 with a clearance height of 13'6" and another 20 with a clearance height of 12'8"). If the Chapel Hill Street, Roxboro St. and Alston Ave. bridges were adjusted to allow passage of 13'6" vehicles, we could probably figure out how to stay in business, continuing to employ 32 +, half of whom live in close proximity to our facility. Movement of 13'6" vehicles across the tracks is of primary concern to us.
- Need crosswalk at bend in loop at SE corner of courthouse property.

## **DILLARD STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Dillard is an important pedestrian and auto connection. Do not close.
- Don't close it! I live on this Street. Connectivity has been Horrible since St. closed (temp) for construction.
- Data Route 16 crossing.
- East way connectors are limited in DT issues of bad urban design. East way traffic into DT very limited.
- Close it! RR (if it can't be elevated).
- Creates connectivity from ATC, 147 to East Durham!
- Minor safety improvements. No closing essential for future growth.
- The loop severely under cuts the ability to get to and through downtown this crossing is needed.
- Please do not close. Critical to downtown access.
- If can maintain ped/bike crossing, cars can use Fayetteville and Roxboro.
- Please do not close – this crossing very critical to downtown traffic flow. Should not even be considered in preliminary study.
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Sometimes travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

### **Following Second Workshop**

- I do not want Dillard Street, Ramseur/Grant Street and Plum closed because it's a resident and business crossing for cars.
- I do not want Dillard St. Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because I use that street a lot. That is a busy street for cars and people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets please.
- I do not support the closure of Dillard, Ramseur Grant St. and Plum St. I would like for these streets to stay open for community and business traffic for car we need the crossing.
- I oppose this situation of closing of these streets, Dillard, Grant, Plum.
- I oppose the following closure listed here: Dillard, Plum, Grant.
- I do not want Dillard St. and Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because we use that street a lot. That is a busy street for people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets.
- My response in hearing of the closing of our side streets is that Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum Street should not be closed. The streets are side streets that I use to prevent in using our main streets. The streets are easy for my use to get to one part of Durham to another area of Durham. The streets should be kept for community use and traffic use.
- I am very concerned about the closing of the following streets: Plum, Ramseur/Grant and Dillard. These are our communities and business crossings for cars to help offset our major fare-ways streets to help with congestion. Also this is keeping the community connected as a whole. The citizens of Durham (East Durham) do not need to be barricaded with blockage of these streets for crossing with cars.
- Yes, my reasons for not wanting these side streets closed: Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum, they are our community and business access the other part of Durham across Pettigrew St. Plus, when the traffic on Driver is changing tracks and others, there are these following streets the cars can use: Peabody to Clay St. to Wade St. to Plum to cross the tracks with safe and easy access to any other they wish to travel in. Plus it helps other major streets that are full with traffic. I wonder do you like to sit in traffic for long period of time?

- I oppose the closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum Streets.
- I am opposed to the closing of the following streets: Dillard; Ramseur/Grant; and Plum Streets. These streets are community and business based streets to be used for traffic use. They help offset high density on major streets.
- I am opposing the street closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum. These streets are used for community and business transportation. They are needed to offset major streets congestion.
- Closing of Dillard Street will prevent my access to get to company on the other side to shop. Helps to avoid traffic congestion
- I had a chance to look through some sections of the report and am rather upset they are proposing to close the Dillard St crossing. The specific plan is to build a “decorative fence or wall” between the eastern edge of Downtown Durham at this crossing and the explosive growth at ATC. You'd think with the new courthouse sitting on Dillard St as well as the Health Department located on Dillard St. and ATC/DPAC bringing in so many folks they would want to IMPROVE connectivity in this area. Neighbors weighed in during the study repeatedly saying they did not want this crossing closed. This is documented in the study.

