Mid-Currituck Bridge Study

Local Officials Meeting
Introductions

• NCTA
• NCDOT
• FHWA
• Others
Agenda

- Background Information
- Project Purpose and Need
- Description of Detailed Study Alternatives
- Project Funding
- Draft EIS
- Recommended Alternative
- Boating and Related Issues
2005 – Mid-Currituck Bridge becomes candidate toll facility
Project Area
Project Purpose and Need

- To substantially improve traffic flow on the project area’s thoroughfares (NC 12 and US 158)
- To substantially reduce travel time for persons traveling between the Currituck County mainland and the Currituck County Outer Banks
- To substantially reduce hurricane clearance time for residents and visitors who use US 158 and NC 168 during a coastal evacuation

With the proposed project in place, future travel time between the Currituck County mainland and Outer Banks is expected to be substantially shorter for many trips, and overall congestion throughout the project area also is predicted to be reduced.
Detailed Study Alternatives

Mid-Currituck Bridge Study
Alternative Concepts Considered in the Draft EIS

- Additional road and/or bridge alternatives
- Low cost alternatives
- Ferry alternatives
- Additional Mid-Currituck Bridge corridor alternatives
Project Funding

- Revenue Bonds
- TIFIA Loans
- Gap Appropriation
- Public Private Partnership
Public Private Partnership

• Private concessionaire will:
  – Design
  – Finance
  – Build
  – Operate
  – Maintain

• Done under a contract with NCTA
• NCTA will own the bridge
How much would tolls cost?

• 2007 preliminary traffic and revenue study indicated a one-way toll of $6 to $12
• Initial toll rates ultimately will be based on Investment Grade Traffic and Revenue Study
• All toll revenue is used to finance, construct, operate, and maintain the bridge
• Legislation requires that when the bridge is paid for, the toll be removed
How will tolls be collected?
What is a Draft EIS?

PART 1500—PURPOSE, POLICY, AND MANDATE

Sec. 1500.1 Purpose.
1500.2 Policy.
1500.3 Mandate.
1500.4 Reducing paperwork.
1500.5 Reducing delay.
1500.6 Agency authority.


SOURCE: 43 FR 5590, Nov. 28, 1978, unless otherwise noted.

§1500.1 Purpose.
(a) The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is our basic national charter for protection of the environment. It establishes policy, sets goals (section 101), and provides means (section 102) for carrying out the policy. Environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment. These regulations provide the direction to achieve this purpose.

§1500.2 Policy.
Federal agencies shall to the fullest extent possible:
(a) Interpret and administer the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States in accordance with the policies set forth in the Act and in these regulations.
(b) Implement procedures to make the NEPA process more useful to decisionmakers and the public; to reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data, and to emphasize real environmental issues and alternatives. Environmental impact statements shall be concise, clear, and to the point, and shall be supported by evidence that agencies have made the proper environmental analysis.
What is a Draft EIS?

- Why is the project needed?
- What are the reasonable alternatives?
- What are the impacts?
- How can impacts be mitigated?
- Summarizes public and agency coordination
Who is involved in the project?
Who Else Is Involved?

Local Stakeholders

- Residents
- Property owners
- Traveling public
- Local governments
  - RPO
  - Towns
  - Counties
- Elected officials
Alternatives Evaluated by Project Impacts

- Human Environment
- Physical Environment
- Cultural Environment
- Natural Environment
Technical Evaluation of...

- Wetlands and Streams
- Water Quality
- Endangered Species
- Floodplains
- Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Noise
- Community Resources
- Relocations
- Air Quality
- Hazardous Materials
- Farmlands
The Alternative Selection Process

- Recommendation made in Draft EIS based on technical evaluation of all factors
- Public Hearing/Comment process provides affirmation -- or -- sufficient justification for changing the recommendation
The Alternative Selection Process

- Not a “vote of the people”
- Not a political decision
- Based on sound, defendable, repeatable technical evidence with consideration of all public comments
- Process dictated by federal law (NEPA)
Recommended Alternative is MCB4

“Recommended Alternative” is only a recommendation.
Boating and Related Issues

- Boating activity study underway
- Will determine need for a navigation span with added height
- If you are a boater or rent boats please provide vessel information on your comment form
Participate in the Hearing

Speak at the Public Hearings

Drop your comments in the box

E-mail your comments

Mail your comments
June 2010

Comments Due

Flag Day

Father's Day
What happens next?

- Review and evaluate comments
- August 2010 – Identify the Preferred Alternative
- September 2010 – Final EIS
- December 2010 – Record of Decision (ROD)
- Early 2011 – Begin Construction
- Late 2014 – Open to traffic