

First Draft Streets Manual - Comments and Responses

Streets Map Section

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
1	1/13/2022	2.2 Policy Background	In section 2.2 of the CSManual, there is specific reference to the Urban Streets Design Guidelines being encompassed in the CSManual. However, I can find no reference to crosswalks at all. I find only one reference to crosswalks in the UDO concerning CATS stops being 1,320 feet from a crosswalk. Have we trashed the design criteria for crosswalks in Charlotte?	The Streets Manual reflects adopted policies (including the USDG) that are most relevant to the specific topics covered by the Streets Manual. It is not intended to replace or include all elements of existing transportation policies. Crosswalks and mid-block crossings are still a key part of the City's street design toolbox - details about how the City applies pedestrian crossings at unsignalized intersections and mid-block locations can be found in Appendix C of Charlotte Walks. https://charlottenc.gov/Transportation/Programs/Documents/Charlotte%20WALKS%20Adopted%20Plan%20-%20February%202017.pdf	No
2	11/27/2021	2.9 Arterial Street Type Design and Dimensional Standards Table 2.3 Arterial Street Type & Dimensional Standards	Table 2.3 should indicate that the dimension provided include all striping etc	The dimensions do include striping width.	No
3	10/12/2021	General	I'm wondering what purpose painted bike lanes have in the Charlotte Streets draft in relation to the 2040 Policy map. Given the city's outspoken commitment to Vision Zero, it seems counterintuitive to have non-separated bike lanes (bike facilities 2.8.1, 2.8.2, and 2.8.3) as part of the options when developing future multi-use streets. To not include designs that all but guarantee bicycle/pedestrian safety disheartens me and discourages people who want to travel in another mode besides a car. The above-mentioned designs maintain the status quo and will require pedestrians and bicyclists to be visible to vehicles rather than forcing drivers to drive safely. We are seeing more people speeding, distracting themselves while driving, or not having any regard for those traveling without using a car. I think it's important to have some forethought into future transportation and include modes that do more in protecting non-vehicular traffic. The minimum standard being the separated bike lanes (bike facility 2.8.4). When designing non-vehicular transportation, I'm imploring you to consider cities like: Carmel, Indiana (using shared-use paths along their major roadways); Somerville, Massachusetts (just completed a shared-use path along Somerville Avenue); Utrecht, Netherlands (pioneer of bicycle transportation in Europe). The cities using the shared-use paths (like the separated bike like but elevated to the sidewalk) not only allow lone bicyclists or a bicycle sports team to travel safely between destinations, but families who bike or walk and disabled pedestrians who only travel by a motorized wheelchair. Given the rising prices of fuel, cars, and the need to reduce fossil-fuel driven pollution, these shared-use paths will completely transform how traffic moves in this city, reduce the need for parking lots (large or small), reduce costs overall in street maintenance, improve physical and mental health (partly through the decrease in pollution, vehicular traffic, and vehicle crashes).	The City has updated its bicycle facility designs to include several options for both in-street and out-of-street facilities. The decision of which facility to include on a given arterial is based on a variety of factors including land uses, number of driveways (which can seriously degrade the safety of an off-street facility), and traffic speeds and volumes. Standard bike lanes have been used for many years, and will continue to be used in specific contexts. However, moving forward the majority of Streets Map cross-sections include either a buffered/separated bike lane or a shared-use path.	No
4	3/15/2022		Is the center of the street be measured from the street or right-of-way line	It is measured from the street centerline and the updated draft includes a description of this.	Yes

Access Management and Driveway Design Section

(Formerly Driveway and Access and Rules Section)

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Recommended Change to Streets Manual
5	11/27/2021	3.1 Purpose & Use	3.1 Purpose: "Applicable to any & All Land Development activities... but no limited to." you need to say specifically who it applies to. since in 3.4 you say that it applies to building change of use development plan (i don't know what that means) which is NOT a land development activity	Driveway plan review and approval follows current practice. Language has been updated. 2.1.B	Yes
6	11/27/2021	3.5 Design Criteria and Access	3.5 Place types should be segmented as high & low intensity uses on the list since the concept comes up	The updated draft removed references to Place Types.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
		Management - Place Types			
7	11/27/2021	3.5 Design Criteria and Access Management - Streets Type - Table 2.1 Streets Types	table 21- uses the word Limited Access which in not used elsewhere	Table 2.1 was updated, including language on Limited Access.	Yes