## **FAYETTEVILLE STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- This is far too busy an intersection to even consider closing this. Would be like when you put the freeway through. Improve the crossing at grade keep street open.
- Only at grade crossing that has a decent line of sight for an at grade crossing if maintained correctly.
- I would suggest closing – no good way for pedestrians to cross seems dangerous.
- Only minor safety improvements. No closing.
- Fayetteville is an important pedestrian and auto link across the tracks, it should remain open.
- Do not like multiple stop lights at the tracks.
- Double traffic lights present hazard and confusion for some drivers. RR crossing functions appropriately except when traffic backs up at stoplight.
- Do not close, area is extremely busy. Closing would disconnect community and create traffic nightmare.
- Keep it open.
- Typically travel to cross railroad track in the area
- Avoid using street/railroad crossing in the area
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Fayetteville/147 intersection & RR crossing is the most challenging. There are lot of things (turns, trains, lights) going on. They are mostly street design related.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

### **Following Second Workshop**

- Need crosswalks across Fayetteville.

## **RAMSEUR STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Close it – pedestrian traffic is not accommodated here – discourage
- Close it, close it, close it
- Ramseur/Grant is a dangerous crossing. Either close or re-align.
- If one HAD to be closed this would be it!
- Okay to close this crossing gets limited use. Closing will make it safer.
- Okay to close. Impact would be minimal

- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Avoid using street/railroad crossing in the area – no need to travel
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

#### **Following Second Workshop**

- I do not want Dillard Street, Ramseur/Grant Street and Plum closed because it's a resident and business crossing for cars.
- I do not want Dillard St. Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because I use that street a lot. That is a busy street for cars and people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets please.
- I do not support the closure of Dillard, Ramseur Grant St. and Plum St. I would like for these streets to stay open for community and business traffic for car we need the crossing.
- I oppose this situation of closing of these streets, Dillard, Grant, Plum.
- I oppose the following closure listed here: Dillard, Plum, Grant.
- I do not want Dillard St. and Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because we use that street a lot. That is a busy street for people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets.
- My response in hearing of the closing of our side streets is that Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum Street should not be closed. The streets are side streets that I use to prevent in using our main streets. The streets are easy for my use to get to one part of Durham to another area of Durham. The streets should be kept for community use and traffic use.
- I am very concerned about the closing of the following streets: Plum, Ramseur/Grant and Dillard. These are our communities and business crossings for cars to help offset our major fare-ways streets to help with congestion. Also this is keeping the community connected as a whole. The citizens of Durham (East Durham) do not need to be barricaded with blockage of these streets for crossing with cars.
- Yes, my reasons for not wanting these side streets closed: Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum, they are our community and business access the other part of Durham across Pettigrew St. Plus, when the traffic on Driver is changing tracks and others, there are these following streets the cars can use: Peabody to Clay St. to Wade St. to Plum to cross the tracks with safe and easy access to any other they wish to travel in. Plus it helps other major streets that are full with traffic. I wonder do you like to sit in traffic for long period of time?
- I oppose the closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum Streets.
- I am opposed to the closing of the following streets: Dillard; Ramseur/Grant; and Plum Streets. These streets are community and business based streets to be used for traffic use. They help offset high density on major streets.
- I am opposing the street closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum. These streets are used for community and business transportation. They are needed to offset major streets congestion.
- When considering these closures, which would undoubtedly improve safety along the tracks, please take bridge clearance into account. There are a number of big trucks which need to move north and south across the tracks in a normal business day (we average 12 with a clearance height of 13'6" and another 20 with a clearance height of 12'8"). If the Chapel Hill Street, Roxboro St. and Alston Ave. bridges were adjusted to allow passage of 13'6" vehicles, we could probably figure out how to stay in business, continuing to employ 32 +, half of whom live in close proximity to our facility. Movement of 13'6" vehicles across the tracks is of primary concern to us. Please consider completing the Alston Ave. widening project which includes raising the Pettigrew St. bridge over Alston Ave. to a height exceeding 13'6" prior to closing either this Ramseur/Grant crossing or the Plum St. crossing.
- Divert traffic so it does not interfere with the Pettigrew business community [Respondent made this comment under the following comment: "Driver, Ramseur, Plum"].
- Closing of Ramseur St./Grant Street Crossing will prevent me from getting to Boys/Girls Club with grandchildren by avoiding traffic congestion on Alston Ave.
- Autos will not be able to cross Pettigrew at Plum, Driver, and Ramseur streets. This could pose difficulty for surrounding residents to have access to businesses which would require crossing at these street intersections.
- Yes I do, how will my parents get their child or children to the day care if you close these streets. I think that it is unfair to me as a business person, and to my parents. [Referenced business is located on Ramseur].
- If the Ramseur/Grant crossing is closed, please consider providing an alternative access to our facility at 1109 E Peabody/1159 E Ramseur through the vacant lot we own at 1101 E Peabody which includes half of the former Laurel St. which has been closed. This lot has frontage on Ramseur St. With the closing of the Ramseur St. crossing, our normal route for trucks into our facility would cease to exist.
- If high speed tracks are realigned, we will lose two properties on Ramseur St. We would appreciate considerable advanced warning of the realignment.
- I am a property owner in East Durham but was not able to attend your meeting. However, I would like to raise my concern that the railroad crossings in our neighborhood are VERY frequently blocked while the trains are switching. If two of our three crossings are going to be closed then the railroad needs to do their switching further east in a less populated section of the tracks!

