Welcome to the Public Hearing for Corridor & Design of the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study

Currituck and Dare Counties
Tonight’s Agenda

• Public Hearing Process
• General Project Overview
• Review of Corridor Map Details
• Public Comment Opportunity
Introductions

• NCTA
• NCDOT
• FHWA
• Others
“Ground Rules”

This is your opportunity…

- Open Houses & Workshops
- Comments - Pros & Cons
- This is not a debate
- General questions will be answered
- Detailed questions - after the hearing
- If not tonight then…
“Ground Rules”

• No debate among the audience
• Even if you do not agree – be courteous
• Three minute time limit
• There is a timekeeper
• Sign-up list
• After those who sign-up have spoken others will have the opportunity
• You may speak, send in written comments – or both
General Project Overview

- Background Information
- Project Purpose and Need
- Description of Detailed Study Alternatives
- Project Funding
- Draft EIS
- Recommended Alternative
- Right of Way and Relocation
- 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 necessary environmental analyses.
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.
Right of Way Process

• If affected, you will be contacted by a Right of Way Agent
• Appraisal made based on current market value at the property’s highest and best use
• Owners and tenants treated equally
• Owners rights explained clearly
• Just compensation paid for property
• Provide relocation advisory assistance
Relocation Assistance

• Assistance in securing comparable housing is available
• Moving assistance provided and expenses may be paid for you
• Additional monetary compensation is available to: cope with mortgage increases, increased value of comparable home, closing costs
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 this Hearing

Speak at the Public Hearings

Drop your comments in the box

E-mail your comments

Mail your comments
June 2010
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29  30

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
ER2 Key Map
MCB2/C1 and MCB2/C2 Key Maps
MCB4/C1 and MCB4/C2 Key Maps
Legend

- Existing Building
- Lakes, Rivers, Ponds, Streams and Sound
- Proposed Right of Way
- Proposed Right of Way with Control of Access
- Proposed Temporary Construction Easement
- Grave Site
- Proposed Pavement
- Proposed Bridge
- Wetlands
- Historic Property
- Property Lines
- Existing Road
- Study Limits MCB4/C2
- Study Limits MCB4/C1
- Study Limits MCB2/C1
- Study Limits MCB2/C2
- Study Limits ER2
- Permanent Drainage Easement
- Proposed Retaining Wall
- Existing Traffic Signal
- Proposed Traffic Signal

Photograph Dated June 2007
MCB4/C1
and
MCB4/C2
Key Maps
3-Lane Road
Superstreet
Thank you for attending the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study Corridor/Design Public Hearing.

WE WILL NOW RECEIVE YOUR COMMENTS