8		3.5 Design Criteria and Access Management - Driveway Selection Guidance	Driveway selection guidance does not define Commercial Driveway review	The updated draft removed this section.	Yes
9	11/27/2021	3.5 Driveway Selection Guidance - Access Amount	page 4 regarding Access Amount & Access Restrictions is written to be a Property Right Taking. if you prohibit access to the only frontage a property has CLT needs to buy that access right.	The updated draft removed this section and incorporated additional guidance in Table 2.1.	Yes
10	11/27/2021	3.5 Driveway Selection Guidance	Also on this page you need to add Driveway TYPE (defined in section 3.6) and define High, High-Med, and Low from 2 Tables labeled 2.2	The updated draft provides clarity in new Table 2.1.	Yes
11	11/27/2021	3.5 Driveway Selection Guidance - Table 2.2 Selection Guidance (continued)	Page 6 Three of the 5 notes under the second table 2.2 are not referenced in the chart. what are they? what do they apply to?	Table was removed and a new table (Table 2.1) with better guidance was created.	Yes
12	11/27/2021	3.6 Driveway Design Criteria - General Criteria	Section 3-6 uses Business days but the UDO is calendar days.	The review dates were removed. Review times will follow standard land development review times.	Yes
13	11/27/2021	3.6 Driveway Design Criteria - General Criteria	same paragraph please reword the last sentence.... officially submitted for review to prevent the official permitting schedule.... (it's to hard to follow what you're trying to say as written)	Text was removed.	Yes
14	11/27/2021	3.6 Driveway Design Criteria - General Criteria - Table 2.3 Standard Driveway Types	table 2.3 why does a 1 car garage home/ townhome have to have a 2-car driveway? this is adding unnecessary cost	A two-car garage is not required. Dimension is ordinance requirement from garage to public right-of-way. Text was removed from draft.	Yes
15	11/27/2021	3.8 Channelization & Internal Driveway Access	3.8 200' of channelization is confusing relative to the standards for driveway connections relative to signalized intersections	Language was updated in Section 2.3.B.2 for clarity.	Yes
16	11/27/2021	3.10 Access Management - Driveway Placement - Separation from Adjacent Driveways	Section 3.10 Separation of adjacent driveways does not work in the dense urban setting we are trying to achieve. when half the lot classifications are less than 50' wide. Residential driveways are not exempted and should be.	Updated draft incorporates current practice of being flexible for varying scenarios and language has been revised for clarity. See sections 2.3.B.3.b and 2.3.B.4.b	Yes
17	11/27/2021	3.10 Access Management - Driveway Placement - Separation from Property Line	page 10 Urban infill is not defined in any document. And requiring driveways to be off the property line serves no purpose in a residential setting	Updated draft incorporates current practice of being flexible for varying scenarios and language has been revised for clarity. See sections 2.3.B.3.b and 2.3.B.4.b.	Yes
18	11/27/2021	3.10 Access Management - Driveway Placement - Left Turn Lanes	page 11 uses the words Thoroughfares twice, but they are no longer in any other document	Updated draft removed references to thoroughfares and uses arterials for consistency.	Yes
19		3.10 Access Management - Driveway Placement - Right Turn Lanes	under right-turn lanes there is a typo 2nd line..... the potential TO degrade	Language was updated.	Yes
20		3.10 Access Management - Driveway Placement - Access Restrictions	under access restrictions you never say 'prohibits' but Table 2.2 does	Language was updated.	Yes
21	11/27/2021	3.12 Residential Driveways	Section 3.12 Residential driveways are unknown & not shown on a Preliminary Plan. so the section needs to correctly state that driveway permits / review are sot required for subdivisions (which brings up the issue with subdivisions started & not completed when this passes. property owners should not have to come back for 50 driveway permits in a new community when the previous 200 didn't have /need driveway permits.	CDOT doesn't require review of residential driveways as part of planned subdivision projects.	No
22	11/27/2021	3.13 Sight Distance	3.13 needs to conform to the latest version of Sight Distance Policy & state law (which in 2021 further defined how they are measure & the UDO conflicts with that law)	The existing ordinance and UDO were updated to conform with updated laws.	No

Comprehensive Transportation Review (CTR) Section

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
23	11/17/2021	General Comment	I'm not seeing any of these assessment or studies with an emphasis on how safety will be improved post-development. It seems to be mostly focused on 1.) having a multi-modal option (which is nice but no one will be inclined to travel between points without the use of a vehicle if there is a high-risk of being on the receiving end of a vehicular crash) and 2.) a reduction in traffic congestion. The latter of which	The CTR assessments include a safety review component.	No

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
			should be an afterthought, or the proverbial "cherry-on-top". I would like to see developers make projects on the current status of vehicular crashes (between other vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians), and then illustrations which show how they think their design will make it safer for most travelers.		