## **ALSTON AVENUE CROSSING**

#### **Following Second Workshop**

- When considering these closures, which would undoubtedly improve safety along the tracks, please take bridge clearance into account. There are a number of big trucks which need to move north and south across the tracks in a normal business day (we average 12 with a clearance height of 13'6" and another 20 with a clearance height of 12'8"). If the Chapel Hill Street, Roxboro St. and Alston Ave. bridges were adjusted to allow passage of 13'6" vehicles, we could probably figure out how to stay in business, continuing to employ 32 +, half of whom live in close proximity to our facility. Movement of 13'6" vehicles across the tracks is of primary concern to us. Please consider completing the Alston Ave. widening project which includes raising the Pettigrew St. bridge over Alston Ave. to a height exceeding 13'6" prior to closing either this Ramseur/Grant crossing or the Plum St. crossing.

- We have been operating our business at 1010 E Pettigrew Streets and 1109 E. Peabody Streets since the early 90's. None of the RR crossings should be altered until the bridge at Alston Avenue (Hwy 55 and Pettigrew) is raised from its current height of 13'2" to at least 13'6". If this is not done prior to the RR crossing adjustments commerce via trucking will cease in this sector. There will be no way for tractor trailers to gain access to our business or any surrounding businesses until this bridge height is addressed if the RR crossings are closed. As noted earlier, no RR crossings should be closed/altered until the bridge height has been addressed. We have 6 to 10 trailers a day come to our facilities and either be loaded or unloaded and without the RR crossings and/or the increased bridge height we could not operate our business. [Comment form mailed in].
- My understanding is that Alston is only being widened briefly, between 147 and Liberty/Holloway, at which point it will narrow back to two lanes. I'm not convinced that this make significant improvements in the congestion.

## **PLUM STREET CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Please do not close. Usually train stalls at Drives Street so this crossing moves the traffic. Also, this crossing is wider and poses a great benefit to the community. Used to get to freeway.
- Plum Street is an important future ped/auto connection to the future Alston Ave station. Keep it open.
- Seems unnecessary but is it an issue for neighborhood or business?
- Close it if it can't be grade separate.
- This one should stay.
- Typically travel to cross railroad track in the area
- Avoid using street/railroad crossing in the area
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.

