WORKSHOP NOTES

Date: August 29, 2012
8:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. (Morning Session)
12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. (Afternoon Session)

Location: Wake Forest Biotech Place
575 N. Patterson Avenue, Suite 550, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

All-Day Attendees (Policy & Tech. Cmtes):
Ralph Womble, NCDOT
Cornelius Graves, WSSU
Brenda Fulmore, WSSU
Owen Cooks, WSSU
Dan Besse, Winston-Salem City Council
Gayle Anderson, Chamber of Commerce
Michael Suggs, Goler CDC
Chad Nolan, WFU Baptist Medical Center
Kenneth Basch, WFU
Daniel Yohannes, Targacept
Art Barnes, WSTA
Scott Rhine, PART
Keith Wilson, Downtown Partnership
Myra Immings, FTA
Greg Errett, City of Winston-Salem
Toneq’ McCullough, City of Winston-Salem
Paul Norby, City of Winston-Salem

Study Team:
David Taylor, HDR
Brett Wallace, HDR
Claire Brinkley, HDR
Karen Simon, Simon Resources
Amy Hubbard, Simon Resources

Afternoon Attendees:
Greg Turner, City of Winston-Salem
Russ Dubois, Creative Corridors
Jim DeCristo, UNCSA
Jeff Macintosh, DWSP
Adam Sebastian, DTP Planning Committee
Jason Thiel, DWSP
Rence Callahan, WRCP
Graydon Pleasants, PTRP

Summary of Discussion:
- Paul Norby welcomed the Policy and Technical Committee Members to the workshop and gave a brief overview of the history of the project.
- Brett Wallace gave an overview of the Planning Workshop, emphasizing that the goal for the day is to get stakeholders involved in selecting an urban circulator route. A defined route, technology (streetcar, enhanced bus, or standard bus) and financial strategy will be the outcomes of this study. Then Mr. Wallace reviewed the study goals that were previously approved by the Policy and Technical Committees.
- David Taylor discussed characteristics that make a good urban circulator route and street. When introducing the vertical clearance minimums and associated overhead wire conflicts, members in the group asked about ways to overcome vertical clearance design challenges. Mr.
Wallace explained that there are three possible streetcar-specific solutions to allow for the necessary vertical clearance:
  o Design a streetcar-only lane so that trucks will not be impacted by the electrified wire;
  o Lowering the entire roadway to provide adequate clearance; or
  o Investigate opportunities to incorporate emerging off-wire technology.

• The group left Biotech Place and commenced on a walking tour of downtown Winston-Salem, traveling west on 5th St, south on Marshall St, east on 4th St, and north on Patterson. Mr. Norby discussed recent changes in the core of downtown and planned projects. Mr. Taylor explained characteristics that would be beneficial and/or detrimental for an urban circulator route.

Walking Tour

• Following the walking tour, Mr. Wallace and Ms. Claire Brinkley gave a presentation on the initial screening of the route options. Mr. Wallace introduced the flowchart concept that will be used to pare down route segments shown on the “spaghetti map”. He reviewed the performance measures that are tied to the study goals which will be used to screen the alternatives.

• Ms. Brinkley presented the initial screening maps to help the group see that some route segments achieve the study goals better than others. While reviewing the maps, the following comments were made:
  o Myra Immings suggested that EPA Brownfield sites be identified.
  o Daniel Yohannes asked if a connection from 5th St to Summit St./Brookstown Ave. could be considered even though it is not shown on the “spaghetti map”. Mr. Wallace recommended that Mr. Yohannes and his table group discuss the pros and cons of this segment during the routing exercise portion of the workshop.
  o Michael Suggs asked if the historic district designation is a negative or positive for development (e.g. the area near Martin Luther King Jr. Dr.) The study team replied that the designation could be beneficial depending on the neighborhood support.
  o Greg Errett informed the study team that sharrow pavement markers for bicycles have been added to 3rd St and 5th St.
  o Mr. Yohannes asked if couplets could be spaced more than one block apart. He liked the idea of using 4th or 5th with 1st or 2nd street in order to “spread” the development potential. Mr. Taylor explained that couplets spaced more than a block or two apart can be too far to walk and may cause rider confusion.

• The group was given a brief break to allow the additional afternoon participants to join the workshop.
• Following the break and time for lunch, Mr. Wallace gave the new participants an overview of the study and explained that the goal for the workshop was to select a route.
• Mr. Taylor discussed the keys to a successful urban circulator system and gave examples from around the country.
• Mr. Wallace gave an introduction to the technology alternatives considered during this study, and explained the differentiating characteristics of a streetcar and an enhanced bus.
• For the benefit of the afternoon participants, Mr. Taylor reviewed characteristics that make a good urban circulator route and street.
• Ms. Brinkley presented the design constraints for the route alternatives.
• The participants were divided into four groups to complete the routing exercise. Each group was given a map showing the conceptual route alternatives, precut (to scale) yellow ribbon and pushpins. Everyone was encouraged to come to a consensus and consider the study goals and design considerations as they designed their route. The table groups could then use the ribbon and pins to design their own route, and count the number of precut ribbons to calculate the cost of their route. Groups could start and end their route where they liked. Pink ribbon was also provided to indicate non-specific future extensions.

During the team discussion the following comments were made:
  o A few people thought that the link between the hospital and PTRP should be serviced by an express shuttle rather than the streetcar; or in the least, provide that link only at specific times of the day on streetcar.
Gayle Anderson questioned if there are opportunities to redevelop the section of 4th St west of Spruce St. She feels that this area is under-developed and has very little activity. She added that the two bookends downtown are BB&T ballpark and PTRP, and this group needs to make sure we can redevelop in between.

Many participants thought it was very important to connect to WSSU, as well as serve MLK on the east side of US 52.

Many participants also liked the idea of future extension to WFU and UNCSA.

Consideration was given to the grades (for walking) if couplets aren’t used especially with elderly and kids.

- Each group was asked to give a “report-out” and explain their group’s rationale for designing their route.
- Mr. Wallace summarized the common themes from the exercise:
  - Each group used the hospital as an end point;
  - Streetcar was used as the technology of choice for each table, with one table selecting a combination of both streetcar and enhanced bus.
  - Each group selected Burke St. or a couplet using Burke/1st/2nd/Broad;
  - 1st St, 5th St east of US 52, and MLK Dr north of Union Station were not selected by any group;
  - Two groups were concerned about the overall cost of the project and their routes provided access to the northern portion of PTRP but did not go all the way through to WSSU.
- Mr. Wallace ended the workshop by discussing the next steps of the study and upcoming schedule. Participants were thanked for being engaged during the day and helping the study team narrow down the route alternatives.

Next Steps:
- The study team will review the route designs created by the groups and plans to accomplish the following items in the coming months:
  - Conduct transit survey / ridership analysis;
  - Initiate funding strategy discussion;
  - Refine route alignment;
  - Develop transit operations plan;
  - Conduct additional traffic analysis;
  - Develop detail comparison of technologies; and
  - Gather additional public input.
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