24	11/27/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Tiers are called thresholds in the UDO. Be consistent in your language	Thank you for your feedback. The Tier structure provides us the best way to clearly describe the thresholds.	No
25	11/27/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Table 1 -how can 35 home be considered High intensity in a TOD (for example). isn't the point of mandating residential in a mixed use to reduce the trips? this is not allowing for that	Intensity is based on Zoning District and not on the development scale.	No
26	11/27/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 2. CTR Scoping and Review Process	Table 2 review times doesn't match Article 2 of UDO	Review times are based on existing TIS review times.	No
27	11/27/2021	3.0.B Multimodal Assessment - Assessment	City's ADA Transition Plan is not on Charlotte Explorer. Nor is the list of approved ped crossing is unavailable in the Supporting documents	An ADA Map will be available for customers to view.	No
28	11/27/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	Table 3 uses SUP abbreviation which also means Special Use Permit section 4	The updated draft will spell out shared-Use path (SUP)	Yes
29	11/27/2021	4.0 Transportation Demand Management	TDM is a big over reach.	The 2040 Comprehensive Plan Policy 5.12 calls for the inclusion of Transportation Demand Management into our regulations.	No
30	11/27/2021	4.0.C.2 TDM Plan Monitoring	TDM Monitoring would go on for How Long? Forever? Don't tax dollars pay for anything. People move, people grow older & change their patterns, jobs go remote & come back to the campus. what you are trying to achieve is not achievable. I also question how CDOT can comply with General Statutes & Case law in the requirement of offsite improvements	The city will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips. We will continue to work to ensure compliance with all statutes and regulations.	No
31	12/16/2021	2.0.C Comprehensive Transportation Review - Professional Requirements	Landscape Designer - who would that be? Engineer - civil?	Someone with TDM experience can submit this portion. A TDM assessment can be submitted by a landscape designer or civil engineer.	No
32	12/16/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	School study disclosure?	The Charlotte Streets Manual speaks about potentially requiring one, but it is not automatically required for schools.	No
33	12/16/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Define land use thresholds to trigger?	The thresholds are based on the Zoning Districts which are defined in the UDO.	No
34	12/16/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Who makes the final call on CTR requirements? Can it be over-ruled? If so why who? CRITICAL	CDOT Director makes the final call, and the UDO includes language regarding variances and proportionality.	No
35	12/16/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Based on suburban or urban Trip Generation numbers?	ITE Suburban Trip Generation. A note has been added for clarity.	Yes
36	12/16/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 2. CTR Scoping and Review Process	Should there be something within the CTR that will specify when a TIS must be submitted in regards to the overall rezoning timeline. This is something that has changed multiple times.	The updated draft provides additional clarity on schedule submittal and timelines.	Yes
37	12/16/2021	3.0.B Multimodal Assessment - Assessment	City's ADA Transition Plan ? Examples of pre-approved mitigation opportunities?	An ADA map will be available for customers to view.	No
38	12/16/2021	3.0.B Multimodal Assessment - Assessment	Is the 1/4 mile distance measured from the boundary line?	Yes.	No
39	12/16/2021	3.0.B.4 Multimodal Assessment - Assessment - Street Lighting	Who provides street lighting information? Who do you coordinate with?	The lighting multimodal mitigation options have been removed from the draft.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
40	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	As discussed, CDOT is not expecting any right-of-way acquisition?	Right-of-way acquisition is not required for Multimodal Mitigation requirements. However, if the developer chooses a measure that requires additional space, it would be the developer's responsibility to acquire additional right-of-way. A note has been added for clarity.	Yes
41	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	If right-of-way doesn't exist? What are the options?	Right-of-way acquisition is not required for Multimodal Mitigation requirements. However, if the developer chooses a measure that requires additional space, it would be the developer's responsibility to acquire additional right-of-way. A note has been added for clarity.	Yes
42	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	Minimum width of SUP?	The city standard is 12', which can be reduced to 10' where verified space constraints exist.	No
43	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	List of approved "Pedestrian Refuge Islands" locations?	We will share the list and investigate whether they can be included in Charlotte Explorer.	No
44	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	What is the spacing and number of street lighting and pedestrian lighting?	The lighting multimodal mitigation options have been removed from the draft.	Yes
45	12/16/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options - Notes	List of other "Multimodal mitigation options" CDOT will consider?	The City is open to reviewing other available options that may be used in other cities or otherwise suggested by an applicant.	No
46	12/16/2021	4.0.C.1.c Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Mitigation ("TDM Plan")	"incorporated into submitted land development construction plans" ?	Required CTR mitigations should be included on the rezoning site plans and/or construction plan submittal.	No
47	12/16/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Plan Monitoring	"TDM Coordinator" - TDM Point of contact?	Larger projects will have a TDM Coordinator, while smaller projects may only have a point of contact.	No
