

How Do I Submit Comments?

- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:

In object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because it poses health and safety hazards for the surrounding communities and the adjacent elementary school. The residents of the communities surrounding the ROMF, proposed to be located at the intersection of Farrington and Ephesus Church Roads in Durham County, inquired about the use of the term "controlled fluids" in the Consolidated Staff Report from the Durham/ Durham County Planning Commission on October 9, 2018. We requested a complete list of these so-called "controlled fluids", the amounts of each and how they were to be stored. This request was made on November 7, 2018, at a meeting of concerned residents with GoTriangle representatives, including John Talmadge, Interim Project Director of the D-O LRT project. He agreed to obtain that information but it did not arrive until late November 12, 2018. (He stated that it had to be obtained from other ROMF's, since the proposed one wasn't in operation.) Upon examination of this 4-page list of chemicals, fluids and waste, several notable issues were raised. 1) The large volumes of lubricants and cleaning fluids required in the ROMF include hydraulic fluids (55 gal.), gear, chassis and various other greases (1550 gal), windshield wiper fluid (60 gal.), and ammonia (192 gal.). 2) While many of these are used in smaller volumes routinely in auto repair garages or automobile agencies), the large volumes of any one of these listed fluids or chemicals represent a potential threat to the surrounding community, either as potential explosives or substances toxic to humans. For example, windshield wiper fluid contains both methanol and ethylene glycol, both of which are lethal upon ingestion and methanol is toxic even when volatilized. The volatility, toxicity and explosive nature of ammonia is well-known; its solution in water produces caustic ammonium hydroxide. 3) There has been no discussion with the surrounding neighborhood, nor any apparent consideration, of how these materials will be stored or dispos	
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
Citv. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:
Date:
Name:
Street Address:
City. State. Zip:
Phone:
Email: Contact Preference: □ Direct Mail □ Email □ Do Not Contact
Contact Freierence: — Direct Maii — Linaii — Do Not Contact



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Co	m	m	ei	nts	
----	---	---	----	-----	--

This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project.
l object to the Farrington location planned for the light rail ROMF because it ———————————————————————————————————
The studies submitted by GoTriangle indicate persistent noise of 99dBA with
Date:
Name:
Street Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone:
Email:
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact



How Do I Submit Comments?

Comments:

- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because it is too small-and poorly shaped for the purpose. The site's awkward shape forces trains to execute 90 degree turns as they are moved around the the site, causing extremely loud track squeal noise a fall times of day and night. Moreover, the site lacks room for expansion. The light rail can only make sense as part of a denser rail network. Yet the proposed site will be at capacity even as it handles the rolling stock of a single 17 mile track.	all
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
Citv. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:	
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because it poses—safety hazards for the surrounding neighborhoods and for the elementary school located right next to it (within 0.25 miles). The ROMF site is planned to hold large quantities of controlled fluids, including 1,000 gallons of used oil. Some of these fluids pose fire or—explosion risks. The fluids would have to be hauled to and from the site by truck, posing further safety concerns. All of this is supposed to happen in the middle of a residential area.	
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
Citv. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:	
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project I object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because the existing noise and vibration study was incomplete. Even its October 2018 update does not include homes in the adjacent Cupl Arbor subdivision that are located within 200 feet of the site. It also fails to account for spikes in noise	
which will occur in the middle of the night as trains are moved around for maintenance. 	
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
Citv. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email: Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project. I object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because the existing noise impact studies are insufficient. As the project progressed, GoTriangle gradually and reluctantly disclosed more and more noise that will emanate from the facility. Only recently have residents learned that trains will generate 136dBA of track squeal each time they make the tight turns when they enter the facility or the maintenance building. Also only recently disclosed was ongoing noise of 99dBA apparently due to electric generators.
Deter
Date:
Name:Street Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone:
Email:
Contact Preference: Direct Mail Email Do Not Contact



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project. I object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because it will impede traffic flowing between US15/501 and NC54. Farrington Road is one of only two significant roads that connect the two main thoroughfares in Durham: US15/501 and NC54. The other (Garrett—Road) is already overcrowded with traffic. The planned ROMF would permanently prevent Farrington Road from being widened to 4 lanes. This would happen at the same time as hundreds of additional homes are built in the vicinity with thousands more to come in the future. Moreover, crossing—trains would close Farrington Road every 10 minutes.
Date:
Name:
Street Address:
Citv. State. Zip:
Phone:
Email:
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:	
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail project I object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because it will reduce home values in surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed site is located in a residential area. There are no commercial or industrial properties anywhere nearby. There will be insufficient transitional protections between the propsoed industrial site and the surrounding homes. Some houses will be less than 200 feet from the site. Their property values will diminish massively. GoTriangle has not carried out a devaluation study.	
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
City. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:				
 I object to the planne GoTriangle withheld period for the project Go Triangle's website a new website was b comment period. The maps provided of 	ed Farrington Road I or obscured informa : e was riddled with b eing developed righ during the notice and Arbor subdivision th	ROMF factation during the second seco	nty (NC) Light Rail projectility on the grounds that g the public comment is for several weeks while iddle of the notice and it period excluded homes ated within 200 feet of the	
Street Address:				
	reference: Direct Mail		☐ Do Not Contact	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