### **Following Second Workshop**

- I do not want Dillard Street, Ramseur/Grant Street and Plum closed because it's a resident and business crossing for cars.
- I do not want Dillard St. Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because I use that street a lot. That is a busy street for cars and people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets please.
- I do not support the closure of Dillard, Ramseur Grant St. and Plum St. I would like for these streets to stay open for community and business traffic for car we need the crossing.
- I oppose the closing of the following streets: Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum St.
- I oppose this situation of closing of these streets, Dillard, Grant, Plum.
- I oppose the following closure listed here: Dillard, Plum, Grant.
- I do not want Dillard St. and Ramseur/Grant closed and Plum St. because we use that street a lot. That is a busy street for people to cross. I hope you don't close these streets.
- My response in hearing of the closing of our side streets is that Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum Street should not be closed. The streets are side streets that I use to prevent in using our main streets. The streets are easy for my use to get to one part of Durham to another area of Durham. The streets should be kept for community use and traffic use.
- I am very concerned about the closing of the following streets: Plum, Ramseur/Grant and Dillard. These are our communities and business crossings for cars to help offset our major fare-ways streets to help with congestion. Also this is keeping the community connected as a whole. The citizens of Durham (East Durham) do not need to be barricaded with blockage of these streets for crossing with cars.
- Yes, my reasons for not wanting these side streets closed: Dillard, Ramseur/Grant, and Plum, they are our community and business access the other part of Durham across Pettigrew St. Plus, when the traffic on Driver is changing tracks and others, there are these following streets the cars can use: Peabody to Clay St. to Wade St. to Plum to cross the tracks with safe and easy access to any other they wish to travel in. Plus it helps other major streets that are full with traffic. I wonder do you like to sit in traffic for long period of time?
- I am opposed to the closing of the following streets: Dillard; Ramseur/Grant; and Plum Streets. These streets are community and business based streets to be used for traffic use. They help offset high density on major streets.
- I am opposing the street closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum. These streets are used for community and business transportation. They are needed to offset major streets congestion.
- I oppose the closing of Dillard, Ramseur/Grant and Plum Streets.
- Autos will not be able to cross Pettigrew at Plum, Driver, and Ramseur streets. This could pose difficulty for surrounding residents to have access to businesses which would require crossing at these street intersections.
- When considering these closures, which would undoubtedly improve safety along the tracks, please take bridge clearance into account. There are a number of big trucks which need to move north and south across the tracks in a normal business day (we average 12 with a clearance height of 13'6" and another 20 with a clearance height of 12'8"). If the Chapel Hill Street, Roxboro St. and Alston Ave. bridges were adjusted to allow passage of 13'6" vehicles, we could probably figure out how to stay in business, continuing to employ 32 +, half of whom live in close proximity to our facility. Movement of 13'6" vehicles across the tracks is of primary concern to us. Please consider completing the Alston Ave. widening project which includes raising the Pettigrew St. bridge over Alston Ave. to a height exceeding 13'6" prior to closing either this Ramseur/Grant crossing or the Plum St. crossing.

