

Collector Street Plan Public Comments - Public Workshop #3

Question 8: How was this workshop helpful? What workshop improvements would you suggest?

| Category | Date | Source | Input | Input Revlevance |
|------------|---------|--------------------|--|------------------|
| Question 8 | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I now understand that this is a plan and developers will build them. Great idea! | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | No new information was presented, therefore useless. No political representatives available. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I'm afraid the workshop is to pacify the public, but not sure the interests of the public. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Yes- but try not to answer questions during the presentation. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | The workshop has shown that much more planning is necessary. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I think neighborhood input was listened to and taken into consideration. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | It was nice meeting people who live in the area and Durham planners and developers. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I am much clearer on why I don't like this. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | None- if 54 is out of study, it is worthless. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Not particularly helpful. Too many important questions were unanswered. Too little traffic analysis actually done. Pretty charts, little information. Overall poorly rationalized study. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I would suggest publishing a very specific description of who the decision makers are and how the decision will be made about this plan. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Yes. Can you distribute the copies of information discussed next time? | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Need better control of the crowd. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | There is some sincerity in presentation. However, the process was giving residents a false sense of participation, while trying to defuse the anger. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Representatives from town; consultant spent too much time defining terms - should have explained maps better. Showing street names to orient people. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Lots of good information and explanation. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Not helpful. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | This plan is absurd. This workshop was not helpful. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Very clear presentation. Very useful maps. There is no doubt about what is being planned. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Yes, helpful. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Not really. | General Theme |

| Category | Date | Source | Input | Input Relevance |
|------------|---------|--------------------|--|-----------------|
| Question 8 | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Public input has been insufficient. Little/no advance notice to Chapel Hill residents. SW Durham drive as an arterial has not been publicly vetted. Meadowmont Lane is residential, has an elementary school, and is full of children walking and playing. An arterial would destroy the only existing model of a walkable neighborhood - which your workshop input indicated that everyone wants. | Meadowmont Lane |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | It did answer a few questions. At least the maps were large enough to see. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | It was not that much helpful because they were partisan in explaining it to Blacks. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Please consider an alternative route to the east of the Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands area - In order to avoid 12,000 cars daily using Meadowmont Lane. Use George King Road as access to 54. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Educational. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Helpful people. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | it was very informative. It was also instructive to hear public sentiment, which was rude, ignorant and abusive. Sorry you had to put up with that. | |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | More analytical, less "hi, I'm Mr. Friendly." | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Better control of questioners. Repeat questions for all to hear. Use of a PA system and portable mikes so all don't try to talk at once. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Learned a lot. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Could not stay for workshop. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Very informative. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | The report shows a picture of a stub-out and the Figure legend calls it the Celeste Circle stub-out. There is no Celeste Circle stubout and this should be corrected. Probably it meant to say the Crossland Drive Stubout. Also, my comments submitted after workshop #2 were not included in the report. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Many showed up. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Good information; learned a bit more about the process. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Yes, but it doesn't make me feel any better about proposal. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Maps and plan, timeline helpful. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Provides some insights into the future development of the area I live in and helps me plan on the disposition of my property in the near future (1-2 years). | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Bigger picture of plan. I would suggest that Roger be more clear and arrange slide in more cohesive manner. Address upfront his role in the plan & what is belonging to others. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | My first information source on the plan. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Report the results of these comments sheets so citizens can access the depth and range of support or objection to these plans. | General Theme |

| Category | Date | Source | Input | Input Relevance |
|------------|---------|--------------------|--|-----------------|
| Question 8 | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Yes. Provide list of website, elected officials, contact info, and any future meetings, plus projected timelines. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Bring the relevant elected officials! | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | I thought Meadowmont Lane was going to become a collector road. Now it sounds like Meadowmont is already a collector that will be connected to an arterial which would make Meadowmont more or less an arterial road. Meadowmont reality lied to all of us about the plan of this road. | Meadowmont Lane |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Provide real data about how traffic would be changed. It is not clear from presentation how widening 54 or I-40 would not be easier and would avoid arterial. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Not really helpful. Consultant only presented topics as fix accomplishments- cost and practicability. No interactive discussion on new alternative CSP. Rude handling of questions. Recommend more structure, time and Q&A process. Communication was vague and general rather than specific. Style was inappropriate. Structure was poorly managed. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | Perhaps the speakers should be better informed and our representatives should be present. | General Theme |
| | 3/21/06 | Public Workshop #3 | More info should be in the newspaper for those who cannot attend. Great information. | General Theme |