48	12/16/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Plan Monitoring	Will every development require a TDM coordinator? Contact?	Yes.	No
49	12/16/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options	Joy Ride?	Joy rides is a bicycle program that promotes bicycle trips. It is included here as an example of this type of mitigation option.	No
50	12/16/2021	5.0B.1 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	"study area intersections" - Area of Influence (AOI)?	The updated draft changes "study area intersections" to "area of influence" .	Yes
51	12/16/2021	5.0B.1 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	"lie within 1/2 mile of proposed development" - All intersections within 1/2 mile? As determined by CDOT?	CDOT will make final determination on study intersections base on the development scale. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes
52	12/16/2021	5.0B.1.c Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	What if under 5,000 daily / 500 peak hour trips and not within 1/2 mile?	CDOT will make final determination on study intersections base on the development scale. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes
53	12/16/2021	5.0B.1.c Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	How will this be determined?	The updated draft does not include this language.	Yes
54	12/16/2021	5.0B.1.d Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	"area of influence" - 1/2 mile?	CDOT will make final determination on study intersections base on the development scale. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes
55	12/16/2021	5.0B.1.e Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	"area of influence" - 1/2 mile?	CDOT will make final determination on study intersections base on the development scale. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes
56	12/16/2021	5.0B.2.d.4 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment -	Synchro or SimTraffic Equivalent? Maximum? NCDOT Guidelines	Maximum of Synchro or SimTraffic are equivalent. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
		Roadway Capacity Analysis			
57	12/16/2021	5.0.C.1 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Identification	Future without build to build?	Yes. Draft has been updated to state Future No Build to Build.	Yes
58	12/16/2021	5.0.C.1 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Identification	NCDOT states mitigation must only be identified for LOS F where a 25% is not exceeded	The CTR TIS will follow NCDOT's thresholds and mitigation requirements. The draft has been updated to provide clarity.	Yes
59	12/16/2021	5.0.C.1.d Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Identification	In the Build when compared to no build? What if no build already exceeds and we make it no worse?	Mitigations will be on a case-by-case basis. In very constrained areas, the city may look for alternate mitigation options.	No
60	12/16/2021	5.0.C.2 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Determination	Determination of mitigation is typical.	Thank you for your feedback.	No
61	12/16/2021	5.0.C.3 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - CTR Documentation	The Documentation format was changed.	Thank you for your feedback.	No
62	12/16/2021	5.0.C.3 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - CTR Documentation	Appendix - List of tables and figures in Appendix	Thank you for your feedback.	No
63	12/16/2021	5.0.C.3 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - CTR Documentation	If the CTR Report only includes an MA or TDM, do they intend for that to be in a memo format? Or will we need to develop a new report format?	A memo format for Multimodal Assessment and Transportation Demand Management is used when a TIS is not required.	No
64	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Internal Capture	What is considered "large" mixed-use development for Internal capture?	The updated draft clarifies that NCDOT Congestion Management Capacity Analysis Guidance is used for internal capture.	Yes
65	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Pass-By Trips	Determining pass-by for other uses than shopping center/retail based on R vs E. spreadsheet?	The updated draft clarifies to use the NCDOT's Rate vs Equation spreadsheet for pass-by determination.	Yes
66	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Trip Distribution	So a 2-4 year buildout is not allowed?	The updated draft states that phasing will be based on the development build out years.	Yes
67	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Turning Movement Counts (TMC)	Why 7pm?	The updated draft reflects current count practice.	Yes
68	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Turning Movement Counts (TMC)	<i>"For TMCs more than one (1) year old, but less than two (2) years old, apply a growth rate, to be determined by CDOT."</i> - Good	Thank you for your feedback.	No
69	12/16/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Other	NCDOT Spreadsheet	Yes, the NCDOT spreadsheet will be used.	No
70	12/16/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form	Will this be only for CDOT only studies, or will both need to be filled out for CDOT/NCDOT projects?	This will be used for CDOT studies only.	No
71	12/16/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form - Contact Information	NC PE #?	A TIS requires the seal of a NC licensed professional.	No
72	12/16/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form - Study Intersections	Will need lot more rows!	The Scope Form will be available separately when the draft is approved.	No
73	12/16/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form - Signature	<i>"NCDOT Approval of Scope"</i> - NCDOT already has their own detailed format.	Only the NCDOT scope form will be required when a project meets NCDOT's TIS threshold requirement. CTR and TDM will be included as an attachment to the scope.	No
74	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	TDM Tiers don't list Mitigation Points or say that they are 0	The draft update addresses the typos in this section.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
