

**TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MINUTES  
December 3, 2009**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Charlie Hileman, Chair  
Austin Brown  
Heidi Perry  
Daniel Amoni  
Robin Michler  
Sammy Slade

**STAFF PRESENT**

Jeff Brubaker

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Seth LaJeunesse  
Michael Krasnov

**I. Call to Order**

Charlie Hileman, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:56 PM, following the joint review session.

**II. Approval of minutes**

Several TAB members expressed interest in receiving meeting minutes and agendas only electronically as an attachment.

MOTION (Michler, Amoni second): TAB approved the November 19, 2009, meeting minutes. Ayes (4): Hileman, Perry, Amoni, Michler. Nays (0). Abstain (1): Brown. Absent (2): LaJeunesse, Krasnov.

**III. Discussion of Joint Review item (1225 Cottage Homes – Hillsborough Rd.)**

Hileman suggested an access easement (on the north end of the property) from Hillsborough Rd. to McDougle School. TAB discussed the merits of sidewalks along Hillsborough Rd. and the proposed access road, including the effect of sidewalk costs on housing affordability and where children would walk and bike. Amoni suggested recommending that the access road be one-way. Brown and Perry said the recommendation should specify that the one-way road have two lanes with one lane for on-street parking. Michler suggested a two-way road as a traffic calming measure. TAB discussed the location of on-street parking. Brown suggested pocket parking (vegetated bulb-outs at intervals between on-street spaces) to address Slade's concern about impervious surface. TAB discussed whether the access road should be public or private.

TAB recommended that the developers:

1. Include an access easement to McDougle School for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity;
2. Design the access road as one-way with on-street, pocket parking; and
3. Contribute to the Town constructing a sidewalk along the southwest side of Hillsborough Rd.

[This is an informal recommendation and was not put to a vote.]

#### **IV. Chapel Hill and Carrboro 2035 Long Range Transit Plan**

Perry and Slade asked about the plan's capital cost estimates for proposed bus rapid transit (BRT) on MLK Blvd. and light rail transit (LRT). Hileman said that LRT should be maintained as a viable option in future planning processes, including through the UNC/Carolina North campus-to-campus bicycle connector process. Perry suggested a discussion with Norfolk Southern representatives regarding future use of the NS rail corridor. Slade recommended that staff compile information on the barriers to LRT in the corridor. TAB discussed density along MLK Blvd., BRT vs. conventional express bus service, and providing BRT and bike facilities through a road diet on MLK Blvd.

MOTION (Perry, Brown second): TAB recommends that the Board of Aldermen support a lighted bicycle and pedestrian commuter route from the UNC main campus, through Carrboro, and along the existing Norfolk Southern rail corridor to Estes Dr. and on to Carolina North. Ayes (5): Hileman, Brown, Perry, Amoni, Michler. Nays (0). Absent (2): LaJeunesse, Krasnov.

Michler noted that the Long Range Transit Plan includes over 20,000 new parking spaces at gateway park-and-rides, including 2,000 on the edge of Carrboro. Hileman and Brown said that park-and-rides prevent commuters from low-density, outlying areas from continuing to drive into town. TAB discussed regional transit provision in Chatham and Alamance Counties and incorporating development (such as commercial uses) at park-and-ride lots. Hileman said that light rail in Carrboro should not be taken off the table.

MOTION (Michler, Brown second): TAB recommends that a road diet be implemented on MLK Blvd., to convert the two outer lanes to bus- and bike-only lanes. This would give buses more capacity without additional roadway construction costs and make it clear that cars will not be accommodated at the expense of alternative forms of transportation. Ayes (5): Hileman, Brown, Perry, Amoni, Michler. Nays (0). Absent (2): LaJeunesse, Krasnov.

Perry and Hileman added the following comments and questions about the plan:

1. Would like to see a more detailed list as to where the costs came from and formulas used in the plan's analysis.
2. Would like a clarification as to what factors are included in the BRT/LRT cost estimates.

3. Does the \$9 mil. average BRT capital cost estimate include construction of new lanes?
4. What factors does the \$86 mil. MLK corridor BRT capital/vehicle cost estimate include?
5. How many miles of busway are included in the \$86 mil. cost estimate?
6. What is capital cost estimate per mile for light rail assuming an existing rail line?
7. What is the greenhouse gas impact of BRT vs. LRT, and between different forms of LRT?

Amoni said the plan's long-term outlook should better emphasize regional connections between dense areas and include gateway nodes that are farther away. TAB discussed light rail and the Long Range Transit Plan in the context of regional transportation planning.

MOTION (Amoni, Perry second): TAB recommends that the Chapel Hill and Carrboro 2035 Long Range Transit Plan include language to evaluate the use of the existing rail corridor (North Rail Corridor – 5A) in:

1. Any future Alternatives Analysis for enhanced transit service in the MLK corridor and
2. The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan

Ayes (5): Hileman, Brown, Perry, Amoni, Michler. Nays (0). Absent (2): LaJeunesse, Krasnov.

## **V. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 PM.