Comments:	
This comment relates to the Durham/Orange County (NC) Light Rail projectI object to the planned Farrington Road ROMF facility because potentially dangerous chemicals will be stored on the property. Those chemicals are not listed in specificity in the critical environmental documents. The publichas had no opportunity to be intelligently informed or to comment based on that information. That is a violation of NEPA requirements	
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
City. State. Zip:	
Phone:Email:	
Contact Preference:	

	Please fold, fasten with tape	and mail. No envelope	necessary. Do not stap	ole.	
	-				Place Stamp Here
	_				
	Research	GoTriangle PO Box 13787 Triangle Park, N	C 27709		



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

_						•	
1 -	$\boldsymbol{\smallfrown}$	m	m	Δ	n	te	1
u	u			C		LO	٠

Date: Name: Street Address: City, State, Zip: Phone: Email:	We object to the planned Durham/Chapel Hill Light Rail project on the grounds that it will likely attract far fewer riders than GoTriangle projects. This will make the rail system (estimated by GoTriangle to cost more than \$130m per mile) economically non-viable. GoTriangle projects 24,000 riders per day or about 9m riders per year. The combined population of Durham and Chapel Hill is about 350,000. There are 42 light rail lines (including trolleys) in North America. All of them are located in far larger cities. Buffalo, NY may be the exception, but it attracts only 4.5m riders per year. Ridership levels similar to what GoTriangle projects for Durham/Chapel Hill are achieved by San Jose, CA (42 miles of track), Pittsburgh, PA (26 miles), Baltimore, MD (33 miles), New Orleans (22 miles; a tourist destination). All of these serve far larger populations than the proposed Durham/Chapel Hill line.	
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:	<u></u>	
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Name: Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Street Address: Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Citv. State. Zip: Phone: Email:		
Phone: Email:		
Email:		
	Contact Preference:	



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

r_{\sim}	-	-	•	~1	-	
Co	ш	ш	ы	ш	LS	

Comments.							
We object to the planned Durham/Chapel Hill Light Rail project on the grounds that it is economically absurd. —GoTriangle has not calculated (or made public) an estimate of the cost per rider. Here is a simple calculation, based entirely on the numbers provided by GoTriangle (likely optimistic):							
1. Capital cost: \$2.45b 2. Assumed interest rate: 5% (our assumption) 3. Interest cost per year: \$122m 2. Daily number of riders: 24,000 3. Annual number of round-trips: 4.4m 4. Interest cost per round-trip: \$28							
This calculation does not account for operating costs (about \$7 per round-trip based onGoTriangle's estimate of \$30m in annual operating costs). It also does not account for the fact that operation does not start until 10 years after the start of construction (capitalcosts accrue).							
A more likely scenario: Capital costs double (the typically cost overrun for public transit projects in the U.S. is over 100%) and ridership is about half of GoTriangle's projection (GoTriangle estimates 60% more riders than Charlotte's Blue Line which is 60% longer and runs through an area with 3 times the population of Durham and Chapel Hill). In that case, the cost per round-trip would quadruple to over \$100.							
In other words, each daily commuter would cost between \$8,400 (\$28x300) and \$30,000 (\$100x300) per year.							
Date:							
Name:							
Street Address:							
Citv. State. Zip:							
Phone:							
Email:							
Contact Preference: Direct Mail Email Do Not Contact							



- Written Comments: Complete and submit this form.
- Electronic Comments: Submit comments by visiting www.lightrailonline.com.

\sim	_			_		1_
	n	m	m	Δ	n	ts
•	u			•		LO

omments:	
We object to the planned Durham/Chapel Hill Light Rail project on the grounds that it is inappropriate for the proposed location. For a light rail project, Durham/Chapel Hill pose a worst case scenario. The area has a far smaller population than comparable projects (about 330,000 persons). The proposed rail does not run through or connect major population centers. Instead, it connects UNC hospitals (but not Chapel Hill or UNC's main campus) with Durham and Duke University. Because the entire area is built up, rail construction is unusally expensive (GoTriangle projects \$2.45b for an 18 mile track or \$136m per mile). A useful comparison is Phoenix, AZ. Construction costs were less than half of GoTriangle's projection (\$65m per mile). The rail line runs through an area with more than 10 times the population of Durham and Chapel Hill. It connects two major population centers (Tempe and ASU with Phoenix). There is enough space to build the rail away from residential areas. It makes sense to build rail in a location like Phoenix, but not in a location like Durham/Chapel Hill where it connects to mid-size towns, but excludes the major population center (Raleigh).	
	—
Date:	
Name:	
Street Address:	
Citv. State. Zip:	
Phone:	
Email:	
Contact Preference: ☐ Direct Mail ☐ Email ☐ Do Not Contact	