75	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	For Medium to High Intensity Development, is the table implying that all development that needs a MA will also need a TDM?	Yes.	No
76	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 2. CTR Scoping and Review Process	How will the CDOT Scoping form work with NCDOT's scoping form? Will they start requiring that both forms be completed?	Only the NCDOT scope form will be required when a project meets NCDOT's TIS threshold requirement. CTR and TDM will be included as an attachment to the scope.	No
77	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 2. CTR Scoping and Review Process	Having a 5 day review timeline feels like it could create some tension with NCDOT's 10 day review timeline	The updated draft aligns with NCDOT's TIS review schedule.	Yes
78	12/6/2021	3.0.B Multimodal Assessment - Assessment	The MA says it will "review and assess the publicly accessible pedestrian network within ¼ mile walking distance of the site". I'd assume this means we'll need to measure walking distances along pedestrian facilities, but that could get tedious in areas where there is a grid network. Not sure that a straight-line distance is appropriate, but this could create some gray areas in denser regions.	The 1/4 mile walking distance measurement aligns with how distance is measured in TOD Zoning.	No
79	12/6/2021	3.0.C.1.c Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - MA Summary	It says that MA Summary should include "Plans, descriptions, and locations of physical MA mitigations, incorporated into submitted lane development construction plans". Does this mean that improvements need to be incorporated into plans at the time of the MA? Or are they saying that after the MA is approved, the improvements will need to be incorporated in the plans? If the former, then it might need an interim step where improvements are approved before anyone starts designing.	Required CTR mitigations should be included on the rezoning site plans and/or construction plan submittal.	No
80	12/6/2021	5.0.B.1 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	5.B.1. & 5.B.2.a - Reference a scoping meeting but say that a scoping meeting is voluntary on page 1	A Scoping Meeting is optional, and may occur more often when a TIS is required.	Yes
81	12/6/2021	5.0.B.1 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	Are there thresholds for measuring the "likely to reduce LOS" and "area of influence"	The updated draft does not include this language.	Yes
82	12/6/2021	5.0.B.2.d.2 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Analysis	Why include v/c as a metric to report if it's no longer a threshold for mitigation? Why ask by individual movement	Providing v/c will not be required as part of the report. The text has been updated to ask for information by intersection and not by movement.	Yes
83	12/6/2021	5.0.C.3 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - CTR Documentation	If the CTR Report only includes an MA or TDM, do they intend for that to be in a memo format? Or will we need to develop a new report format?	A memo format is used for MA/TDM if a TIS is not required.	No
84	12/6/2021	5.0.C.3.g.3 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - CTR Documentation	Does this mean that a concept will be required for all identified mitigation in a TIS?	Not necessarily. A concept will be by request or for constrained conditions to assist in determining feasibility of proposed mitigations.	No
85	12/6/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Pass-by	Add restaurants to uses that can have pass-by (or clarify that that is included in retail). Why is pass-by only limited in the PM? Is there a technical basis for this or just a carryover from the old code?	The draft update clarifies to use the NCDOT's Rate vs Equation spreadsheet for pass-by and internal capture determination.	Yes
86	12/6/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Turning Movement Counts	There's a typo of TCM in the last bullet of the counts section	The updated draft addresses the typos in this section.	Yes
87	12/6/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form	Will form be provided separately after CTR is finalized?	The Scope Form will be available separately when the draft is approved.	Yes
88	12/6/2021	6.0 CTR Scoping Form - Study Parameters	Does it need to be 16 hours?	The updated draft reduces count duration to 12-hours.	Yes
89	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Suburban or urban Trip Gen	The updated draft clarifies to use the suburban trip category to determine vehicle trips using Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation software.	Yes
90	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Thresholds seem relatively close to each other	Thanks for your feedback. The thresholds were developed in consultation with industry representatives.	No
91	12/6/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 2. CTR Scoping and Review Process	Is scope/CTR approved if review deadline is not met?	The updated draft aligns with NCDOT's review process.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
92	12/6/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options	Can there be a payment in lieu for MA mitigations?	Payment in-lieu will be on a case-by-case basis. The updated draft includes information about payment-in-lieu.	Yes
93	12/6/2021	5.0.B.1 Traffic Impact Study - Assessment - TIS Study Area	Is meeting optional or case-by-case?	Meetings are optional and will be more of a case-by-case scenario.	Yes
94	12/7/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Table 1. CTR Review Thresholds Will this be determined on the unadjusted trip generation rates/equations using the general suburban information?	The updated draft clarifies that vehicle trip thresholds are based on unadjusted trips.	Yes
95	12/7/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Consider including TDM Mitigation for low density development but make the point thresholds lower. Maybe something like: Tier 1 = 1 point; Tier 2 = 2 points; Tier 3 = 3 points	Thank you for your feedback. As TDM advances we will continue to assess implementation and refinements.	No