- Divert traffic so it does not interfere with the Pettigrew business community [Respondent made this comment under the following comment: “Driver, Ramseur, Plum”].
- I request that the Plum St. crossing be left open to keep the traffic from congesting on the Driver St. crossing.
- I am at the corner of Plum St. and Pettigrew St. This would drastically affect my business and I do not support this road closure.
- My business is at the corner of Plum St. and East Pettigrew St. to close this off would hurt my business. I have other businesses at the same location.
- My business is located at the corner of Plum Street and East Pettigrew. I fear the close would be a detriment to my business.
- Closing of Plum Street will cut me off from getting to business (Flea Market) etc. without being involved in traffic congestion to get there.
- Please do not close the crossing at Plum St. Closing the crossing would negatively impact access to the Green Flea Market which provides access to fresh fruits and vegetables for the neighborhood. Additionally, the crossing provides very important alternate access for myself and other neighbors too and likely emergency vehicles when the crossing at Driver St. is closed. The Driver St. crossing is often closed for long periods of time with trains sitting still on the tracks. It is also likely that the closure of the Plum Street crossing will increase traffic on Alston and Angier, coming to and from downtown. Angier and Alston are already busy streets (I live right off of Angier Ave.), and Alston is also overcrowded.
- Plum Street is important to the [Green Flea Market] as well.
- If the plans for a pedestrian crossing at Plum Street are at least 7 years away and unfunded, does that mean the crossing won't close until then? Or will the crossing close sooner?
- I also recognize that it is more likely that the Plum Street crossing will be closed and this also impacts our daily travel. Often, the railroad crossing at Driver St. gets backed up for one reason or another and more often than not, there are just train cars sitting across the railroad crossing blocking the street. When this happens, we turn around and/or cut over to Plum Street to access Pettigrew St, which accesses 147 via Briggs. This happened twice yesterday and on its own stands as a significant problem. I understand that Brentag, a company at the end of S. Driver St. receives rail car shipping, but more often than not it looks like they are just switching the engines to different rail cars and block the road, when they could simply move down the railroad a little and not block Driver St. This happens way too often to be normal and should be fixed. If it cannot be fixed then I would urge the NCDOT to leave the Plum St. railroad crossing open, but I would prefer to maintenance, train engine switching, etc., be done somewhere else other than across Driver St. There are other areas in Durham where this would never be done because people with more power would complain.
- To close off these access points would cripple the area financially. The City of Durham is using significant financial resources to revitalize the Angier/ Driver St. corridor and to limit the access to the Durham Freeway would hurt our community and future business. The state of Alston Avenue does not allow for easy access to 147 and the added traffic would hurt that access even more. I know that there is another project to change and renew Alston Avenue (which I would like a status update on), but the access for Old East Durham to Hwy 147 is vital to our community health and it would be detrimental to close off our access. [Follow-up requested].