96	12/7/2021	4.0.A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment	This is the metric for success that should be measured as part of TDM Plan Monitoring. Biannual mode split surveys would be a way to measure this	Thank you for your feedback. We will continue to work with the community to develop the preferred approach(es) to monitoring TDM.	No
97	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Plan Monitoring	Consider being more specific so that developers/owners know what to expect. Maybe it's annually for the first 3 years and every 3 or 5 years thereafter. Require an annual monitoring report.	The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
98	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Plan Monitoring	This raises the question about what is "effective". Without a larger metric for determining whether the site is "reduce[ing] single occupant vehicles and encourage[ing] alternative modes of transportation" it will be hard to measure whether the strategies are effective. Utilization of a strategy alone is somewhat arbitrary.	The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
99	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - TDM Coordinator	If this is required for sites triggering a TIS, consider making this 0 points.	Thank you for your feedback. As TDM advances we will continue to assess implementation and refinements.	No
100	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Education, Marketing and Outreach	<p>"Education, Marketing and Outreach" - Consider increasing mitigation point value to 2 points. This is critical to making sure all other programs get utilized. Or maybe there are more points if the education is ongoing and proactive, not just a one time move in packet.</p> <p>"Education packets" Hard copy materials are only one means of educating tenants. Consider adding another Programmatic Strategy for "TDM Program Website and/or Building App - Develop a central website as part of the property's website and/or building app to serve as a hub of transportation related information for tenants and visitors of the site."</p> <p>"specific transit and bicycle routes" Also consider calling this a "transportation access guide" rather than an "education packet". It's more focused on the sales value of this strategy.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
101	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Transit Fare Subsidy	<p>"Transit Fare Subsidy" Consider making this more generic so that it can be used for transportation modes other than transit if that's what's most effective. Maybe make the title "TDM Financial Incentives"</p> <p>"at least once annually" - Is this an ongoing subsidy for all tenants? If so, we may want to consider increasing the subsidy to 100%, but make it a one-time purchase for tenants that move into the property. Maybe even consider limiting to initial lease up.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
102	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Ride Matching	consider adding "residents" too, since much of the new development could be multifamily.	The updated draft includes residents.	Yes

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
103	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Flexible Work Schedules	This is not something a multi tenant office or residential building have control over. It's something an employer controls. It would be very hard for a property manager to track participation in this.	Thank you for your feedback. We will leave this in as an option for those cases where there are large employer tenants.	No
104	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Resident TDM Amenities	These strategies seem very specific. Are there other types of amenities? What outcome is desired with these strategies?	They are specific to provide guidance for and examples of these types of mitigations, but the City will consider other options.	No
105	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Bicycle Facilities	If these are offsite improvements that are conditions of development, consider not including them here as they are already required. Consider moving this to Table 3 as part of Multimodal Assessment	The improvements are on-site or frontage requirements, unlike the Multimodal Assessment mitigations.	No
106	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - On-site Childcare	Although onsite Childcare does reduce the need to drive, it is a very expensive ongoing service. Consider providing more mitigation points for sites that offer it.	Thank you for your feedback. As TDM advances we will continue to assess implementation and refinements.	No
107	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Transit Stop/Mobility Hub Improvements	Since this is a one time investment, consider moving it to "Physical Strategies" or Table 3.	Thank you for your feedback. We will leave as is, with an eye towards adjustments as we continue to assess and monitor TDM.	No
108	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Transit Service Upgrades	Given the level of ongoing cost and cities desire to encourage rather than cannibalize transit service, consider increasing the mitigation points for Transit Service Upgrades	Thank you for your feedback. We will leave as is, with an eye towards adjustments as we continue to assess and monitor TDM.	No
109	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Real Time Information	This is for more than Transit. Consider moving it to "Physical Strategies" to be more comprehensive/inclusive.	Thank you for your feedback. We will continue to assess and monitor TDM strategies, and make future adjustments as necessary.	No
110	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Price Parking	should have a higher value for mitigation points. At least 2 points but could be as high as 3 points if they are charging market rate.	The updated draft includes new point value.	Yes
111	12/7/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options - Note Section - 2	Consider moving to Table 3	The updated draft update adds note 2 to Table 3.0.	Yes
112	12/7/2021	5.0.C.1.b Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Identification	Is there a desirable LOS? If something is an A or B, can mitigation be waived? Potentially higher threshold in the TOD areas	The City does not have a specific LOS for intersections.	No