- I am writing to you concerning the proposed railroad crossing changes in East Durham. I am currently out of town, so I do not have an official comment form to submit, but as my husband and I are residents of Vale Street we am very concerned about the proposed closing of the Plum Street crossing. There is already a considerable amount of traffic on Alston and Angier, as well as Driver, (and serious back-ups and wait times during peak hours) and it seems that closing the Plum Street crossing will divert a large amount of traffic to these already congested areas, making it quite difficult for East Durham residents to get to other parts of the city without serious delays. As we regularly use the Plum Street crossing, several times on a daily basis, we are very familiar with the local traffic patterns, and we are at a loss to see the value in closing Plum Street (it is certainly not a dangerous crossing, it is one of the more widely visible crossings with no view obstructions in either direction to see oncoming trains.)
- I live right behind the railroad tracks between Plum and Driver's crossings over the tracks. I use these crossings every day and they affect my drive directly. I offer the following suggestions and know that my neighbors share the same sentiments. Please do not close the crossing at Plum St. Closing the crossing would negatively impact access to the Green Flea Market which provides access to fresh fruits and vegetables for the neighborhood. Additionally, the crossing provides very important alternate access for myself and other neighbors to and likely emergency vehicles when the crossing at Driver St. is closed.
- I am a resident of Old East Durham, at 2111 E Main St. Below are my comments on the changes to the rail road crossings that most impact my daily trips in and out of my neighborhood. Please do not close the crossing at Plum St. Closing the crossing would negatively impact access to the Green Flea Market which provides access to fresh fruits and vegetables for the neighborhood. Additionally, the crossing provides very important alternate access for myself and other neighbors to and likely emergency vehicles when the crossing at Driver St. is blocked. The Driver St. crossing is often blocked for long periods of time with trains sitting still on the tracks.
- Thanks for considering this comment. I live in Old East Durham and ride my bicycle to and from work every day using the Plum St. railroad crossing. There is less traffic than the Driver St. crossing, and I can cross the tracks when there is a train parked on the Driver St. crossing as well. Also, there is a fruit stand that I like to walk to in the Durham Green Market which I could not access easily without a crossing at Plum St.
- I am a property owner in Old East Durham and am most concerned about the proposed closure of the Plum St. railroad crossing. I would like to have a nearby alternate route to cross the tracks when trains are stopped for extended periods at Driver St. Closing Plum Street crossing will impact neighborhood travel to the popular green flea market as well as impede access to and egress from the area by emergency vehicles. Please maintain adequate crossing points in Old East Durham.
- I purchased, rehabbed and lived from 2006 - 2009 1814 Vale, located 1-2 blocks from Plum and Pettigrew, and now rent this house out. Currently, I live at 1912 Cardens Lane located close to Driver and Pettigrew. I purchased 1912, 1909 and 1907 Cardens Lane and have rehabbed these houses and rented them out. Here is a link to an article on these rehabbed houses. My houses are the ones featured in the slide show. <http://www.durhamvoice.org/preserving-durhams-historical-heritage-one-house-at-a-time/>. I am writing to state that I do support the closing of these crossings to reduce through traffic and improve the overall quality of life. This area has supported a nice residential community since the early 1900's co-existing with light industry and business. To continue the vitality of this historic area and offer a quality of life I believe closing these crossings and introducing a walk way is a good idea.
- I feel this railway crossing connecting E. Durham to the flea market is very important part of the neighborhood fabric.
- I am a property owner in East Durham but was not able to attend your meeting. However, I would like to raise my concern that the railroad crossings in our neighborhood are VERY frequently blocked while the trains are switching. If two of our three crossings are going to be closed then the railroad needs to do their switching further east in a less populated section of the tracks!