113	12/7/2021	5.0.C.2 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Determination	Expand this to describe CDOT's approach to mitigation. Which may include physical or non-physical improvements	The updated draft provides guidance on mitigations based on scale and context.	Yes
114	12/7/2021	5.0.C.2 Traffic Impact Study - Documentation - Mitigation Determination	Can credit be given if you build another development's improvements? "In cases where improvements are implemented in advance....."	Credit may be given if a mitigation is determined from traffic analysis.	No

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
115	12/7/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Background Growth Rate	Clarify whether this is annually, compounded or other? Scoping form states 'Applied Once'	It is compounded.	No
116	12/7/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Existing Trip Reduction	Include a section with Trip Generation Methodology	Thank you for your feedback. The methodology is based on industry standards.	No
117	12/7/2021	5.0.C Traffic Impact Study - Table 5. Trip Calculation Assumptions & TIS Data Requirements - Pass-by Trips	commercial ?	The updated draft clarifies to use the NCDOT's Rate vs Equation spreadsheet for pass-by and internal capture determination.	Yes
118	1/12/2021	1.0.B Purpose and Applicability - Applicability	In Section 1.0.B, how is redevelopment is defined? Is it a percentage of the property getting redeveloped, i.e. 50% of the developable area? This will ensure that the CTR is applied accordingly during the permitting process. Also, this will help to determine how fees can be accessed for review redeveloped property for the CTR.	The CTR threshold based on the number of daily trips, and not a percentage of the site redevelopment.	No
119	1/12/2021	2.0.B Comprehensive Transportation Review Process - CTR Scoping and Review Process	In Section 2.0.B., when in the workflow land development process is an application submitted for review under the CTR? Is it prior to a formal submission to the Planning Department for a by-right or rezoning petition	CTR approval is needed prior to a formal submission to the Planning Department for by-right projects.	No
120	1/12/2021	2.0.B Comprehensive Transportation Review Process - CTR Scoping and Review Process	In Section 2.0.B., How many resubmittals/review cycles are allowed before another fee is applied?	The fee structure and resubmittals/review cycles align with by-right permit and rezoning submittals.	No
121	1/12/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	For Table 1, fee schedules will have to be created to accommodate the reduced thresholds and increased number of rezoning districts that will now require a traffic analysis.	Fee schedule is out of our purview.	No
122	1/12/2021	2.0 Comprehensive Transportation Review - Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Also, under TIS requirements, shouldn't change of use or increase in trips since previous TIS approval be included as part of the triggers?	The CTR thresholds consider increase in trips.	No
123	1/12/2021	3.0.B Multimodal Assessment - Assessment	In Section 3.0.B, what is the 'CDOT's list of approved pedestrian crossings and signal locations' and where can it be located? How often is the list updated? Please hyperlink the City's ADA Transition Plan to ensure that the correct version is referenced.	The approved signals are in Charlotte Explorer and pedestrian crossings will also be provided. The Safety Section updates the list periodically.	No
124	1/12/2021	3.0.C Multimodal Assessment - Documentation - Table 3. Multimodal Assessment Mitigation Options - Notes	Under Table 3, Note 1 states that 'CDOT may consider other Multimodal mitigation options.' What do those options include? Are they based on industry standards or manuals published by NACTO?	The note provides flexibility for the development to propose other multimodal mitigations that may encourage non-vehicle trips. Those proposed mitigations can come from a variety of sources and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No
125	1/12/2021	4.0.C.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assessment - TDM Plan Monitoring	In 4.0.C.2, what does periodically include? Is it once a year, every two years? Providing a 'periodical period' provides certainty in the process.	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
126	3/15/2022	General Comment	This is a great tool to supplement other TDM and multimodal strategies that the city is adopting to ensure that communities benefit from development and the possible negative impacts are mitigated.	Thank you for your feedback.	No
127	3/22/2022	Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Comment concerning Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds. The breakout of Low-Intensity Development and High-Intensity development needs to be adjusted. The UDO Zoning districts CAC-1, NC, N2-C, IMU located under the "Low-Intensity" Development have the following building heights without bonuses, CAC-1 (75'), NC (60'), N2-C (65'), and IMU (80'). All of these districts could be/are moderate-density residential in nature.	NC, CAC-1, and IMU Zoning Districts have been added to the High Intensity Zoning Districts in the CTR.	Yes
128	3/23/2022	Table 1. Comprehensive Transportation Review Thresholds	Thresholds, as drafted, may be too high to trigger the Multimodal Assessment. Lowering the threshold will capture more development. Given an example of a series of "smaller" developments (under >750) along a corridor adding up to a very impactful situation for the neighborhood. We want to ensure that the cumulative changes are tracked or considered for the broader geography so the impacted residents are not	Thank you for your feedback. The thresholds were developed through discussions with industry representatives.	No

#	Date	Section	Public Comments	Staff Response	Change to Streets Manual
			left behind. This point also helps make a case for removing CAC-1, NC, N2-C, IMU from the "Low-Intensity Development" category.		