## DRIVER STREET CROSSING

### Following First Workshop

- Do not close this crossing. It would kill any revitalization to Northeast Central Durham
- What impact does it have on commercial area?
- Revitalizing commercial + res. corridor. Don't close vital commercial area make grade improvement
- Driver is important connection to commercial areas. Keep it open perhaps grade separate.
- Suggestion: Close this crossing at driver unless it can be grade separated. M. Shiflett.
- Important to keep open if Plum were to be closed – Briggs Ave extension grade separation may be key
- Improve safety of spur crossing on Pettigrew St. DATA rt 13 uses this road
- Typically travel to cross railroad track in the area
- Avoid using street/railroad crossing in the area
- New crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers)
- Enhancements for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Referring to railroad crossing closures: NO! Connectivity is vital for economic development.
- Referring to new crossing equipment (such as signals, gates, signs, median barriers): All locations – more pronounced gates – maybe that come up from street level
- Referring to new roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians: If any crossings get closed in downtown there needs to be a ped/bike bridge constructed.
- The Swift Street tracks has traffic backups, also Driver Street has backups.

### Following Second Workshop

- Autos will not be able to cross Pettigrew at Plum, Driver, and Ramseur streets. This could pose difficulty for surrounding residents to have access to businesses which would require crossing at these street intersections.
- Divert traffic so it does not interfere with the Pettigrew business community [Respondent made this comment under the following comment: “Driver, Ramseur, Plum”].
- Please do not close the crossing at Plum St. Closing the crossing would negatively impact access to the Green Flea Market which provides access to fresh fruits and vegetables for the neighborhood. Additionally, the crossing provides very important alternate access for myself and other neighbors too and likely emergency vehicles when the crossing at Driver St. is closed. The Driver St. crossing is often closed for long periods of time with trains sitting still on the tracks. It is also likely that the closure of the Plum Street crossing will increase traffic on Alston and Angier, coming to and from downtown. Angier and Alston are already busy streets (I live right off of Angier Ave.), and Alston is also overcrowded.
- Even though Driver St. is not being recommended for closure, the Driver Street crossing is often blocked due to trains being stopped along the tracks at/near that crossing.
- My wife and I live at 106 N Driver St., Durham, NC, 27703. We are recent residents of Old East Durham, but have been in Durham for the past 5 years (wife has been here for 12 years). We use the railroad crossing at S. Driver St. every single day, if not multiple times a day. It provides quick and easy access to NC Hwy 147 (Durham Freeway). It is much faster than going up to Alston Avenue, which is often over congested. To close the Driver St. crossing would severely impact our travel and I think would cut off our community from access to important resources that come with easy access to the Durham freeway.
- I also recognize that it is more likely that the Plum Street crossing will be closed and this also impacts our daily travel. Often, the railroad crossing at Driver St. gets backed up for one reason or another and more often than not, there are just train cars sitting across the railroad crossing blocking the street. When this happens, we turn around and/ or cut over to Plum Street to access Pettigrew St., which accesses 147 via Briggs. This happened twice yesterday and on its own stands as a significant problem. I understand that Brentag, a company at the end of S. Driver St. receives rail car shipping, but more often than not it looks like they are just switching the engines to different rail cars and block the road, when they could simply move down the railroad a little and not block Driver St. This happens way too often to be normal and should be fixed. If it cannot be fixed then I would urge the NCDOT to leave the Plum St. railroad crossing open, but I would prefer to maintenance, train engine switching, etc., be done somewhere else other than across Driver St. There are other areas in Durham where this would never be done because people with more power would complain.
- To close off these access points would cripple the area financially. The City of Durham is using significant financial resources to revitalize the Angier/ Driver St. corridor and to limit the access to the Durham Freeway would hurt our community and future business. The state of Alston Avenue does not allow for easy access to 147 and the added traffic would hurt that access even more. I know that there is another project to change and renew Alston Avenue (which I would like a status update on), but the access for Old East Durham to Hwy 147 is vital to our community health and it would be detrimental to close off our access. [Follow-up requested].
- I live right behind the railroad tracks between Plum and Driver's crossings over the tracks. I use these crossings every day and they affect my drive directly. I offer the following suggestions and know that my neighbors share the same sentiments. \*\*\*The Driver St. crossing is often closed for long periods of time with trains sitting still on the tracks. This is likely the most annoying thing about this section of the tracks. The signalization at Driver St. should be improved. Right turns from Pettigrew onto Driver are often delayed, waiting at a red light with no other vehicles in sight at non-peak hours.
- I am a resident of Old East Durham, at 2111 E Main St. Below are my comments on the changes to the rail road crossings that most impact my daily trips in and out of my neighborhood. The signalization at Driver St. should be improved. Right turns from Pettigrew onto Driver are often delayed, waiting at a red light with no other vehicles in sight at non-peak hours.
- I purchased, rehabbed and lived from 2006 - 2009 1814 Vale, located 1-2 blocks from Plum and Pettigrew, and now rent this house out. Currently, I live at 1912 Cardens Lane located close to Driver and Pettigrew. I purchased 1912, 1909 and 1907 Cardens Lane and have rehabbed these houses and rented them out. Here is a link to an article on these rehabbed houses. My houses are the ones featured in the slide show. <http://www.durhamvoice.org/preserving-durhams-historical-heritage-one-house-at-a-time/>. I am writing to state that I do support the closing of these crossings to reduce through traffic and improve the overall quality of life. This area has supported a nice residential community since the early 1900's co-existing with light industry and business. To continue the vitality of this historic area and offer a quality of life I believe closing these crossings and introducing a walk way is a good idea.

- I am a property owner in East Durham but was not able to attend your meeting. However, I would like to raise my concern that the railroad crossings in our neighborhood are VERY frequently blocked while the trains are switching. If two of our three crossings are going to be closed then the railroad needs to do their switching further east in a less populated section of the tracks!

## **ELLIS ROAD (WEST) CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Close it if the rails can it be elevated
- Many drivers do not stop clear of railroad crossings in close proximity to street intersections (e.g. Swift Ave near intersection w/ W. Main St.). Drivers need to understand that they should not stop on tracks! Ellis Rd is also a location w/ this problem.
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians
- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area
- There are backups at the East Durham Station (west) because they are going up with cars & then they back the cars to put on the right track

### **Following Second Workshop**

- When considering options for the Ellis/Pettigrew/Angier crossing, please ensure any bridges over Pettigrew exceed 13'6" clearance. We routinely move through the Ellis/Pettigrew portion of this intersection in order to access clients in Regional Commerce Center and the warehouse facility on Ellis.
- When the improvements were made on Ellis more than a year ago, I could not believe they did not raise the grade on both sides of the rail crossing to make it level after all of these years of it being a big bump/hump in the road. I called NCDOT after the work was done on Ellis and someone said it could not be done at this time as it required the cooperation of the RR. How else can it be done? The RR does not raise or lower rails so the road has to be changed as a way of making it a level crossing. There are literally a thousand cars that travel on Ellis night and morning and have to slow down below 20 to make a safe crossing for kids and stuff in the car that can be harmed by the jolt. Strangers approaching in the dark, unaware of the bump, can actually leave the ground at the 45 mph speed limit. Many months ago I complained about the poor visibility on Ellis at night and especially in the rain. Cars headlights blind eastbound cars due to the slight hill on the west side of the crossing. As there was no lines or shoulder on the road, cars were running off into the ditch on the East side of the crossing. Now I wish to compliment NCDOT on the work that was done on Ellis to improve it by adding street lights, painted traffic lines and reflectors. Thanks for reading down this far. I welcome your reply.
- I live right behind the railroad tracks between Plum and Driver's crossings over the tracks. I use these crossings every day and they affect my drive directly. I offer the following suggestions and know that my neighbors share the same sentiments. If any grade separation is undertaken for Ellis Rd (west), option 4 where the intersection would align with East End Ave seems to make the most sense.
- I am a resident of Old East Durham, at 2111 E Main St. Below are my comments on the changes to the rail road crossings that most impact my daily trips in and out of my neighborhood. If any grade separation is undertaken for Ellis Rd (west), option 4 where the intersection would align with East End Ave seems to make the most sense.
- She is requesting that we change the signal configuration at this location back to what it was before the improvements were made. She believes that there is a lot more congestion during the peak periods and confusion as to how to cross at this location. She says that they have a difficult time accessing their driveway and that there are a lot more people running the light. She also added that transfer trucks are routinely hitting the light poles out there. While she is sympathetic that there was a fatal accident at this location she does not feel that it justifies the changes made at this location. I explained that the long term recommendation looks at a possible grade separation at/near this crossing. She feels that this is too far in the future to fix the existing problem and that the solution is to redo the crossing and adjacent intersection signals back to the previous configuration. She said that she has called to complain to the City on a number of occasions, however nothing has been done. I did inquire as to who she spoke with and she could not give me a name, just that she has spoken to a number of people. She said that they commonly sit at the lights for 30 minutes at a time and since they are hourly employees that is unreasonable. I did give her the dates for the meetings and told her I would forward on her comments. [Provided via email by N. Horne, NCDOT based on phone conversation with commenter].

## **GLOVER ROAD CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Typically travel to cross railroad tracks in the area

## **WRENN ROAD CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Glover Road and Wrenn Road could be combined into a single grade separated crossing- maybe extend Ruritan Road on a bridge over RR, then connect to Wrenn Road, Stone Park Ct and Glover Road on the west side of RR.

## **ELLIS ROAD (EAST) CROSSING**

### **Following First Workshop**

- Many drivers do not stop clear of railroad crossings in close proximity to street intersections (e.g. Swift Ave near intersection w/ W. Main St.). Drivers need to understand that they should not stop on tracks! Ellis Rd is also a location w/ this problem.
- New roadway overpasses or underpasses to separate trains from cars, bicycles and pedestrians

## **CORNWALLIS ROAD CROSSING**

[No comments were received for the Cornwallis Road crossing]