129	3/19/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation	Strategies should be implemented to evaluate the ongoing efficiency of these mitigation measures. We are concerned that many of the programmatic strategies could be quickly reversed by building owners or managers, which would result in no long-term benefits to tenants and people in the surrounding community.	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
130	3/17/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation	Some strategies do not provide mechanisms for how their efficiency would be assessed over time, and whether points should be reevaluated. This applies to the majority of mitigation options listed in the guidance	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
131	3/16/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Programmatic Strategies	Some suggested programmatic strategies have a questionable distribution of points that may not accurately reflect the relative impact of implementing them. For example, the distribution of materials (p. 6, table 4. "Education, Marketing and Outreach) should be 0.5 points instead of 1.	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
132	3/20/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Programmatic Strategies	The strategies for mitigation in business (employees) and residential development (residents) projects should be separated, or at least clarified. Mixing them all together is confusing. For example, "Guaranteed Ride Home", "Flexible work schedule") (Table 4, p. 6) that are more applicable for the employees, rather than residents.	Thank you for your feedback. We will continue to assess how TDM is applied and monitored, and make necessary adjustments as these programs advance.	No
133	3/18/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Physical Strategies	The current version of CTR (Table 4. TDM Mitigation Options: Physical Strategies) says that the developer would gain (1) mitigation point if they "Designate (5) parking spaces or 5% of spaces for carpooling/vanpooling and car-share services". We argue that more car-sharing spaces should be dedicated for car-share parking for daily/hourly car rental, vs "on-demand" services like "Uber and Lyft". The latter actually leads to higher VMTs in some cities because the driver is coming to pick up the passenger, instead of the passenger accessing a shared car that's parked on-site.	Thank you for your feedback. The City will work with the community to assess and measure the most effective monitoring process that provides the desired outcome of reducing single occupant vehicle trips.	No
134	3/24/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Physical Strategies	Comment under Physical Strategies in Table 4: TDM Mitigation Options "Bicycle Facilities – Completion of Streets Map designated bicycle facility along the development frontage (including ordinance requirements) and/or off-street trails or crossing treatments that encourage bicycling to and from the site." Adding an option here or under "Active Transportation Strategies " incorporating the Bicycle Priority Network facility (using the map when released with the SMP) with an All Ages Abilities (AAA) buildout. Having a higher level of safety and comfort with the added connectivity should be highly rewarded in this process.	The bicycle facility will follow the Streets Map recommendations, and the Bicycle Priority Network is a subset of the Streets Map.	No
135	3/25/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Physical Strategies	Comment under Physical Strategies in Table 4: Parking Strategies: Adding the option for installing on-street parking meters in appropriate street types like Main Street and a primary or secondary frontage	Thank you for your feedback. We will forward the comment to staff working on the Strategic Mobility Plan.	No
136	3/21/2022	Table 4. TDM Mitigation - Transit Stop/Mobility Hubs Improvements	The improvements that developers implement might be not enough. We suggest that the following mitigation strategies could be added: "bus stop improvements" (for example, 1 point for the provision of a bench, and 2 points for provision of a shelter"; additional measures that would offset the need for travel, especially in a mix-use development (provision of the fitness center; convenience/grocery store; parcel drop off on-site for shipment"); car-share subsidy for membership costs)	Thank you for your feedback. We will forward the comment to CATS, as they will be requiring transit mitigations as part of the UDO.	No